UWG General Education [UWG_GEN_ED]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2022 to May 31, 2023

Program Name: UWG General Education [UWG_GEN_ED]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2022 to May 31, 2023

1 Compliance Declaration

In Compliance
In Compliance

2 Executive Summary

Overall, of the seven CAP sections reported here, five of them met the success criteria, one was partially met, and one was not met.

Success Criteria: 70% of students will achieve a 3 or better in the CAP learning outcome rubric.

CAP / Learning Outcome	Overall Percent Successful	Overall Success Criteria
A1 - SLO 1 (Written) A1 - SLO 2 (Written) A1 - SLO 3 (Written)	91% 78% 73%	Met Met Met
A2 - SLO 1 (Multiple Choice) A2 - SLO 2 (Multiple Choice / Written)	79% 63% / 69%	Met Not Met
C2 - SLO 1 (Written)	78%	Met
D2 - SLO 1 (Multiple Choice)	81%	Met
E1 - SLO 1 (Written)	71%	Met
E1 - SLO 1 (Written)	64%	Not Met
E4 - SLO 3 (Multiple Choice / Written)	79% / 92%	Met

A more detailed analysis of the CAP Learning Outcome results is available in the following sections.

General Education Assessment Staggered Plan:
Assessment of the Core Curriculum occurred in three broad areas delineated by the Staggered Plan:

		Academic Year '22				Academic Year '23	
		Summer '21	Fall '21	Spring '22		Summer '22	Fall '22	Spring '23
BC = Baseline Collection	A1		IC	IC	A1	AP**	AP	IC
AP = Analyze & Plan	A2		IC	IC	A2	AP**	AP	IC
IC = Implement & Collect	B1		BC	AP	B1		IC	IC
	B2		AP	AP	B2		IC	IC
	C1		AP	AP	C1		IC	IC
	C2		BC	BC	C2		AP	AP
	D1	BC*	BC	AP	D1	AP**	IC	IC
	D2		BC	BC	D2		AP	AP
	E1	AP**	IC	IC	E1		AP	AP
	E2	AP**	IC	IC	E2		AP	AP
	E3		AP	AP	E3		IC	IC
	E4	AP**	IC	IC	E4		AP	AP

Baseline Collection:
The remaining Core Area Programs (CAPs) C2 and D2 completed their first round of baseline collection during Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 (AY2022), with A1, A2, E1, E2, and E4 collecting their second round of data.

Analysis and Planning:
During Fall 2022, CAPs A1 and A2 finished developing their second round of Improvement Plans (IPs) as the final semester of the Analysis and Planning phase, based on data collected during Fall 2021 and Spring 2022. Meanwhile, during Fall 2022 and Spring 2023, CAPs C2, D2, E1, E2, and E4 began composing Improvement Plans (IPs) drawing on faculty discussion of student performance and the results of aggregated data produced over two semesters alongside contextual circumstance and analysis of how the approved tool impacted student accession of the Student Learning Outcome (SLOs).
AY2023 was also the first complete Analysis and Planning phase for C2 and D2.

Implementation and Collection:
CAPs B1, B2, C1, D1, and E3 implemented improvement plans and collected data during Fall 2022 and Spring 2023, their first Implement and Collection phase.
As mentioned, CAPs A1 and A2 also implemented their improvement plans and collected data in Spring 2023.

3 Prior Improvement Plan for GEAC

For Academic Year 2023, GEAC focused on continuous improvements to the General Education Assessment (GEA) processes by focusing on the following:
- Ensuring the General Education Assessment website is up-to-date and adding additional faculty resources, particularly information related to Core Area SLO assessment methods for individual core courses and semester-specific data collection instructions
- Reinforcing the use of Xitracs to organize, and score GEA information, continuing to use the Xitracs Programs module for CAP reporting, scheduling Xitracs Training Sessions for faculty, and building on existing GEA Xitracs resources.
- Collaborating with UWG Online to finalize the process of collection, extraction, and submission of GEA data from CourseDen and developing resources for faculty on how to create GEA assignments (e.g., multiple-choice quizzes)

- Continuing to analyze previously collected data by IEA staff and the graduate research assistants, faculty scoring of written artifacts in Xitracs, and assisting CAP faculty workgroup members in developing Improvement Plans based on an analysis of the results from previously collected data
- Utilizing SAS to aggregate and analyze multiple-choice data
- Developing a more automated random sampling process

4 CAP Learning Outcome A1 SLO 1

Recognize and identify appropriate topics for presentation in writing

Outcome Links

Area A1 [Gen-Ed]

A1 SLO 1

Recognize and identify appropriate topics for presentation in writing

4.1 Success Criterion Met?

Met
Met

4.2 Results

After integrating the Improvement Tool in all sections of ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102, an increase in score was noted in all LOs. Student performance for the targeted area of LO 2, Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations, increased by almost 18% from the last data collection in AY 20-21. The workgroup anticipated that the design and content of the Improvement Tool would inherently address other LOs and concurrently increase those scores as well; the data specifically for ENGL 1101 manifested this anticipation. Although student performance for LO 3 did not meet the GEAC requirement of 70%, it did increase by 26.5% from 54.43 to 68.90. Student scores indicate that the Improvement Tool implemented during AY 21-22 was successful in its endeavor to increase student retention and performance in these three areas.

Total Scored	Total scored 1/2	% scored 1/2	Total scored 3/4	% scored 3/4
173	16	9%	157	91%

Additional Results Attached.

Prior Improvement Plan
The Assessment Workgroup developed an improvement plan that specifically identified three components required for paragraph instruction: topic sentences, examples and evidence, and analysis. Instructors may utilize various pedagogical strategies to deliver these three components as long as they align with the order and definitions set forth by the improvement plan. The improvement plan should be implemented early in the course and scores collected and reported to the workgroup and GEAC/ICA.

Improvement Plan for Next Year
Per the GEAC Data Collection Rotation, CAP A1 is to implement another Improvement Tool for Spring 2023; however, given the data results from AY 21-22 evidencing an increase in student success across both ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 within all LOs, it seems to implement a new or additional tool would be unwise as student performance scores are increasing with the use of the current tool; however, modifications to the previous tool in regards to supplemental examples and resources for faculty are being added to the tool to increase variety of integration strategies and language for the tool overall (ie: topic sentences could also be referred to as 'mini-thesis' or claim statement).

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

F21-SP22 ENGL 1101 A1 Written
F21-SP22 ENGL 1102 A1 Written

5 CAP Learning Outcome A1 SLO 2

Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations

Outcome Links

Area A1 [Gen-Ed]

A1 SLO 2

Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations

5.1 Success Criterion Met?

Met
Met

5.2 Results

After integrating the Improvement Tool in all sections of ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102, an increase in score was noted in all LOs. Student performance for the targeted area of LO 2, Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations, increased by almost 18% from the last data collection in AY 20-21. The workgroup anticipated that the design and content of the Improvement Tool would inherently address other LOs and concurrently increase those scores as well; the data specifically for ENGL 1101 manifested this anticipation. Although student performance for LO 3 did not meet the GEAC requirement of 70%, it did increase by 26.5% from 54.43 to 68.90. Student scores indicate that the Improvement Tool implemented during AY 21-22 was successful in its endeavor to increase student retention and performance in these three areas. After integration of the Improvement Tool across all sections of ENGL 1102, notable improvement was evidenced within each LO. The targeted area of LO 2, Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations, increased by 40% from 61.73 to 87.01. Similarly, to the improvement in ENGL 1101, student performance within the areas of LO 1 and LO 2 increased by 22% and 37% respectively. Data indicates that the integration of the Improvement Tool within ENGL 1102 sections during AY 21-22 was successful in its endeavor to increase student retention and performance within the LOs and subsequently 'Meets' the GEAC requirement.

