EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Report for Non-Accredited Programs

(*updated 9/17/24*)

Program Type: **Non-Accredited Program**

Program Name: Geography B.S.

Submitted By: Barry Kronenfeld

Email: bjkronenfeld@eiu.edu

Submission Date: 10/13/2025

Review Cycle: Odd Year

- Even Year
- **Odd Year**

Review Round and Instructions

- **Round A** (Associate Dean review)**:** Submit this cover sheet and a copy of the annual (or periodic) report most recently submitted to the accrediting agency; your accreditation report should address assessment.

- **Round B** (Associate Dean + VPAA review): Submit this cover sheet and the following:
  - evidence of ongoing accreditation (document confirming accreditation status, which could be a letter from the accrediting agency)
  - annual (or periodic) accreditation report submitted to agency
  - this SLO report, which provides a summary of the program's collection and evaluation of its annual assessment data*
  - an optional cover memo (not to exceed one page), which briefly describes any information or highlights the department believes would be important to demonstrate academic excellence and program quality

If your program completed a significant review (accreditation application and/or the full 8-year IBHE report) in the last calendar year, then you may, with permission from the VPAA or designee, substitute either of these major reports for your typical Student Learning Outcomes report.* ***To be approved, these documents must substantively discuss assessment, outcomes, and data, and have been prepared and submitted within the same calendar year.*

All SLO reports are archived here: https://www.eiu.edu/assess/majorassessment.php
DUE: **October 15th** to your Associate Dean or designee

Each academic program is expected to prepare a Summary of the Assessment Data by Student Learning Outcome. This summary may take the form of a chart or other means of presentation that describes the annual data collected, when it is collected, in which course(s), through which assignment or activity, and by whom. This summary should clearly indicate what the program seeks to discover in its students' learning. The summary should correspond to the record-keeping documents maintained by the academic program.

Program Name: Geography B.S.

PART 1. OVERVIEW OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND MEASURES

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) *Primary **undergraduate learning goal (ULG)**: writing, speaking, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, responsible citizenship* ***(w,s,q,c,r)***	What **measures and instruments** are you using? This could be an oral or written exam, a regularly assigned paper, a portfolio—administered early and later in coursework.	How are you using this info to improve student learning? What are you hoping to learn from your data? Include **target score(s) and results**, and specify whether these were met, not met, or partially met for each instrument. *Key:* ✓ *target met* ✓* *target partially met* ✗ *target not met* *Target scores are further discussed in Part 2.*
Objective 1.1 Uses and creates maps to interpret physical and human characteristics such as scale, distance, climate, soils, resource distribution, and other spatial information in determining geographic patterns. ***(c) critical thinking***	GEO 3820 Remote Sensing I *Embedded Exam Question* A one-page essay question was embedded into the final exam requiring demonstration of knowledge of basic remote sensing concepts and image processing techniques.	Viertel S25 Students are expected to develop familiarity with the basic principles and applications of remote sensing. Students must demonstrate the ability to interpret aerial and satellite imagery, recognize geographic features, and analyze spatial processes on the landscape. Among 9 students, answers received an average rating of 4.11 out of 5. The average was lower than the previous assessment average of 4.5. (✓)
	GEO 3820 Remote Sensing I *Research Paper* Students were required to present the results and analysis of an in-depth, student-driven	Viertel S25 Students are expected to develop familiarity with the basic principles and applications of remote sensing. Students must demonstrate

	research project in the form of a written research paper.	the ability to interpret aerial and satellite imagery, recognize geographic features, and analyze spatial processes on the landscape. Among 8 students, research papers received an average rating of 3.875 out of 5. This was slightly higher than the previous assessment average of 3.75. (✓*)
	GEO 3825 Lidar Mapping *Embedded Exam Question* A one-page essay question was embedded into the final exam	Viertel S25 Among 13 students, question responses received an average rating of 4.15/5. This was slightly down from the previous assessment. (✓)
	GEO 3825 Lidar Mapping *Research Paper* Students were required to present the results and analysis of an in-depth, student-driven research project in the form of a written research paper.	Viertel S25 Among 12 students, research papers received an average rating of 4.5/5. This was an increase from the previous assessment. (✓)
	GEO 3825 Lidar Mapping *Speech/Oral Presentation* Students were assessed by presenting the results of a research project in a brief 10 minute speech.	Viertel S25 Among 11 students, speeches received an average rating of 4.18/5. This was a slight increase from the previous assessment. (✓)
	GEO 3870 Remote Sensing II *Embedded Exam Question* Students were assessed by means of a one-page essay question on the final exam involving in-depth exploration of classification and multi-temporal spatial analysis procedures.	Viertel F24 Students are expected to demonstrate comprehension of advanced remote sensing techniques and applications and relate these to other coursework undertaken during their time at EIU. Among 8 students, essay questions received an average rating of 4.125 out of 5. This was a slight improvement over the previous assessment average of 4. (✓)
	GEO 3870 Remote Sensing II *Research Paper*	Viertel F24 In GEO 3870, students are expected to research advanced remote sensing methods

