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Section-1 Committee Activities

Section 1.1-Committee members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beth Trammel (Psychology)</th>
<th>Kris Rees (Political Science and International Studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Kim (Fine Arts)</td>
<td>Andrea Quenette (Communication Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Perkins (English)</td>
<td>Justin Carrol (History, Philosophy &amp; World Languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Raposo (Music)</td>
<td>Wazir Mohamed (Sociology, Anthropology &amp; Geography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kim (Criminal Justice)</td>
<td>Amanda Kraha (Bachelor of General Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julien Simon (Spanish)</td>
<td>Travis Rountree (Writing Center)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1.2- Recommendations from AY2017-2018:
The HSS assessment committee goals for AY2017-2018 were as follows:

1. Revise the data disaggregation processes, which were implemented in the 2016-2017 assessment cycle.
   - During the 2017-2018 year, program coordinators continued to disaggregate data. Additionally, implicit bias testing was institutionalized and there were discussions of expanding the student categories by which data would be disaggregated. It was not possible to complete the category expansion during the 2017-2018 year. However, this topic will be revisited in the 2018-2019 year pending the approval of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

2. Complete all missing assessment documentation from the 2015-2018.
   - There was a push for program coordinators to complete any outstanding assessment documentation during the 2017-2018 year. Some programs such as Music, did complete their missing Assessment Review. However, not all programs have completed their missing Assessment Reviews.

3. Implement the use of indirect assessment instruments in all HSS programs.
   - At this point, all programs should have indirect assessment tools. However, the missing Assessment Reviews make verification of the indirect assessment tools more difficult. The committee chair will conduct an audit during the Summer 2018 session to determine if all of the HSS programs do, in fact, have indirect assessment tools.

4. Explore moving to a more centralized assessment system for HSS.
   - This concept was explored but was not found to have much support. This may be a concept that is better suited to a campus-wide initiative.
The HSS assessment committee chair’s recommendation for AY2017-2018 were as follows:

1. Continue the IUPUI Assessment Institute rotation for the HSS assessment committee. I would like to send all new committee members to the institute as well as 4 returning members. The attendance of returning committee members would help existing committee members to stay abreast of new assessment methods.

- During the 2017-2018 year, the HSS Assessment Committee was able to send the majority of committee members to the IUPUI annual Assessment Institute. Only David Kim and Ann Kim were not in attendance. David Kim had not yet joined the committee and Ann Kim was on sabbatical. One of the committee members, Dr. Beth Trammel, presented at the institute. This marks the second consecutive year that the IU East HSSAC has had a member present at the institute.

2. Create fixed-terms of service on the HSS assessment committee. Implementing fixed three-year terms on the HSSAC may help to address the high turnover rate on the HSSAC. Of course, a fixed-term cannot account for situations in which a faculty member leaves the university all together but a fixed term may help reduce other cases of transient membership.

- There was no support for this idea and the committee continues to suffer from high turnover. In 2017-2018 the committee added Julien Simons, Andrea Quenette, David Kim and Travis Rountree while losing Diane Moneypenny. In 2018-2019 the HSSAC is expected to lose Beth Trammel and Amanda Kraha will become the new assessment coordinator for Psychology. This will leave a place vacant for the BGA assessment coordinator.

Section 1.3- Committee Activities:
During the AY2017-2018, the HSS Assessment Committee (HSSAC) conducted several noteworthy programs and revisions. A brief description of each activity is listed below.

Professional Development for committee members:
- As previously stated, 11 of the HSS Committee members attended the IUPUI Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. This conference is the primary means through which to enhance the professional development of HSS assessment committee members. It is anticipated that this conference will continue be used for professional development in the future.

- HSS Assessment Committee Fall Workshop.
  - The committee conducted its annual Assessment Goals, Innovations, Logistics and Evaluation (AGILE) workshop in the Fall Semester. This workshop is open to all faculty, but primarily attended by HSSAC members. Topic areas included: new assessment techniques used by coordinators in specific programs as well as specific findings and feedback from HSS programs.

- HSS Assessment Committee Spring Workshop.
  - The committee conducted a Spring workshop focused on closing the assessment loop in a more consistent way. The training also had Professor T.J. Rivard as a
guest speaker. Professor Rivard discussed some expectation from Academic Affairs and finding from HLC monitoring reports.