Total Scored	Total scored 1 /2	% scored 1/2	Total scored 3 /4	% scored 3/4
173	38	22%	135	78%

6 CAP Learning Outcome A1 SLO 3

Adapt written communication to specific purposes and audiences.

Outcome Links

Area A1 [Gen-Ed]

A1 SLO 3

Adapt written communication to specific purposes and audiences.

6.1 Success Criterion Met?

Partially Met
Partially Met

6.2 Results

After integrating the Improvement Tool in all sections of ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102, an increase in score was noted in all LOs. Student performance for the targeted area of LO 2, Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations, increased by almost 18% from the last data collection in AY 20-21. The workgroup anticipated that the design and content of the Improvement Tool would inherently address other LOs and concurrently increase those scores as well; the data specifically for ENGL 1101 manifested this anticipation. Although student performance for LO 3 did not meet the GEAC requirement of 70%, it did increase by 26.5% from 54.43 to 68.90. Student scores indicate that the Improvement Tool implemented during AY 21-22

was successful in its endeavor to increase student retention and performance in these three areas. After integration of the Improvement Tool across all sections of ENGL 1102, notable improvement was evidenced within each LO. The targeted area of LO 2, Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations, increased by 40% from 61.73 to 87.01. Similarly to the improvement in ENGL 1101, student performance within the areas of LO 1 and LO 2 increased by 22% and 37% respectively. Data indicates that the integration of the Improvement Tool within ENGL 1102 sections during AY 21-22 was successful in its endeavor to increase student retention and performance within the LOs and subsequently 'Meets' the GEAC requirement. After integration of the Improvement Tool across all sections of ENGL 1102, notable improvement was evidenced within each LO. The targeted area of LO 2, Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations, increased by 40% from 61.73 to 87.01. Similarly to the improvement in ENGL 1101, student performance within the areas of LO 1 and LO 2 increased by 22% and 37% respectively. Data indicates that the integration of the Improvement Tool within ENGL 1102 sections during AY 21-22 was successful in its endeavor to increase student retention and performance within the LOs and subsequently 'Meets' the GEAC requirement.

Total Scored	Total scored 1 /2	% scored 1/2	Total scored 3 /4	% scored 3/4
173	46	27%	127	73%

7 CAP Learning Outcome A2 SLO 1

Students demonstrate a strong foundation in college-level mathematical concepts and principles.

Outcome Links

Area A2 [Gen-Ed]

A2 SLO 1

Students demonstrate a strong foundation in college-level mathematical concepts and principles.

7.1 Success Criterion Met?

Not Met
Not Met

7.2 Results

Data were collected in 5 courses. MATH 1111, 1001, 1113, 1401, and 1634.
As a whole, students did well on the assessment. In the fall, 77% of students scored 3 or higher. In the spring, 70% of students scored 3 or higher. Students did marginally better in this cycle compared to the last cycle.

Total Scored	Total scored 1 /2	% scored 1/2	Total scored 3 /4	% scored 3/4
1441	300	21%	1141	79%

Courses	Total Scored	Total Scored 1/2	%Scored 1/2	Total scored 3/4	% scored 3/4
MATH 1001	462				
		91	20%	371	80%
MATH 1111	544				
		138	25%	406	75%
MATH 1113	168				
		33	20%	135	80%
MATH 1401	204				

		19	9%	185	91%
MATH 1634	63				
		19	30%	44	70%

*Additional Results Attached.

Prior Improvement Plan

The prior improvement plan was to have students work more word problems in class.

Impact of Prior Improvement Plan

For SLO 1 - The prior improvement plan helped student performance.

Improvement Plan for Next Cycle

Based on their results of the students in Core Area A2 on the assessment instruments during the Fall 21 and Spring 22 semesters, the mathematics faculty propose the following to help students succeed in MATH 1111, MATH 1113 and MATH 1634:

1. For each class, a list of mathematics topics that students should know to help them be successful in the course will be created for each class.

2. For each class, a pretest will be created to be given at the beginning of the semester over those topics.

3. A list of resources to help students master those topics will be created.

Starting in Spring 23, several faculty will pilot items 1 and 2, while working on creating a list of resources for item 3. In fall, the number of faculty will be expanded and items 1 and 3 will be put on a common course syllabus for the class.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

A2 F21 LO1 Summary

8 CAP Learning Outcome A2 SLO 2

Students demonstrate the ability to apply symbolic representations to model and solve real-world problems.

Outcome Links

Area A2 [Gen-Ed]

A2 SLO 2

Students demonstrate the ability to apply symbolic representations to model and solve real-world problems.

8.1 Success Criterion Met?

Not Met
Not Met

8.2 Results

Data were collected in 5 courses. MATH 1111, 1001, 1113, 1401, and 1634.
The benchmark of 70% of students scoring a 3 or higher was met in MATH 1001 and MATH 1113 at 79% and 78%, respectively. However, the benchmark was not met in MATH 1111, 1401, and 1634 with 63%, 60%, and 51%, respectively.

Courses	Total Students Scored	Total Scored 1/2	% Scored 1/2	Total Scored 3/4	% Scored 3/4
MATH 1111	344				
		127	37%	217	63%
MATH 1001	131				
		28	21%	103	79%
MATH 1113	100				
		22	22%	78	78%
MATH 1401	122				
		49	40%	73	60%
MATH 1634	67				
		33	49%	34	51%

Additional Results Attached.
Prior Improvement Plan
The prior improvement plan was to have students work more word problems in class. This was due to the weakness in student performance on selected word problems, both overall in the class and in the assessment tool. The faculty teaching these courses felt that more class time being devoted to practicing and breaking dow word problems might translate to higher student performance, again both overall in the class and in the assessment tool.
Impact of Prior Improvement Plan
For SLO 2 - There is no noticeable change in the results based on the previous improvement plan.
Improvement Plan for Next Cycle
Based on their results of the students in Core Area A2 on the assessment instruments during the Fall 21 and Spring 22 semesters, the mathematics faculty propose the following to help students succeed in MATH 1111, MATH 1113 and MATH 1634:
1. For each class, a list of mathematics topics that students should know to help them be successful in the course will be created for each class.
2. For each class, a pretest will be created to be given at the beginning of the semester over those topics.
3. A list of resources to help students master those topics will be created.
Starting in Spring 23, several faculty will pilot items 1 and 2, while working on creating a list of resources for ite 3. In fall, the number of faculty will be expanded and items 1 and 3 will be put on a common course syllabus fo the class.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

A2 MATH 1111 F21 LO2 Summary
F21-SP22 A2 SLO2 MATH Summary

9 CAP Learning Outcome C2_SLO 1

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the foundational concepts of artistic, intellectual, or literary achievement, adapting written communication to specific purposes and audiences.

Outcome Links

Area C [Gen-Ed]

C2_SLO 1

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the foundational concepts of artistic, intellectual, or literary achievement, adapting written communication to specific purposes and audiences.