	Students presented the results and analysis of an in-depth, student-driven research project in an approximately ten page research paper. A capstone project requires the application of acquired skills to all portions of the remote sensing process including image acquisition, correction, geo-registration, classification, and analysis.	and apply these techniques to a study area of their choice. The results of this work are presented in an approximately 10-page research paper, with expectations for proper citation and coherent communication. Among 8 students, research papers received an average rating of 4.125 out of 5. This was slightly improved from the previous assessment average of 4.0. (✓)
Objective 1.2 analyzes geographic data and appropriately presents them in charts, graphs, tables, and other forms. ***(q) quantitative reasoning***	GEO 3885 Quantitative Methods in Geography *Pre/Post-Test Questions* Students were given a pre/post-test consisting of 15 questions testing students understanding of and ability to measure distributions and analyze statistical and spatial statistical problems.	Kronenfeld S25 Among 11 students, average response rates increased from 40% to 62%. Improvement was slightly less, but baseline and posttest scores were both significantly higher than the previous assessment. (✓*)
Objective 2.1 understands the dynamic and interactive nature of the physical and human processes of the earth, including how the human activity within a region modifies the physical properties of the region, and how physical attributes of the land and climate influence and constrain human activities. (R) ***(r) responsible citizenship***	GEO 1120G The Natural Environment *Pre/Post-Test Questions* Students were given pre and post tests consisting of 16-20 questions that spanned the semester content, to assess students' understanding of Earth's physical geography – the atmosphere, hydrosphere, lithosphere, and biosphere – and how these integrated systems influence one another.	Increase from pretest to posttest scores are used to determine whether learning met expectations, where they target improvement of 30% by total number of questions. Laingen S25 In a F2F section of 18 students, scores increased from a pretest average of 35% (range: 5-75%) to a posttest average of 78% (30-100%). (✓) In a online section also of 18 students, scores increased from a pretest average of 54% (35-90%) to a posttest average of 86% (40-100%). (✓) Riley F24 The pretest was completed by 57 students and the posttest by 52 students; 1 was a Geography major. Scores increased from a

		pretest average of 35.6% to a posttest average of 73.8%. (✓) Riley F25 The pretest was completed by 27 students and the posttest by 26 students; 2 were Geography majors. Scores increased from a pretest average of 39.55% to a posttest average of 74.35%. (✓)
	GEO 2000: Food and Agriculture *Pre/Post-Test Questions* Student understanding of key concepts relating to food and agriculture was assessed by using a pre-test given on the first day of class and a post-test given near the end of class.	Laingen F23 Increase from pretest to posttest scores are used to determine whether learning met expectations, where they target improvement of 30% by total number of questions. Scores increased from a pretest average of 32% (range: 7-67%) to a posttest average of 74% (27-100%). (✓)
	GEO 3020: Natural Disasters *Embedded Exam Question* Students were assessed by using an embedded question on the final exam that required students to apply key concepts discussed throughout the semester to a recent natural disaster.	Riley F23 Of the 10 students who completed the final exam question, 1 scored at or above 90% (**Superior**), 7 scored between 75% to 89% (**Significant**), and 2 students scored between 60% and 74% (**Satisfactory**). The average score for the question was 84%. 8 of the 11 students enrolled were Geography majors. (✓) Riley F24 Of the 7 students who completed the final-exam question (all majors), 2 scored at or above 90% (**Superior**), 2 scored between 75% to 89% (**Significant**), and 3 students scored between 60% and 74% (**Satisfactory**). The average score for the question was 80%. (✓)