Documentation procedures:
- The HSS assessment committee continued its practice of documenting all assessment activities in the HSS assessment archives found in Canvas.

### Section-2 Program Reports

#### Section 2.1- Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment</th>
<th>None Reported.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment</td>
<td>None Reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation and Discontinuity</td>
<td>None Reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:

1. Revisit the assessment plans within the music theory course cycle to establish more continuity and consistent learning to better prepare student success. (PLO#1)
2. Revisit and refine the measurement tools for use in the Sight Singing and Aural Perception classes, so we can better assess the aural components of PLO#1.
3. Work with the applied lesson instructors to set stronger expectations students, so we can have a more common set of definitions for student achievement in lessons. (PLO #4)
4. Develop improved course activities and learning tools within the History of Music classes, and a more structured approach to research papers in the Capstone course, to improve achievement in music history (PLOs 2 and 3).

Assessment results for 2017-2018:

**There were no students completing the program for the 2017-2018 academic year.**

Action steps for the coming year:
- None reported.
Section 2.2- History

| Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment | 40% PLO Attainment. |
| Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment | None Reported. |
| Disaggregation and Discontinuity | None Reported. |

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:

1. Over the last several years, we became aware that our assessment wasn’t creating the vibrant or robust data to adequately assess our PLOs. When we started this process, we were told that we could take a sampling of students per course, but as our understanding of assessment became more robust and formal, we learned that wasn’t the case. As such, we created an assessment program that collects material from all of the students in our courses – shared exams, research papers, and a capstone. Likewise, we transitioned to a portfolio model for the program; the students collect material from multiple courses and turn it in during their capstone experience. This will go into effect in Fall 2017.

2. In order to solid a stronger understanding of historical material, primary source analysis, research and writing, etc., we created shared mid-terms and final exams, and we implicated a final cumulative exam that students have to pass in the captive. Likewise, we now require research papers in all of our 300/400 level courses; this will ensure that students will always engage academic research and writing. This will go into effect in Fall 2017.

3. Finally, as a way of fostering students with a clear understanding of what a history degree can do for them, and, as a result, better tailor and take ownership of their academic career, we created a series of assignments in our HIST-H217: Methods course and our HIST-J495 designed to foster job-related skills like CV writing, or resume writing, or teaching philosophy development, or how to establish a research agenda. This will go into effect in Fall 2017.

Assessment results for 2017-2018:

Proficiency target: 75% of students meeting Proficient or above.

- PLO1: **Not Met** (40% Proficient)
- PLO2: **Not Met** (0% Proficient)
- PLO3: **Not Met** (40% Proficient)
- PLO4: **Met** (100% Proficient)
- PLO5: **Met** (100% Proficient)

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.*

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Create a “how to research” module series for all 300/400 courses – this will help our students
refresh their knowledge of research after 217. This will also help flatten the disparities of experience.

2. Create more consistent engagement across 100 level courses for primary sources – introduce students earlier and more consistently.

3. Create more consistent engagement across our 100 level courses for secondary sources – or historiography.

Section 2.3- Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment</th>
<th>33.3% PLO Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment</td>
<td>100% Indirect PLO Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation and Discontinuity</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:

1. Continue to implement consistent rubrics to give a clearer picture of our students' strengths and areas of need.
2. Continue to analyze the exit exam, but more importantly emphasis critical aspects of psychology within every course to help improve scores on the exit exam (and the students' overall knowledge of psychology).
3. Train each faculty member to incorporate assessment effectively and meaningfully in our courses.

Assessment results for 2017-2018:

Proficiency Goals: Direct Measures (75% of students would get 70%+ on their final paper.)
Indirect Measures (80% or more of students will report proficiency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Direct Target</th>
<th>Indirect Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1:</td>
<td>Not Met (45.5% met target), Met (95% reported proficiency)</td>
<td>Met (90% reported proficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2:</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Met (92% reported proficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3:</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Met (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4:</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Met (90% reported proficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5:</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Met (96% reported proficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6:</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Met (100% reported proficiency)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Continue to monitor data about student writing, knowledge of psychology at the senior level, and critical thinking. Modify existing assessments if needed.
2. Develop and implement a plan to analyze potential differences between adjunct faculty
members and full-time faculty members with regard to student learning.
3. Develop and implement a plan to analyze potential differences between online students and face-to-face students with regard to achieving PLOs.