9.1 Success Criterion Met?

Met
Met

9.2 Results

Data were collected in 20 courses across four different departments to assess if students can successfully demonstrate knowledge of the foundational concepts of artistic, intellectual, or literary achievement, adapting written communication to specific purposes and audiences. Overall, of the 489 student artifacts scored against a common rubric, the success criteria of at least 70% of students achieving a 3--proficient--or better was met for all three rubric components (*Grasp of Foundational Concepts*, *Context and Rhetorical Situation for Writing*, and *Use of Discipline-Specific Language*), with the *Context and Rhetorical Situation for Writing* component showing the most success with 84% of students (or 410 out of 489) scoring a 3 or 4 on the rubric. The *Use of Discipline-Specific Language* component also met the success criteria, with 76% of students (or 371 out of 489) scoring a 3 or 4 on the rubric, followed closely by the *Grasp of Foundational Concepts* component, which met the success criteria with 75% of students (or 366 out of 489) also achieving a rubric score a 3 or 4.

	Total Scored	Total Scored 1/2	%Scored 1 /2	Total Scored 3/4	% scored 3 /4
Grasp of foundational concepts	489	123	25%	366	75%

Context and rhetorical	489	79	16%	410	84%
Use of discipline-specific	489	118	24%	371	76%

At the course level, COMM 1154 and XIDS 2100 students demonstrated marked success, with 100% of students in COMM 1154 meeting the success criteria in two of the three rubric components and 100% of students in XIDS 2100 meeting the success criteria in all three. Also demonstrating success were students enrolled in foreign language courses (FREN, GRMN, and SPAN), except for SPAN, most notably SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002. Students in FREN 1001, 1002, and 2001 met the success criteria for all three components, and students in FREN 2002 were successful in two out of the three components (where there was an unusually small sample size of only five students). Students in GRMN courses also met the success criteria for all components, as did most of students in SPAN 2001 and 2002. However, scores from SPAN 1001 and 1002 students were unsuccessful in all but the *Grasp of Foundational Concepts* component in SPAN 1002, where 79% of students (or 30 out of 38) scored a 3 or 4 on the rubric. Students' performance in PHIL 2010 and PHIL 2030 was generally successful, but scores varied more across the three rubric components. PHIL students in both courses met the success criteria for *Context and Rhetorical Situation for Writing* (91% and 87%, respectively) and *Use of Discipline-Specific Language* (70% and 73%, respectively).

The student scores in the five English courses (ENGL 2110, 2120, 2130, 2180, and 2190) were some of the lowest for Core Area C2, with ENGL 2130 and ENGL 2180 students failing to meet the success criteria in all three components. Still, ENGL 2120 and 2190 students scored a 3 or 4 in all three areas at 75% and 80%, but with small samples.

Courses		Total Scored	Total Scored 1/2	%Scored 1/2	Total scored 3/4	% scored 3/4
COMM 1154		21				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		0	0%	21	100%
	Context and rhetorical		3	3%	18	97%
	Use of discipline-specific		0	0%	21	100%
ENGL 2110		19				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		9	47%	10	53%
	Context and rhetorical		8	42%	11	58%
	Use of discipline-specific		4	21%	15	79%
ENGL 2120		4				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		1	25%	3	75%
	Context and rhetorical		1	25%	3	75%
	Use of discipline-specific		1	25%	3	75%
ENGL 2130		10				
	Grasp of foundational		4	40%	6	60%

	concepts					
	Context and rhetorical		6	60%	4	40%
	Use of discipline-specific		7	70%	3	30%
ENGL 2180		7				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		4	57%	3	43%
	Context and rhetorical		4	57%	3	43%
	Use of discipline-specific		5	71%	2	29%
ENGL 2190		10				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		2	20%	8	80%
	Context and rhetorical		2	20%	8	80%
	Use of discipline-specific		2	20%	8	80%
FREN 1001		38				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		7	18%	31	82%
	Context and rhetorical		2	5%	36	95%
	Use of discipline-specific		5	13%	33	87%
FREN 1002		20				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		3	15%	17	85%
	Context and rhetorical		3	15%	17	85%
	Use of discipline-specific		3	15%	17	85%
FREN 2001		9				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		0	0%	9	100%
	Context and rhetorical		0	0%	9	100%
	Use of discipline-specific		1	11%	8	89%
FREN 2002		5				

	Grasp of foundational concepts		1	20%	4	80%
	Context and rhetorical		1	20%	4	80%
	Use of discipline-specific		2	40%	3	60%
GRMN 1001		15				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		0	0%	15	100%
	Context and rhetorical		0	0%	15	100%
	Use of discipline-specific		0	0%	15	100%
GRMN 2001		9				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		0	0%	9	100%
	Context and rhetorical		0	0%	9	100%
	Use of discipline-specific		0	0%	9	100%
GRMN 2002		10				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		1	10%	9	90%
	Context and rhetorical		1	10%	9	90%
	Use of discipline-specific		0	0%	10	100%
PHIL 2010		90				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		29	32%	61	68%
	Context and rhetorical		8	9%	82	91%
	Use of discipline-specific		27	30%	63	70%
PHIL 2030		84				
	Grasp of foundational concepts		34	40%	50	60%
	Context and rhetorical		11	13%	73	87%
	Use of discipline-specific		23	27%	61	73%

SPAN 2001		37					
	Grasp of foundational concepts		10	27%	27	73%	
	Context and rhetorical		8	22%	29	78%	
	Use of discipline-specific		13	35%	24	65%	
SPAN 1001		13					
	Grasp of foundational concepts		6	46%	7	54%	
	Context and rhetorical		5	38%	8	62%	
	Use of discipline-specific		5	38%	8	62%	
SPAN 1002		38					
	Grasp of foundational concepts		8	21%	30	79%	
	Context and rhetorical		13	34%	25	66%	
	Use of discipline-specific		16	42%	22	58%	
SPAN 2002		17					
	Grasp of foundational concepts		4	24%	13	76%	
	Context and rhetorical		3	18%	14	82%	
	Use of discipline-specific		4	24%	13	76%	
XIDS 2100		33					
	Grasp of foundational concepts		0	0%	33	100%	
	Context and rhetorical		0	0%	33	100%	
	Use of discipline-specific		0	0%	33	100%	

Additional Results Attached.

Improvement Plans Based on Analysis of the Results
Highlights

COMM 1154:
SLO 1: Encourage faculty to collaborate and share models of well-articulated responses that

accurately consider their audience and reinforce the concept of addressing specific audiences in classes. Enhancing in-class focus on this concept will improve student outcomes according to this measure and lay a stronger foundation for subsequent learning.

ENGL 2110, 2120, 2130, 2180, and 2190:

SLO 1:

Actions for Improvement:

Instructors will engage in intentional recursive modeling activities several times throughout the semester to help students practice articulating foundational concepts using appropriate rhetorical strategies. Specific activities will be up to the individual instructor and may include reading journals, short in-class writing exercises, or reading quizzes with an analytical component. Instructions for these activities will foreground the goals of the task to help students understand the skills they are learning through the task.

New Assessment Instrument:

A new writing prompt will be included as part of a course exam or a timed writing assignment (in-class or take-home). Instructors may define the specific course concept/theme and text options for students to use based on the specific content of the course as long as the standardized prompt is included.