		These results are comparable to previous semesters.
	Alumni Survey One question embedded into alumni survey asked alumni to rate how well undergraduate experience prepared them to understand earth systems and processes. The survey was sent to 72 alumni who graduated between 2014-2024.	Su25 Of 12 respondents, the average rating was 4.25/5. (✓)
Objective 2.2 effectively analyzes and interprets information regarding the distribution of physical landscapes on the earth and their development from landscape processes ***(w) writing & critical reading***	GEO 3020 Natural Disasters *Research Paper* Students were assessed by a research paper involving a specific aspect of natural disasters of their choosing. The purpose of this project was to have students provide a synthesis of previously published material.	Students were expected to demonstrate greater familiarity with chosen topics than discussed in class. Riley F23 Among 11 students completing the paper (8 majors), the overall average rating was 3.7 out of 5. (✓*) Riley F24 Among 7 students completing the paper (all majors), the overall average rating was 3.82 out of 5. (✓*) These results represent a slight increase from the previous assessment average rating of 3.61/5. Students continued to perform relatively better on citations and graphics and worst on language style and grammar. (✓*)
Objective 2.3 presents coherent arguments in well-organized, focused and cohesive evidence-based reports on the earth's physical processes and landscapes ***(s) speaking and listening***	GEO 3820 Remote Sensing I *Speech/Oral Presentation* Students were assessed by presenting the results of a research project in a brief 10 minute speech.	Viertel S25 Students are expected to research and relate contemporary methods of applied remote sensing. Among 9 students, average rating was 4.11. This is nearly the same as the previous assessment period. (✓)
	GEO 3870 Remote Sensing II *Speech/Oral Presentation*	Viertel F24 In GEO 3870, students are expected to research advanced remote sensing methods

	Students were assessed by presenting the results and analysis of an in-depth, student-driven research project to the class at the end of the semester.	and apply these techniques to a study area of their choice. Among 8 students in F24, average rating was 4.125. This is up from an average of 3.75 in the previous assessment period. (✓)
Objective 3.1 understands and interprets geographic patterns of population, culture, religion, and their interrelationships from a broad perspective, and demonstrates awareness of the vital role of economic resources and their spatial distribution in global conservation and stewardship of earth resources ***(r) responsible citizenship***	<u>GEO 1100G Cultural Geography</u> *Pre/Post-Test Questions* Student understanding of key concepts in cultural geography was assessed by using a pre-test given on the first day of class and a post-test given on the last day of class. The test consisted of 15 questions. Assessed every semester.	Davis S25 Responses increased from a pretest average of 42% to a post test average of 71.3%. These were similar to the previous assessment, and met the assessment target. (✓*)
	<u>GEO 1200 World Regional Geography</u> *Pre/Post-Test Questions* Student understanding of key facts related to human & physical geography of each world region was assessed by using a pretest given on the first day of class and a posttest given during the last week of class. The test consisted of 20 questions.	Kronenfeld F24 Among 30 students taking the pretest, the average score was 44.3% (range: 7-100%). Among 21 students completing the posttest, the average score was 73.3% (range: 33-100%). (✓*)
	<u>GEO 1290G Honors World Regional Geography</u> *Embedded Exam Perspective Question*	Viertel S25 Among 17 students, perspective questions received an average rating of 4.12/5. (✓)
	<u>GEO 3780 Land Use Planning</u> *Embedded Exam Question* Students were assessed by means of a one-page essay question on the final exam involving in-depth exploration of topics in land use planning.	Viertel F24 Students are expected to demonstrate comprehension of advanced topics in land use planning. Among 10 students, essay questions received an average rating of 4.6 out of 5. (✓)
	<u>Alumni Survey</u> One question embedded into alumni survey asked alumni to rate how well undergraduate experience prepared them to understand unique characteristics of people's and regions.	Su25 Of 12 respondents, the average rating was 4.17/5. (✓)