Section 2.4- Political Science

| Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment | 25% PLO Attainment |
| Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment | 100% Indirect PLO Attainment |
| Disaggregation and Discontinuity | Reported but not verified. 75% Discontinuity, student origin. |

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:
1. Integration of signature assignments from each upper division course into Senior Seminar portfolio. Creation of an assessment-oriented rubric for these assignments, so that we can include procedural assessment data into future program evaluations.
2. Revise senior exit exam in early Fall 2017, per Spring Meeting action plan, including approval of revised PLOs. Take into account the problem areas identified in the senior seminar data reporting document.
3. Build review modules in the Senior Seminar course that reinforce the material that students covered in previous courses, introduce the learning outcomes that they will be assessed on in their revised assignment, and review some of the materials they will see in their post-test.
4. Continued and expanded development of evaluation rubrics for course assignments (including discussion posts, journal entries, and course papers) that are clearly and explicitly linked to appropriate PLOs (whether via PLO-linked CourseLOs, or to PLOs directly). Consider linking to Mastery Paths on Canvas.
5. More rigorous application of the QM rubric to all online classes, to ensure that students are receiving a consistent educational experience within the program. Raising the QM credentials of all TT POLS faculty to QM Certified Reviewer level or higher. Work with all program faculty to harmonize look-and-feel between courses (and to coordinate content where possible, especially at the introductory level).
6. Continued and expanded use of quizzes (for credit and not for credit) with questions directly linked to PLOs in intro and upper division classes. This is expected to improve student engagement with, and retention of, (PLO-linked) course material, and may help provide objective indicators of student performance that would close the gap between direct and indirect evaluations.

Assessment results for 2017-2018:

Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.
Proficiency goal (Indirect measure): 70% of students “Agree” or “Strongly agree” with the PLO-link statement of ability.

PLO1: Direct Target: Not Met (62.5%, n=5 met proficiency target)
Indirect Target: Met (100%, n=8)
PLO2: **Direct Target: Not Met** (25%, n=2 met proficiency target)
   - **Indirect Target: Met** (100%, n=8)

PLO3: **Direct Target: Not met** (38%, n=2 met proficiency target)
   - **Indirect Target: Met** (100%, n=8)

PLO4: **Direct Target: Met** (75%, n=6 met proficiency target)
   - **Indirect Target: Met** (100%, n=8)

*Data disaggregation was completed but no significance tests were reported. Disaggregation data suggested that Transfer students performed lower than IU East Native students did in every PLO category except PLO#2. However, without the accompanying significance tests it is impossible to know whether those results occurred by chance.*

**Action steps for the coming year:**


2. Building on the minorly revised senior exit exam from Fall 2017 / Spring 2018, incorporate more substantial revisions into the 2018-2019 exam that reflect the evolution of our program in practice, including alignment with appropriate Bloom’s Taxonomy outcomes.

3. Develop formalized assessment mechanism (e.g. rubrics and reporting pathway) for evaluation of senior seminar artifacts from a program assessment perspective in addition to student evaluation.

4. Build review modules in the Senior Seminar course that reinforce the material that students covered in previous courses, introduce the learning outcomes that they will be assessed on in their revised assignment, and review some of the materials they will see in their post-test. Minor progress AY2017-2018. Needs to be expanded and continued for AY2018-2019.

5. Incorporate direct and indirect assessment instruments into core upper division courses to reinforce, and provide early data about student attainment of, PLOs assessed in Senior Seminar course.

6. Continue 2017-2018 AY project of developing expanded evaluation rubrics for course assignments (including discussion posts, journal entries, and course papers) that are clearly and explicitly linked to appropriate PLOs (whether via PLO-linked Course LOs, or to PLOs directly). Consider linking to Mastery Paths on Canvas.

7. More rigorous application of the QM rubric to all online classes, to ensure that students are receiving a consistent educational experience within the program. Raising the QM credentials of all TT POLS faculty to QM Certified Reviewer level or higher. Work with all program faculty to harmonize look-and-feel between courses (and to coordinate content where possible, especially at the introductory level). Major progress AY2017-2018: POLS-Y 205 is going up for formal QM review. We plan to undertake self-reviews of intro level courses in AY2018-2019.
8. Continued and expanded use of quizzes and reflection assignments (for credit and not for credit) with questions directly linked to PLOs in intro and upper division classes. This is expected to improve student engagement with, and retention of, (PLO-linked) course material, and may help provide objective indicators of student performance that would close the gap between direct and indirect evaluations.