FREN 1001:

SLO 1: To enhance students' proficiency in French language, time in class will continue to be used to identify common errors and develop strategies for identifying, evaluating, and using language in a range of contexts. Furthermore, a brief in-class writing assignment will be introduced, where students independently write a short email to an imaginary virtual French 'pen pal,' in which they describe themselves, a family member or friend, and their daily routine, followed by small group peer review and feedback, further followed by whole class sharing and feedback guided by the instructor. The additional writing assignment will help students improve their writing skills by providing real-time feedback as they develop their grammar and vocabulary.

FREN 1002:

SLO 1: The results indicate that the weakest area of student performance is the use of discipline-specific language, technical vocabulary, and argumentative strategies. Therefore, the improvement plan will include the introduction of a brief in-class writing assignment where students independently write a short response to a prompt concerning past holiday experiences and family traditions, followed by small group peer review and feedback, further followed by whole class sharing and feedback guided by the instructor. This will provide students with both written and real-time feedback as they develop these skills.

FREN 2001:

SLO 1: Since the data suggest that some students struggle to adopt discipline-specific language, future instruction will target the development of success strategies in this area. More time in class will be spent identifying common errors and developing strategies for identifying, evaluating, and using appropriate language in a range of contexts. Part of the discussion will entail an explicit examination of relevant examples of how the language is used for specific purposes and identifying appropriate forms for different purposes and contexts.

FREN 2002:

SLO 1: Based on the data collected, the area where students need improvement the most is in the use of discipline-specific language, technical vocabulary, and argumentative strategies. Actions to improve student learning involve the addition of a brief in-class writing assignment where students independently write a short analysis of an assigned film, followed by small group peer review and feedback, further followed by whole class sharing and feedback guided by the instructor. This approach will provide students with both written and real-time feedback to reinforce the development of these crucial skills.

GRMN 1001, 2001, and 2002:

SLO 1: The German sections will endeavor to improve students' demonstrable knowledge of artistic, intellectual, and literary production by incorporating a larger variety of written assignments in different genres and modes and by giving these written assignments a more career-oriented focus.

PHIL 2010 and 2030:

SLO 1: Students met the criteria for success for two of the rubric criteria: *Context and rhetorical situation for writing*, which includes consideration of audience and purpose and *Use of discipline-specific language, technical vocabulary, or argumentative strategies.* No students from either course met the criterion for the other rubric criteria: *Grasp of foundational concepts.* The criterion

for success was that 70% of students scored a 3 (out of 4) or better on this measure, but only 68% from PHIL 2010 and 60% from PHIL 2030 scored a 3 or better. From this, we find that students' grasp of fundamental concepts was insufficient to meet the above mentioned success criterion. To assist students in grasping these concepts, and in accordance with TiLT principles, we will provide transparent guidance to students on how to do the assessment exercise and on how the essays will be evaluated for assessment purposes. The improvement will be implemented in all PHIL 2010 and PHIL 2030 sections beginning in Fall 2024.

Key Guidelines Provided to Students
- A list of the pertinent concepts of philosophy covered in the assignment
- Explanation of how the assignment assesses the Core Area Learning Outcome and that measuring performance is a completely different process than that by which your instructor determines your grade in the course

SPAN 1001 and 1002:

SLO 1: Our plan to improve students' grasp of foundational concepts, audience awareness, and language usage includes frequent short writing assignments throughout the semester in which students address the cultural topics and learn new vocabulary and structures in the target language. Although the initial assignments will be in Spanish, students will also expand in English, incorporating discipline-specific language.

SPAN 2001:

SLO 1: Our plan to improve students' grasp of foundational concepts, audience awareness, and language usage includes frequent short writing assignments throughout the semester in which students address the cultural topics and learn new vocabulary and structures in the target language. Students will also get frequent feedback on grammatical structures, so their language usage may improve.

SPAN 2002:

SLO 1: The improvement plan includes the development of a new in-house low-cost textbook made possible with an ALG grant. Each textbook's cultural segment introduces students to scientists, creators, athletes, and artists. Activities throughout the semester will include short writings about these people. Students will also choose a person from each chapter/geographic area, write short bios about them using the vocabulary appropriate to each chapter and content, and make brief oral presentations.

XIDS 2100:

SLO 1: The improvement plan for the next cycle includes the introduction of a brief in-class assignment through which students will practice, on their own, using discipline-specific terminology and argumentative strategies to evaluate a text, art object, or subject. Students will have ten minutes to think and write, followed by small group sharing and feedback, concluding with group sharing across the entire class and a faculty-led discussion. The purpose of the assignment is additional practice and constructive criticism.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

F21 FREN 1001 C2-SLO1 Written
F21 FREN 1002 C2-SLO1 Written
F21 GRMN 1001 C2-SLO1 Written
F21 GRMN 2001 C2-SLO1 Written
F21 SPAN 1001 C2-SLO1 Written
F21 SPAN 1002 C2-SLO1 Written
F21 XIDS 2100 C2-SLO1 Written
F21-SP22 PHIL 2010 C2-SLO1 Written
F21-SP22 PHIL 2030 C2-SLO1 Written
F21-SP22 SPAN 2001 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 COMM 1154 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 ENGL 2110 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 ENGL 2120 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 ENGL 2130 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 ENGL 2180 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 ENGL 2190 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 FREN 2001 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 FREN 2002 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 GRMN 2002 C2-SLO1 Written
SP22 SPAN 2002 C2-SLO1 Written

10 CAP Learning Outcome D2_SLO1

Apply scientific reasoning and methods, mathematical principles, or appropriate information technologies to explain natural phenomena or situations that arise in the real world.

Outcome Links

Area D [Gen-Ed]

D2_SLO1

Apply scientific reasoning and methods, mathematical principles, or appropriate information technologies to explain natural phenomena or situations that arise in the real world.

10.1 Success Criterion Met?

Met
Met

10.2 Results

Faculty submitted Core Area D2 data from six courses, including two computer science courses and four mathematics courses, to assess student learning in applying scientific reasoning and methods, mathematical principles, or appropriate information technologies to explain natural phenomena or situations that arise in the real world. Overall, 81% of students (or 640 out of 787) met the success criteria, scoring 3--proficient--or better on the rubric for the D2-SLO 1.

	# Students Scored	Total Scored 1 /2	%Scored 1/2	Total scored 3 /4	% scored /4
Applies scientific knowledge	787	147	19%	640	81%

At the individual course level, five out of the six courses met the success criteria, including all four of the MAT courses (MATH 1401 at 85%, MATH 1413 at 79%, MATH 1634 at 94%, and MATH 2644 at 73%), and CS 13 (at 76%). While students assessed in CS 1030 came close, with 67% scoring a 3 or better (or 107 out of 159)

Courses	Total Scored	Total Scored 1/2	%Scored 1/2	Total scored 3/4	% scored 3/4
CS 1030	159				
		52	33%	107	67%
CS 1300	59				
		14	24%	45	76%
MATH 1401	415				
		63	15%	352	85%
MATH 1413	38				
		8	21%	30	79%
MATH 2644	15				
		4	27%	11	73%
MATH 1634	101				
		6	6%	95	94%

Additional Results Attached.