	The survey was sent to 72 alumni who graduated between 2014-2024.	
Objective 3.2 effectively analyzes and interprets information regarding the distribution of human cultural and economic systems and the interdependences between ***(w) writing & critical reading***	GEO 1290G Honors World Regional Geography *Research Paper*	Viertel S25 Among 18 students, research papers received an average rating of 4.27. (✓)
	GEO 3620 Geography of Tourism *Embedded Exam Question* One embedded essay question was given on the final exam to determine if the students had an understanding of major concepts presented in the class.	Davis S24 Students averaged 4.2 out of 5 on embedded essay questions. This is a slight decrease from the previous assessment. (✓)
	GEO 3640 Geography of Sports *Embedded Exam Question* One embedded essay question was given on the final exam to determine if the students had an understanding of major concepts presented in the class.	Davis F24 Students averaged 8.7 out of 10 on embedded essay questions. This was similar to the average in previous assessments. (✓)
	GEO 3780 Land Use Planning *Research Paper* Students presented the results and analysis of an in-depth, student-driven research project in an approximately ten page research paper.	Viertel F24 Students are expected to research advanced topics in land use planning. The results of this work are presented in an approximately 10-page research paper, with expectations for proper citation and coherent communication. Among 9 students, research papers received an average rating of 4.4 out of 5. (✓)
Objective 3.3 presents coherent arguments in well-organized, focused and cohesive evidence-based reports on human cultural and economic patterns, processes and their interdependence	GEO 1290G Honors World Regional Geography *Speech/Oral Presentation* Students were required to present the results of their research report to the class in a speech.	Viertel S25 Among 9 students, presentations received an average rating of 4.11/5. (✓)

(s) speaking and listening		
	GEO 3070: Geography and Culture of Mexico, Central America and Caribbean *Speech/Oral Presentation* Students were required to present the results of their research report to the class in a speech.	Cornebise F23 Among 6 students presenting, oral reports received an average rating of 4.67 out of 5. (✓)
	GEO 3750: Population Geography *Speech/Oral Presentation* Students were required to present the results of their research report to the class in a speech.	Cornebise F24 Among 6 students presenting, oral reports received an average rating of 4.58 out of 5. (✓)

PART 2. IMPROVEMENTS AND CHANGES BASED ON ASSESSMENT

A. Provide a short summary (1-2 paragraphs) or bulleted list of any **curricular actions** (revisions or additions) that were approved over the past two years as a result of reflecting on the student learning outcomes data. Are there any additional future changes, revisions, or interventions proposed or still pending?

No curricular actions were approved over the past two years as a result of student learning outcomes data. There are no future changes, revisions, or interventions proposed or pending curricular action. However, individual professors regularly make modifications to their curricular content on the basis of assessment outcomes, even if these do not require official curricular actions.

B. Provide a brief description or bulleted list of **any improvements (or declines)** observed/measured in student learning. Be sure to mention any intervention made that has not yet resulted in student improvement (if applicable).

Overall, observed student learning outcomes were steady in comparison to the previous assessment period. Minor improvements and declines were observed in a large number of courses, but in most cases the number of students assessed was too small to ascribe significant meaning to these movements. Overall, assessment ratings for all courses were generally consistent with previous years and increases were observed in a few more courses than decreases in assessment ratings.

C. HISTORY OF DATA REVIEW OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS

Please document annual faculty and committee engagement with the assessment process (such as the review of outcomes data, revisions/updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs).

Date of annual (or periodic) review	Individuals or groups who reviewed the assessment plan	Results of the review (i.e., reference proposed changes from any revised SLOs or from point 2.A. curricular actions)
Oct 2025	**Chris Laingen, Jim Riley, David Viertel, Barry Kronenfeld**	**There has been discussion about developing a capstone course to address some observe results of alumni survey. Discussion is ongoing and no decision has been made yet.**

Dean Review and Feedback

The BS in Geography assessment plan has well-defined student learning objectives mapped to instruments in specific courses including pre- and post-tests, embedded exam questions, research papers, and oral presentations. Since the last report, the program developed an alumni survey which elicited responses from 12 graduates. The program report indicates that student learning results mostly held steady compared to data from previous years. Drawing from data gleaned in the alumni survey, the assessment committee met in fall 2025 to discuss the possible development of a capstone course in the major. Overall, the department's assessment plan continues to evolve with the implementation of the alumni survey, and the assessment data are being used to inform curricular and programmatic decisions.

Michael Cornebise, Associate Dean — 11/25/2025

Dean or designee — **Date**

VPAA Office Review and Feedback (for "Round B" SLO report only)

VPAA or designee Date