Section 2.5- Fine Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment</th>
<th>50% PLO Attainment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment</td>
<td>50% Indirect PLO Attainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation and Discontinuity</td>
<td>Not Reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:
1. More collaboration among instructors to improve and embed experiential learning into our curricula such as group field trips, domestic travel courses, guest artists, visiting artist demos and workshops, etc.
2. More strategic programming in terms of the exhibition calendar, alignment among exhibitions with course curricula, and regular/streamlined events that are well-promoted, organized, and announced in advance. Gallery schedules need to be provided to the students at the beginning of the academic year.
3. Organize a meeting with our adjunct faculty that teach 2+ courses/semester to get feedback about ways in which we can improve our instruction and student learning.

Assessment results for 2017-2018:

Proficiency goal: Direct Measure (80/100 for all PLOs.)
Indirect Measure (students to rate their level of growth and knowledge at 3 on a 1-4 scale [75%])

PLO1: **Direct Target: Not Met** (75% met proficiency target)
      **Indirect Target: Met** (75% reported proficiency)

PLO2: **Direct Target: Met** (87.5% met proficiency target)
      **Indirect Target: Not Reported**

PLO3: **Direct Target: Not met** (75% met proficiency target)
      **Indirect Target: Not Reported**

PLO4: **Direct Target: Met** (81.2% met proficiency target)
      **Indirect Target: Met** (75% reported proficiency)

Action steps for the coming year:
1. Have ALL studio courses incorporate “visual formal analysis” exercise to ensure student achievement in PLO #1 (Terminology) and PLO #2 (Art Criticism)
2. Two of the required field trips to Cincinnati for the Capstone students was very
successful: continue this model with upper level courses, and require students to visit nationally ranked museums each semester for their special exhibitions.

3. We are finally in the process of having a streamlined exhibition schedule that is publicized at the beginning of each semester and more invited artist lectures, which will help with PLO #3 in terms of students’ knowledge of contemporary art practices, art criticism, and art history: this way, we can also assign them to write about their experiences, which will reinforce their ability to utilize the terminology they have learned in the class, which will improve PLO #1’s “Terminology” portion as well as PLO #3’s aim to increase students’ ability to critique works of art in their historical context while incorporating high-impact practices that haven been proven to reinforce learning in a more effective way than just from class exercises alone. In order for this to work, it will be important to have a set calendar at the beginning of each semester. Also, continue to utilize university support services such as the writing center, student support services, and multiple revisions and resubmission options for written assignments.

4. Start offering a competitive internship course every Fall starting Fall 2019 as a way to expand student professional opportunities.

Section 2.6- English

| Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment | 87.5% PLO Attainment. |
| Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment | 87.5% Indirect PLO Attainment. |
| Disaggregation and Discontinuity | Discontinuities Found. (Course Delivery) (Student Origin) |

Action steps from 2016-2017:

1. Information literacy, PLO #5, in both literature and technical and professional writing concentrations, returned softer scores in comparison with other PLOs, overall. Increased attention will be given to classroom effectiveness/practices in conveying concepts as well as clarifying what constitutes evidence of learning in this area.

2. Discontinuity between native and transfer students will be addressed in literature courses for all PLOs, beginning with PLO #5 in the next academic year, by including review of fundamental concepts, as faculty deem necessary, that transfer students may have not learned prior to coming to IU East or may have not retained.

3. Revisions will be made to quantitative sections of exit survey (indirect measure) in order to better align questions with concentration PLOs.