Improvement Plans Based on Analysis of the Results
Highlights
CS 1030:
SLO 1: Keep the MyLab IT content delivery platform, or if a different learning platform is necessary, carefully select a user-friendly platform that aligns well with the course objectives. Assign a separate CourseDen site to each section, allowing instructors to monitor the performance of the students in their section better, intervene more quickly, and communicate better with their students.
CS 1300:
SLO 1: Implementation of an interactive textbook to allow students to practice and apply new concepts immediately. Students and the instructor will also be able to detect any concepts that students struggle with early on. Revise the non-technical questions of the assessment tool to either a universal language or require instructors to use the same terminology across all sections.
MATH 1401:
SLO 1: We will create a repository that will allow faculty to share supplemental materials. These materials will available to students taking MATH 1401, and faculty will be encouraged to add materials over time.
MATH 1413:
SLO 1: We will create a repository that will allow faculty to share supplemental materials. These materials will available to students taking MATH 1413, and faculty will be encouraged to add materials over time.
MATH 1634:
SLO 1: The improvement plan is to pool online resources, including problem sets and instructional videos, into central repository that all faculty teaching a section of MATH 1634 can add to their course's online portal. We will also review the assessment tool and consider replacing one or two non-applied problems with applied problems and using 11 problems instead of 8.
MATH 2644:
SLO 1: The improvement plan is to pool online resources, including problem sets and instructional videos, into central repository that all faculty teaching a section of MATH 2644 can add to their course's online portal.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

F21 and SP22 Combined MATH 1634 D2 SLO1
F21 CS 1030 D2-SLO1 Data Template
F21 CS 1300 D2-SLO1 Data Template
F21 MATH 1413 D2 SLO1
F21 SP22 Combined MATH 1401 D2-SLO1
SP22 CS 1030 D2-SLO1 MC
SP22 CS 1300 D2-SLO1 MC

11 CAP Learning Outcome E1_SLO 1

Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.

Outcome Links

Area E [Gen-Ed]

E1_SLO 1

Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.

11.1 Success Criterion Met?

Met
Met

11.2 Results

The History program has completed its analysis of assessment data from its four Core Area E1 and E2 courses from the fall 2021 and spring 2022 semesters. History offers two courses in Core Area E1 (HIST 1111 and 1112) and two in Core Area E2 (2111 and 2112), and all four of those courses use the

same essay-based assessment tool to measure the same three components that comprise the overall student learning outcomes that are assessed using a common four-point rubric. Our goal is for at least 70 percent of the student essays in our sample to achieve an assessment score of 3 or 4 for each of the three student learning outcome components.

Because we offer four courses that are each assessed for three components of our learning outcome, our data includes twelve assessment scores per semester (HIST 1111 Component 1, HIST 1111 Component 2, HIST 1111 Component 3, HIST 1112 Component 1, etc.). If we were to fully meet our stated goal, at least 70 percent of the student essay samples would receive an assessment score of 3 or 4 in all twelve of these SLO assessment categories.

In the spring 2022 semester, six of those twelve SLO assessment categories achieved this goal, but because of significantly lower assessment scores in the fall 2021 semester, our overall assessment numbers for AY 2022 were low: Only three of the twelve SLO assessment categories achieved the stated goal of 70 percent of student samples earning assessment scores of 3 or 4. In AY 20-21 (the previous round of assessment), we met this stated goal in four of our twelve categories. Thus, we'll have to admit that we experienced a slight decline in student assessment performance between AY 20-21 and AY 2022.

Fall 2021 & Spring 2022
E1-SLO 1 (Written)

Course	Total Students	Rubric Scores of 1 or 2	Rubric Scores of 3 & 4	Total Percent Successful	Success Criteria
HIST 1111	**114**				
Factual knowledge		26	88	77.19%	**Met**
Dimensions		37	77	67.54%	**Not Met**
Understanding		44	70	61.40%	**Not Met**
HIST 1112	**121**				
Factual knowledge		29	92	76.03%	**Met**
Dimensions		38	83	68.60%	**Not Met**
Understanding		31	90	74.38%	**Met**
Total	**235**				
Factual knowledge		55	180	76.60%	**Met**
Dimensions		75	160	68.09%	**Not Met**
Understanding		75	160	68.09%	**Not Met**
OVERALL				**70.93%**	**Met**

Additional Results Attached.

From the time that we first began assessing student essays in spring 2020, we have noted that students often seem to find it more challenging to meet SLO Component 2 (identifying the "political, economic, or cultural dimensions" of history) than SLO Component 1 (factual knowledge), and even more challenging to meet SLO Component 3 ("Understanding of historical context, cause and effect, and chronological relationships"). However, we were happy to see that both of our Core Area E1 courses (HIST 1111 and 1112) experienced significant improvement in students' SLO Component 3 scores between AY 20-21 and AY 2022, and one of those courses experienced an improvement in students' SLO Component 2 scores during the same period. Yet, both of our Core Area E2 courses experienced declines in students' SLO Component 2 and SLO Component 3 scores between AY 20-21 and AY 2022, which means that the results of our improvement plan are inconclusive.

Prior Improvement Plan and Impact

In the summer of 2021, following our initial round of assessment data evaluation, the History program created an improvement plan that gave every student a detailed worksheet and guidelines for the

assignment that conformed to the standards of Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT). We hoped that these guidelines would give students the additional assistance that they would need to write compelling essays that demonstrated proficiency in each of the three SLO Components.
However, the guidelines had no measurable effect on student essay scores, since overall assessment scores experienced a slight decline after these guidelines were created (even though some particular courses experienced improvements in scores for some individual SLO Components). We will therefore adopt another improvement plan to try to increase the percentage of students who demonstrate proficiency in our three SLO Components – and especially for SLO Components 2 and 3, where student assessment scores have for years been lower than for SLO Component 1. Both of our Core Area E1 courses are currently meeting our stated goals for the percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in SLO Component 1, and our Core Area E2 courses appear to be on the cusp of meeting this. But only one of our courses (HIST 1112) met the stated goal for <u>either</u> SLO Component 2 or SLO Component 3 in AY 2022, and none of our courses succeeded in meeting the goal for <u>both</u> of these components.

Improvement Plan for Next Year Based on Analysis of Results
Our improvement plan for AY 2024 will focus on the development of the skills outlined in SLO Components 2 and 3 by placing additional emphasis on students' analysis of primary source documents. We will now expect every faculty member teaching a section of a Core Area E1 or E2 general education history course to create an assessment essay question for their course section that requires students to analyze and compare two primary source documents of the faculty member's choice. Students will use those primary source documents in their essays to trace change and continuities over time in a way that demonstrates an "understanding of historical context, cause and effect, and chronological relationships" (Component 3). The essay question will conform to the general structure that the History program adopted as part of its assessment plan that was approved in the 2019-2020 academic year, and it will be assessed according to the same rubric, but instead of simply asking students to answer a historical question without specifying the use of primary sources, we will now ask students to engage with particular primary sources when writing their assessment essays.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

F21-SP22 E1 SLO1 Written

12 CAP Learning Outcome E2_SLO1

Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.

Outcome Links

Area E [Gen-Ed]

E2_SLO1

Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.

12.1 Success Criterion Met?

Not Met
Not Met

12.2 Results

The History program has completed its analysis of assessment data from its four Core Area E1 and E2 courses from the fall 2021 and spring 2022 semesters. History offers two courses in Core Area E1 (HIST 1111 and 1112) and two in Core Area E2 (2111 and 2112), and all four of those courses use the same essay-based assessment tool to measure the same three components that comprise the overall student learning outcomes that are assessed using a common four-point rubric. Our goal is for at least 70 percent of the student essays in our sample to achieve an assessment score of 3 or 4 for each of the three student learning outcome components.
Because we offer four courses that are each assessed for three components of our learning outcome, our data includes twelve assessment scores per semester (HIST 1111 Component 1, HIST 1111 Component 2, HIST 1111 Component 3, HIST 1112 Component 1, etc.). If we were to fully meet our stated goal, at least 70 percent of the student essay samples would receive an assessment score of 3 or 4 in all twelve of these SLO assessment categories.

In the spring 2022 semester, six of those twelve SLO assessment categories achieved this goal, but because of significantly lower assessment scores in the fall 2021 semester, our overall assessment numbers for AY 2022 were low: Only three of the twelve SLO assessment categories achieved the stated goal of 70 percent of student samples earning assessment scores of 3 or 4. In AY 20-21 (the previous round of assessment), we met this stated goal in four of our twelve categories. Thus, we'll have to admit that we experienced a slight decline in student assessment performance between AY 20-21 and AY 2022.

Fall 2021 & Spring 2022
E2-SLO 1 (Written)

Course	Total Students	Rubric Scores of 1 or 2	Rubric Scores of 3 & 4	Total Percent Successful	Success Criteria
HIST 2111	117				
Factual knowledge		42	75	64.01%	**Not Met**
Dimensions		53	64	54.70%	**Not Met**
Understanding		51	66	56.41%	**Not Met**
HIST 2112	125				
Factual knowledge		41	84	67.20%	**Not Met**
Dimensions		38	87	69.60%	**Not Met**
Understanding		40	85	68.00%	**Not Met**
Total	242				
Factual knowledge		83	159	65.70%	**Not Met**
Dimensions		91	151	62.40%	**Not Met**
Understanding		91	151	62.40%	**Not Met**
OVERALL				**63.50%**	**Not Met**

*Additional Results Attached.

From the time that we first began assessing student essays in spring 2020, we have noted that students often seem to find it more challenging to meet SLO Component 2 (identifying the "political, economic, or cultural dimensions" of history) than SLO Component 1 (factual knowledge), and even more challenging to meet SLO Component 3 ("Understanding of historical context, cause and effect, and chronological relationships"). However, we were happy to see that both of our Core Area E1 courses (HIST 1111 and 1112) experienced significant improvement in students' SLO Component 3 scores between AY 20-21 and AY 2022, and one of those courses experienced an improvement in students' SLO Component 2 scores during the same period. Yet, both of our Core Area E2 courses experienced declines in students' SLO Component 2 and SLO Component 3 scores between AY 20-21 and AY 2022, which means that the results of our improvement plan are inconclusive.

Prior Improvement Plan and Impact

In the summer of 2021, following our initial round of assessment data evaluation, the History program created an improvement plan that gave every student a detailed worksheet and guidelines for the assignment that conformed to the standards of Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT). We hoped that these guidelines would give students the additional assistance that they would need to write compelling essays that demonstrated proficiency in each of the three SLO Components.

However, the guidelines had no measurable effect on student essay scores, since overall assessment scores experienced a slight decline after these guidelines were created (even though some particular courses experienced improvements in scores for some individual SLO Components). We will therefore adopt another improvement plan to try to increase the percentage of students who demonstrate proficiency in our three SLO Components – and especially for SLO Components 2 and 3, where student assessment scores have for years been lower than for SLO Component 1. Both of

our Core Area E1 courses are currently meeting our stated goals for the percent of students who demonstrate proficiency in SLO Component 1, and our Core Area E2 courses appear to be on the cusp of meeting this. But only one of our courses (HIST 1112) met the stated goal for either SLO Component 2 or SLO Component 3 in AY 2022, and none of our courses succeeded in meeting the goal for both of these components.

Improvement Plan for Next Year Based on Analysis of Results

Our improvement plan for AY 2024 will focus on the development of the skills outlined in SLO Components 2 and 3 by placing additional emphasis on students' analysis of primary source documents.

We will now expect every faculty member teaching a section of a Core Area E1 or E2 general education history course to create an assessment essay question for their course section that requires students to analyze and compare two primary source documents of the faculty member's choice. Students will use those primary source documents in their essays to trace change and continuities over time in a way that demonstrates an "understanding of historical context, cause and effect, and chronological relationships" (Component 3). The essay question will conform to the general structure that the History program adopted as part of its assessment plan that was approved in the 2019-2020 academic year, and it will be assessed according to the same rubric, but instead of simply asking students to answer a historical question without specifying the use of primary sources, we will now ask students to engage with particular primary sources when writing their assessment essays.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

F21-SP22 E2 SLO1 Written

13 CAP Learning Outcome E4_SLO3

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the fundamental concepts of a discipline examining the social world.

Outcome Links

Area E [Gen-Ed]

E4_SLO3

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the fundamental concepts of a discipline examining the social world.

13.1 Success Criterion Met?

Partially Met
Partially Met

13.2 Results

The learning outcome assessed within CAP E4 is broad and open to interpretation by each discipline teaching in the CAP. Therefore, it is impossible to aggregate the data into a single data point or percentage. While every rubric has the same 4-point scale (4 = Exemplary, 3 = Proficient, 2 = Developing, and 1 = Unsatisfactory), the assessment tool content and rubric criteria for E4 courses differ.

For example, POLS 2201 and SOCI 1101 both have rubrics based on a 4-point scale; however, the POLS 2201 assessment content includes four categories: *Culture and Federalism*, *Constitutions*, *Institutions*, and *Public Policy*, with an assessment tool comprised of 16 questions where four correct questions in each content area equal a rubric score of 4 (Exemplary). On the other hand, the SOCI 1101 assessment content includes four different categories: *Culture*, *Social Structure*, *Human Development*, and *Inequality*, with an assessment tool comprised of only 12 questions where three correct questions in each content area equal a rubric score of 4 (Exemplary). Another important distinction is that although most assessment tools in Core Area E4 are multiple-choice, PSYC 1101 uses matching, while PHIL 2130 and XIDS 2300 require a written submission.

CAP E4 POLS 2201 and SOCI 1101 Rubric Examples Attached.

The data in the table below represents each of the courses in E4 offered during the data collection period and the rubric scores relative to their discipline. Of the ten courses comprising Core Area E4, students in seven met the success criteria (or 70% of the E4 courses), students in two only partially met the success criteria (or 20% of the E4 courses), and students in one did not meet the success criteria (or 10% of the E4 courses). In courses with overall achievement, students also met the success criteria across all rubric components. However, in courses where students achieved only partial success overall, they performed well in some but not all of the rubric components. For instance, in the ECON 2106 course, at least 70% of students scored a 3--Proficient--or better on the rubric for only two out of four components (namely, *Scarcity* and *Market Equilibrium*).

Examination of performance in individual courses/content areas reveals several courses had high levels of student achievement in all corresponding assessment content categories according to their rubrics. Some of these courses include XIDS 2300, with 95% of students meeting the success criteria in all three content categories, POLS 2201 with success rates of 92% (*Cultural & Federalism*), 94% (*Constitutions*), 100% (*Institutions*), and 97% (*Public Policy*), and in SOCI 1160, where scores of 3 or better were achieved at 100% in the *Culture* category, 97% in the *Human Development* category, 89% in the *Social Structure* category, and 80% in the *Inequality* category.