Assessment results for 2017-2018:

**Literature Concentration** (Proficiency goal 60% Achieving Mastery)
PLO1: Literary Interpretation and Textual Analysis:
   **Direct Target: Met** (74% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Met** (73% met proficiency target)
   Discontinuity (IUE Native and Transfer students: p=.004, d=.680)

PLO2: Critical Approaches:
   **Direct Target: Met** (62% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Met** (71% met proficiency target)
   Discontinuity (Seated and Online students: p=.001, d=.730)

PLO3: Cultural and Historical Contexts:
   **Direct Target: Met** (64% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Not met** (52% met proficiency target)
   Discontinuity (Seated and Online students: p=.05, d=.990)*

PLO4: Effective Writing:
   **Direct Target: Met** (70% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Met** (74% met proficiency target)
   Discontinuity (Seated and Online students: p=.001, d=.790)

PLO5: Information Literacy:
   **Direct Target: Not met** (44% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Met** (69% met proficiency target)

**Creative Writing Concentration** (Proficiency goal: 60% Mastery)

PLO1: Craft:
   **Direct Target: Met** (86% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Met** (88% met proficiency target)

PLO2: Practice:
   **Direct Target: Met** (84% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Met** (80% met proficiency target)

PLO3: Context:
   **Direct Target: Met** (92% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target: Met** (61% met proficiency target)
   Discontinuity (Seated and Online students: p=.001, d=1.86)*

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Plans in place to revisit literature LOs (less in number and more supportive of learning).
2. Revisit 400 level versus 300 level targets.
3. Add assessment for CW 400 level as mastery courses for assessment.
4. Include data outcomes for majors versus non-majors and online versus seated courses.
5. Avoid repeating books across different courses.
6. Revise question in senior exit survey on work to edit out IU East (some students read this as did they work at IU East rather than did they work).
7. Data on major versus non-major, seated versus online needed to determine specific patterns and trends for outcomes (i.e. lower ratings in documentation and research may be due to large numbers of non-majors in particular courses.
Section 2.7- Sociology, Anthropology, Geography

| Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment | 28.57% PLO Attainment |
| Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment | Not Reported |
| Disaggregation and Discontinuity | Not Reported |

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:

1. Deviant Behavior (S320): Recommend no changes in the overall assessment of this learning outcome in Deviant Behavior and Social Control. I feel confident that this course reinforces the knowledge and application of dominant theoretical perspectives. The three problematic questions (one for labeling, 1 for rational choice, and 1 for control) will be examined closely to see if the question structure or coverage in the texts or lectures needs to be supplemented.

2. Gender Inequality (S413): There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 1f and 4d as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes. With regard to outcome 1g, the question placed more emphasis on negative consequences of a gender imbalance and not proposal for solutions. The question will be modified, in the next offering, to shift the emphasis to specific solutions. This was a particularly good group of students with strong critical thinking skills.

3. Queer Identities (S410Q): Recommend no changes in the assessment of outcomes 1F, 4B or, 4C as the results reflect high levels of mastery of the learning outcomes. With regard to 1g: While this is a strong result for this outcome, the assignment could be modified by changing the language slightly in the assignment to have them investigate all four levels more explicitly. Because the assignment specifically asked students to look at social movements the majority of their analysis was focus on the structural and cultural changes.

4. Human Origins (A103): There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 3e and 3f as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes.

5. Culture and Society (A104): There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 3e and 3f as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes.

6. Language and Culture (L200): There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcome 2c as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of this learning outcome.

7. Forensic Anthropology (B320): Lab time was increased from the previous year which improved performance on the midterm and quizzes. This structure will be used in the next offering and the results will be analyzed again to check for consistency.

8. Cultures of Africa (E310): There is only a minor recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 5d and 5e as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes. The quizzes were reduced to three from four and an additional textbook was added to the course this past year. This structure will be used in the next offering and the results will be analyzed again to check for consistency.
Assessment Results from 2017-2018.

Proficiency goal: 100% Proficiency or above.

PLO1: Social Inequalities and Hierarchies:
   **Direct Target: Met** (100% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target:** Not Reported

PLO2: Theoretical Frames:
   **Direct Target: Not met** (75% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target:** Not Reported

PLO3: Social Structure, Human Agency, & Culture:
   **Direct Target: Met** (100% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target:** Not Reported

PLO4: Sociological Imagination
   **Direct Target: Met** (100% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target:** Not Reported

PLO5: Location Within the Global Context:
   **Direct Target: Unknown** (50% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target:** Not Reported

PLO6: Research Literacy:
   **Direct Target: Not met** (50% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target:** Not Reported

PLO7: Dissemination of Ideas Proficiency:
   **Direct Target: Not met** (50% met proficiency target)
   **Indirect Target:** Not Reported

Action steps for the coming year:

1. No action is warranted at this time for SOC S254 (Fall 17) since all LO’s were met by the two students who completed all components of the course. As this was the first time the course was assessed with these LO’s it will need further assessment for trend analysis.

2. Specific action is recommended stemming from assessment of LO’s in SOC S230 (Spring 18). LO #1 (Describe and differentiate social class (race/ethnicity; gender; sexual identification) structure in the United States) should be removed from the Program Assessment Curriculum Map for reinforcement in this class. Only one week of instruction gives focus to this issue and this is insufficient for adequate reinforcement. This LO is reinforced more appropriately in several other classes including S217, S308, S320, S335, S410Q, and S413. Removing this LO from this course would not have an adverse result. Likewise, LO 3a (Describe and provide examples of social structure, human agency, and culture) is specifically discussed in one lecture, which is insufficient reinforcement. This LO is reinforced in several other courses including, S215, S308, S320, S335, S410Q, S410M, and S413. One option is to remove this LO from the curriculum map. The other option would be to enhance the lectures to place more emphasis
on this outcomes. LO 4d (Critically assess how social forces affect life chances & experiences across social position & location) was not assessed. A more specific assignment needs to be created if this LO is to be assessed in this course.

3. Adjustments in the structure of the course, initiated from Spring 2016 assessment of Social Theory (S340), had a positive impact on all LO performance. Learning outcome #4 (6d Analyze and appropriately relate differing methodologies to theoretical paradigms (epistemologies and ontologies) also experienced significant improvement from the previous assessment but the target proficiency is still below what Denise would like to see. Denise will look to improved or new ways to measure this outcome. She will also incorporate additional lecture material to enhance knowledge and application of theory/method placement proficiency.

4. Specific action is recommended for summative assessment for Sociology students to advise students into taking social theory earlier in their academic careers so as to not take the course simultaneously with senior seminar. This is problematic at this time since social theory is offer every even spring semester. As we begin to offer the online sociology degree the course may be offered more frequently. The HSS Sociology advisor has already been advised of the issue and emphasis.

5. To further enhance skill development for citation and referencing, it is recommended that upper-level Sociology classes require Sociology majors and minors to use ASA citation style to reinforce the knowledge development for those students.

6. In Fall 2018, assessment coordinator, Wazir Mohamed will establish an e-portfolio structure for use by all BS Sociology majors. This portfolio will be used as part of the summative assessment. Work on the development of the e-portfolio is to be completed by December 2018.

7. Wazir Mohamed will establish assignments and procedure for assessment of the three summative learning outcomes for learning objective #5-- An ability to recognize & relate themselves, their culture & nation within a global context. Assessment from this course will need to be retained for each Sociology major and minor and transferred to the summative assessment rubric for each student.

8. Specific action will be needed by Sociology faculty to incorporate learning outcomes for the online degree. The online learning outcomes will be aligned with the current program outcomes. Both degree programs will be offered simultaneously and courses will serve both majors. This means that the aligned outcomes will be woven into the overall assessment program.

Section 2.8- Communication Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment</th>
<th>50% PLO Attainment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment</td>
<td>100% Indirect PLO Attainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation and Discontinuity</td>
<td>Not Reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:

1. Modify rubrics for the capstone course and presentation to address the difficulties in the assessment and learning.
2. Modify the capstone course to address student difficulties with research project and other options in the capstone project.
3. Discuss, plan and possibly implement at least 1 types of assignment across a few courses in the program.
4. Include formal language about portfolios in the syllabi so that students plan to save the documents and prepare collect portfolios by the end of their career at IU East.

Assessment results for 2016-2017:

Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.
Proficiency goal (Indirect measure): 80% of students would have “Perceived Proficiency” or higher.

PLO1: Direct Target: Not Reported
Indirect Target: Met (100%, n=21 met proficiency target)

PLO2: Direct Target: Not Reported
Indirect Target was met (100%, n=21 met proficiency target)

PLO3: Direct Target: Not Reported
Indirect Target: Met (100%, n=21 met proficiency target)

PLO4: Direct Target: Met (93%, n=27 met proficiency target)
Indirect Target: Met (83%, n=24 met proficiency target)

PLO5: Direct Target: Met (83%, n=24 met proficiency target)
Indirect Target was met (97%, n=28 met proficiency target)

PLO6: Direct Target: Partially met (69% (n=20) and 76%, (n=22) met proficiency target on different measures)
Indirect Target: Met (97%, n=27 met proficiency target).