Despite meeting the overall success criteria, a few courses had more significant differences in content category scores. For example, in ANTH 1102, *the Global Diversity* and *Intracultural Diversity* categories achieved high levels of success at 95% and 100%, respectively. However, the *Cultural Concept* and *Methods/Subfields* categories achieved somewhat lower levels of success at 81% and 80%, respectively. The same is true for content category scores in SOCI 1101 and, to a lesser extent, ECON 2105 and PHIL 2130.

In ECON 2106 and GEOG 1013, student learning varied across different content categories with partially met success. Student performance in ECON 2106 differed the most. Although only two of the four content categories met the success criteria, 94% of students scored a 3--proficient-- or better on material related to *Scarcity*, demonstrating high levels of student learning in this area. Additionally, 75% of students demonstrated proficiency in *Market Equilibrium* content, and the *Opportunity Cost* content category had 69% of students scoring at least a 3, almost meeting the 70% threshold. Despite the *Supply and Demand* content category having the lowest percentage of students achieving success, it still had a 63% success rate. In GEOG 1013, student performance showed even greater achievement, where 3 out of the 4 categories met the success criteria (*Globalization* at 82%, *Urban Geography* at 94%, and *Political-Economic Concepts* at 78%). Even in the fourth category of *Demography*, 68% of students were successful, just missing the 70% mark for overall achievement.

Out of the ten Core Area E4 courses, PSYC 1101 was the only course in which none of the seven content categories met the success criteria. Moreover, of the content areas in which students scored a three or greater on the rubric, only one had a success rate of more than 50%, which was *Biological/Neuroscientific Theory* with 55% of students. *Critical Theory* had the lowest percentage of students meeting the rubric score criteria at a mere 17%. The remaining five content areas had success rates ranging between 24% and 40%, with a median of 25%.

Courses		Total Scored	Total Scored 1/2	%Scored 1/2	Total scored 3/4	% scored 3/4	
ANTH 1102		176					MET
	Global Diversity		8	5%	168	95%	
	Intracultural Diversity		0	0%	176	100%	
	Cultural Concept		34	19%	142	81%	
	Methods/Subfields		35	20%	141	80%	
ECON 2105		516					MET
	Scarcity		55	11%	461	89%	
	Opportunity Cost		121	23%	395	77%	
	Supply and Demand		128	25%	388	75%	
	Market Equilibrium		91	18%	425	82%	
ECON 2106		365					PARTIALLY MET
	Scarcity		22	6%	338	94%	*5 Students missed one of the exams and were not able to be assessed on the scarcity or market equilibrium questions.
	Opportunity Cost		114	31%	251	69%	
	Supply and Demand		136	37%	229	63%	
	Market Equilibrium		89	25%	271	75%	*5 Students missed one of the exams and were not able to be assessed on the scarcity or market equilibrium questions.
GEOG							PARTIALLY

1013		50					MET
	Globalization		9	18%	41	82%	
	Demography		16	32%	34	68%	
	Urban Geography		3	6%	47	94%	
	Political-Economic Concepts		11	22%	39	78%	
PHIL 2130		19					MET
	Definitions		4	21%	15	79%	
	Conceptual Relationships		2	11%	17	89%	
	Use of Concepts		3	16%	16	84%	
POLS 2201		36					MET
	Culture & Federalism		3	8%	33	92%	
	Constitutions		2	6%	34	94%	
	Institutions		0	0%	36	100%	
	Public Policy		1	3%	35	97%	
PSYC 1101		330					DID NOT MEET
	Behavioral Theory		197	60%	133	40%	
	Biological / Neuroscientific Theory		148	45%	182	55%	
	Cognitive Theory		247	75%	83	25%	
	Critical Theory		273	83%	57	17%	
	Humanistic Theory		252	76%	78	24%	
	Psychoanalytic Theory		248	75%	82	25%	
	Transpersonal / Contemplative Theory		258	78%	72	22%	
SOCI 1101		258					MET
	Culture		61	24%	197	76%	
	Social Structure		28	11%	230	89%	
	Human Development		12	5%	246	95%	
	Inequality		61	24%	197	76%	
SOCI 1160		64					MET
	Culture		0	0%	64	100%	
	Social Structure		7	11%	57	89%	
	Human Development		2	3%	62	97%	
	Inequality		13	20%	51	80%	

XIDS 2300		20						MET
	Understand Disciplines		1	5%	19	95%		
	Identify Disciplines		1	5%	19	95%		
	Apply Assumptions		3	15%	17	85%		

*Additional Results Attached.

Improvement Plans
Highlights
ANTH 1102:
SLO 3:
Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - Faculty developed new procedures for exporting data that resulted in student-level question data, enabling a more granular analysis of how students perform. They also targeted their teaching to clarify concepts and specific areas of knowledge that, according to the data, students need help to gain mastery over during the course. The main objective of reworking the method of data extraction from the assessment tool was achieved, and enabled the collection of student-level data for the first time in this cycle. Faculty were also able to highlight areas where students need help improving their scores in areas where averages were lower.
Suggestions and feedback for GEAC:
Per our suggestion, GEAC created and distributed an instructional video and step-by-step documentation showing the new export process for assessment data from CourseDen.
New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - The results of the current assessment data point to a different distribution of scores across competency areas than our data from the last cycle, suggesting that we revisit how students are presented with content relating to the concepts of *Culture* and *Anthropological Methods Across the Sub-Fields*, the two areas with the lowest levels of success at 81% and 80% success rates. For the new plan, we will introduce a written assignment through which students will practice identifying and distinguishing the four anthropology sub-fields and the concepts of culture and cultural diversity. Students will complete the assignment as part of a weekly module and receive individual feedback from the instructor.
ECON 2105 and 2106:
SLO 3:
Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - For the previous improvement plan, the Economics Department focused on the content areas of *Opportunity Cost* and *Supply and Demand*, where student performance was weakest. To address this issue, the Department added Videos from the Federal Reserve Economic Lowdown series on the production possibility frontier (*Opportunity Cost*) and on *Supply and Demand* were added as required material to all ECON 2015 and ECON 2106 sections, giving students additional coverage of these topics and aimed at increasing student learning in these areas. Although the performance of students slightly improved for Question 7, related to opportunity cost in terms of a production possibilities frontier, the overall achievement of students remained low for *Opportunity Cost* (Questions 5-8 on the assessment tool), failing to produce the desired impact for this topic.
New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - *Identified Area of Weakness and Focus of Improvement:* Opportunity Cost (as assessed in Questions 5 and 6)
ECON 2105 (Principles of Macroeconomics) and ECON 2106 (Principles of Microeconomics) faculty collaborated to edit and improve the PPF Softchalk Activity, ***Opportunity Cost and the Production Possibilities Frontier*** during Spring 2023. The Softchalk Activity was revised to have a greater focus on the concept of *Opportunity Cost,* the identified area of weakness based on an analysis of the results, AND then have students submit it as a GRADED Assessment.

See the Revised Softchalk Activity Attachment.

GEOG 1013:
SLO 3:
Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - The prior improvement plan centered on getting the evaluation arrangement correct because the previous way of administrating questions produced results that we could not use to measure the success criteria effectively. We addressed this issue by moving the administration of questions online via CourseDen. Since implementing the new assessment procedures, we now have a good sense of individual students' performance in the required format, which we can use to improve learning outcome proficiency.
New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - Due to the substandard performance in the *Demography* question category, instructors will spend more time going over and then reviewing these concepts. We have also made some small improvements to the questions administered that should help in conducting a clear and effective assessment.

See GEOG 1013 Revised Questions Attachment.