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Incorporate formative assessment to identify places where students need greater support throughout the program.
2. Better scaffold assignments from C405 and C424 so students are prepared for the assignments in the Capstone.

Section 2.9- Criminal Justice

| Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment | 100% PLO Attainment |
| Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment | Not Reported. |
| Disaggregation and Discontinuity | No discontinuity found. |

Action steps generated from 2016-2017 assessment:
1. Continue to monitor faculty course realignment of courses.
2. Implement centralized assessment structure, using the Canvas LMS, to increase data collection consistency. A centralized assessment system would allow the program to improve data collection and track student learning across their matriculation.
3. Develop a robust formative assessment system.
4. Continue the discussion on requiring prerequisite classes.
Assessment results for 2017-2018:

Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.

PLO1: **Direct Target: Met** (91%, n=20 met proficiency target)
Indirect Target: Not Reported

PLO2: **Direct Target: Met** (82%, n=18 met proficiency target)
Indirect Target: Not Reported

PLO3: **Direct Target: Met** (91%, n=20 met proficiency target)
Indirect Target: Not Reported

PLO4: **Direct Target: Met** (73%, n=16 met proficiency target)
Indirect Target: Not Reported

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Continue to monitor faculty course realignment of courses. This strategy appears to be having an impact as the PLO Attainment for PLO #2 has met the target threshold for the first time in 5 years.
2. Improve data collection method for indirect measures for seniors. In the 2017-2018 year, the program switched to the Qualtrics survey platform. This created collection problems for the indirect survey instrument. Additionally, the CJUS program also migrated to an individually-based assessment structure rather than the customary cohort assessment system. This created some confusion among the students but the errors and misunderstandings are being resolved.
3. Continue the development and implement a formative assessment system for the program. This goal was not completed from the previous year.

**Section 3.0- WLC (Spanish)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Attainment: Direct Assessment</th>
<th>Not Submitted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment: Indirect Assessment</td>
<td>Not Submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation and Discontinuity</td>
<td>Not Submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action items from the 2016-2017 academic year.

NA

Assessment results for 2017-2018:

NA
Section 3- Observations and Recommendations

Section 3.1- Assessment Observations and Trends
The culture of assessment at IU East continues to develop in a positive way. The assessment committee members seem more willing to participate in disseminating their assessment knowledge and experience at assessment conferences than in past years. This suggests that the committee members are far more comfortable with their roles as assessment coordinators that in previous years. Despite the continued growth of the assessment culture, there are several lingering challenges that need to be addressed.

Now that the HSS Assessment Committee has implemented all of the required assessment components outlined by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the committee members need to institutionalize these new components and practices. The 2017-2018 program assessment summary reports contained a number of errors and omissions that appeared to be related to the implementation of multiple new procedures in a relatively short amount of time. These types of errors and omissions are common during periods of rapid change and expansion. The HSS programs also need to do a better job of demonstrating proper ‘follow-up’ on stated goals for program revisions. The following recommendations and committee goals are designed to address these issues.

Section 3.2- Goals and Recommendations for AY2018-2019

The HSS Assessment Committee goals for the 2018-2019 academic year are as follows:

1. The HSSAC will conduct climate interviews with the HSSAC committee members to determine if there are any outstanding problems with the committee structure or function. These climate interviews will be conducted by a faculty member who is external to the committee. The reviewer should be at the Dean or AVC level.

2. Individual assessment coordinators, in conjunction with the committee chair, will create exemplars of their respective summary reports. These exemplars will serve as models against which the coordinators may check their future summary reports prior to submitting them.

3. The HSSAC Chair will review the GenEd data collection process for the purpose of coordinating its transference to the GenEd committee in the most efficient manner.

4. The HSSAC Chair will develop Graduate assessment procedures for new graduate programs.

5. The primary focus of the 2018-2019 academic year will be on implementing evidence-based program changes in a more systematic, concrete manner. In order to accomplish this goal, the HSSAC committee will undertake the following objectives:

   A. Introduce the HSS Assessment Loop Organization (HALO) Form. The HALO form will allow HSS assessment coordinators to streamline the tracking of
program interventions while increasing the concrete linkage between assessment outcomes and program interventions.

B. Introduce a ‘goal follow-up process’ to ensure that proposed goals are completed and re-evaluated in a timely manner.