PHIL 2130:
SLO 3:
Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - Faculty teaching PHIL 2130 focused their efforts on helping students improve their scores related to the relationship between the various basic concepts of religious studies. Faculty worked to ensure that students were clearly introduced to the concepts in isolation and in connection to one another. For example, the syllabus included adjustments to spend an extra day discussing a reading in which the relationship between these key concepts is discussed. Additionally, prompts for earlier essays in which students practice skills needed for success on the final essay were tweaked to push students to address these conceptual relationships in their analyses explicitly. During our analysis of the data collected from the most recent collection period, faculty were pleased to see great improvement in students' performance related to the conceptual relationships between the various basic concepts of religious studies. Student performance improved by 18%, from 71% during the first data collection to 89% for the most recent data collection, making it the rubric category with the highest level of achievement. As such, our previous improvement plan did achieve the intended result.
New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - Students again met the success criteria in all three content categories. Faculty teaching PHIL 2130 will continue the measures we have implemented to help ensure success, including talking with students throughout the semester about this learning outcome, being very clear about what the basic concepts of religious studies are, and assigning other essays earlier in the semester in which students can practice the skill of using these concepts to examine the social world.

POLS 2201:
SLO 3:
Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - The assessment technique seemed reasonable and effective, but the individual question responses were accidentally made the unit of observation in the data rather than the student question, so reassembling the assessment proved impossible. For that reason, past actions concentrated on ensuring faculty followed the guidelines and schedule for conducting and reporting assessment data, which consisted of developing instructions for assessment and reporting to prevent future errors and ensuring that student-level questions data was available for analysis in the future. Providing faculty with new instructions for administering and exporting the data, such that student-level question analysis was possible, eliminated previous errors and resulted in the ability to analyze the data so that subsequent improvement plans by the faculty included steps to increase student success based on the results.
New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - The results from Fall 2021-Spring 2022 indicated that the Rubric Category comprised of questions related to the Constitution, although Met the Success Criteria with 94.4% of students achieving a score of three or better, was the area where students scored the greatest number of 3's (at 38.9%) and the lowest number of 4's (at 55.6%). Therefore, the program coordinator will confer with faculty who teach the course to include an additional reading on Constitutions designed to improve student

performance on Constitution LO knowledge and increase scores of 3 to 4. Although the success criteria have consistently been met, faculty anticipate that a deeper understanding through an additional complexity in the readings will show improvement through the assessment.

PSYC 1101:

SLO 3:

Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - Since the majority of PSYC 1101 classes (where this Area E4 SLO is introduced, reinforced, and mastered) are taught by Graduate Teaching Assistants, our prior improvement plan included the formal revamping of the way instructors of PSYC 1101 are trained and selected. Aimed at improving the quality of instruction for PSYC 1101 courses, two semesters of teaching practicum were made mandatory for all GTA's. Additional improvements were the required inclusion of the GE SLO on all PSYC 1101 syllabi and the development of an online database for PSYC 1101 instructors, which includes reading materials, lecture slides, and teaching strategies designed to help teach the seven major theories of psychology that comprise the assessment tool. Unfortunately, students again failed to meet the success criteria for all seven of the major theories in psychology assessed, indicating less success with the improvement plan than expected. While the low scores on theory knowledge have begun to tick up, and we still have a lot of work to do, we also anticipate the start of more positive results in the coming semesters.

New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - Our analysis of assessment results revealed that students in PSYC 1101 require additional time to practice different theories, as evidenced by the low percentage of students who successfully met the success criteria across all categories. So, as part of the new improvement plan, we devised several exercises and assignments for instructors to use in class that will enable students to acquire this knowledge better. An example assignment involves giving students a case study and having them decide from the list of seven theories which theoretical application is most suitable for the situation. Next, instructors ask students to articulate a rationale as to why that theory is a better fit than the others. Finally, there is a class discussion about which theory students think is the worst and why.

SOCI 1101 and 1160:

SLO 3:

Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - The prior improvement plan included streamlining the administration of the assessment tool and collection of data, regardless of the faculty who teaches course sections. Since regular data collection is imperative for adequate assessment, the improvement plan worked in producing robust data to assess learning across course sections and faculty adequately.

New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - The data shows that students in the SOCI 1101 course had the most difficulty grasping the concepts related to *Culture* and *Inequality*, with a 76% success rate for each. Meanwhile, students in the SOCI 1160 course scored the lowest on concepts about *Inequality*, with an 80% success rate. As a result, the faculty teaching SOCI 1101 will include an introductory-level common reading/assignment that addresses the concepts of *Culture* and *Inequality*. Similarly, the faculty teaching SOCI 1160 will include a common reading/assignment that addresses *Inequality* as it relates to social problems.

XIDS 2300:

SLO 3:

Prior Improvement Plan & Impact - In the prior improvement plan, we highlighted the need to provide XIDS 2300 instructors with the assessment tool early in the semester to ensure that they plan for assessment at the end of the semester. We see significant improvement based on the data from the previous round of assessments.

New Improvement Plan Based on Analysis of Results - Student performance across all categories was quite strong, and students met the success criteria in all three content areas. However, students did not perform quite as well in the *Apply Assumptions* category, where fewer students scored a 3 or higher (85% compared to 95% in the other two categories). To address this concern, we will request that all XIDS 2300 instructors introduce a short in-class writing assignment in which students analyze a complex problem or question using insights from two or more disciplines. After completing the assignment, the instructor will organize the class into groups to allow students to discuss how they approached it. Then, the instructor will convene the entire class for a broader discussion examining various disciplinary approaches to investigating the problem.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

CAP E.4 GEOG 1013 Revised 2023
CAP E.4 Rubric and Tool for POLS 2201
CAP E.4 Rubric and Tool for SOC 1101 and SOC 1160
ECON 2105 Report F21-SP22 Combined I
ECON 2106 Report F21-SP22 Combined I
F21 PHIL 2130 E4 SLO3 Written
F21 PSYC 1101 E4-SLO3 Results
F21 SOCI 1160 E4-SLO3 MC
F21-SP22 ANTH 1102 E4-SLO3 MC
F21-SP22 GEOG 1013 E4-SLO3 MC
F21-SP22 SOCI 1101 E4-SLO3 MC
Macro Results Fall 2021 & Spring 2022 Combined
Micro Results Fall 2021 & Spring 2022 Combined
Opportunity Cost and the Production Possibilities Frontier
S22 PSYC 1101 E4-SLO3 Data Template I
SP22 POLS 2201 E4-SLO3 MC
SP22 XIDS 2300 E4 SLO3 Written

14 Gen Ed Assessment Committee (GEAC) Next Steps

For Academic Year 2024, GEAC will focus on continuous improvements to the General Education Assessment (GEA) processes by focusing on the following:

- Ensuring the General Education Assessment website is up-to-date and adding an outward-facing timeline to assist faculty in planning for the different phases of the assessment process
- Seeking wider availability of SAS so that the process of aggregating and analyzing multiple-choice data will be more streamlined
- Identifying courses where it is appropriate for assessment to be administered in CourseDen and assisting in the process of converting assessment tools into a CourseDen-compatible format
- Meaningfully improving communication between GEAC and faculty teaching General Education courses via consistent (both in format and content) email reminders, updates to the website, the creation and distribution of informational resources, and GEA attendance and participation in new faculty orientation
- Focusing on filling vacant GEAC Core Area Workgroup Coordinator member positions

End of report