



ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IN GENERAL EDUCATION

SUMMARY REPORT

*Use this form to provide a summary report on campus-based assessment
of student learning outcomes in General Education*

Prepared by Laurel M. Garrick Duhaney, Associate Provost, duhaneyl@newpaltz.edu

845-257-3287

Name of Institution: SUNY at New Paltz
{Specify name of branch campus, if relevant}

Academic Year: Spring 2016

A. Assessment Process

In spring 2016 we assessed 25% (5% oversampling to account for attrition) of our GE courses in Basic Communication-Written, Diversity, Foreign Languages, Mathematics, and The Arts. We also assessed these competencies: Critical Thinking-which is embedded in courses in the foregoing content areas, Effective Expression-Aesthetic, and Effective Expression-Written.

To begin the process, in fall 2015 I sent relevant faculty advanced notice regarding their required participation in the upcoming spring 2016 GE assessments, about the process itself, and about how to obtain resources to assist in completing the assessments. I also sent the faculty follow up emails in fall and spring about the GE assessments.

At the end of the spring, faculty submitted their course assessment information in my.newpaltz.edu and reported what they learned from teaching and assessing their GE courses, revisions they planned to make to their courses, and how we could improve the GE assessment process. Lucy Walker, Assistant VP for Institutional Research then aggregated the information into (a) overall campus reports, (b) school reports, and (c) departmental reports by content and competency areas (see enclosed). I then drafted this summary campus report which I disseminated, along with reports that Lucy Walker generated, to various members of the campus (i.e., Interim Provost, GE Board Chair, Presiding Officer of the Faculty, Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs, and Faculty). The cover memos accompanying the reports encouraged departments to schedule meetings to discuss the GE assessment results, to implement changes based on

the results, and to comply with reporting requirements (i.e., submission of departmental summary reports describing changes and results of changes based on the GE course assessment results).

B. Summary of the Spring 2016 GE Assessments

As mentioned in the opening paragraph, this spring we assessed 20% (actually, 25%, 5% oversampling to account for attrition) of our GE courses in Basic Communication – Written, Diversity, Foreign Languages, Mathematics, and The Arts. We also assessed these competencies: Critical Thinking, which is embedded in courses in the foregoing content areas; Effective Expression-Aesthetic; and Effective Expression-Written.

Results of the spring 2016 GE assessments show a majority of the students exceeded or met the GE learning outcomes. Results also show a significant number of students as approaching or not meeting learning outcomes in the areas of Critical Thinking, Mathematics, and Effective Expression – Aesthetic. With regard to Critical Thinking, students’ proficiency in developing well-reasoned arguments and in identifying, analyzing, and evaluating arguments as they occur in their own and others’ work needs to improve. In Mathematics, students’ weaknesses were most evident in their lack of ability to estimate and check mathematical results for reasonableness; recognize the limits of mathematical and statistical methods; and in representing mathematical information symbolically, visually, numerically, and verbally. Finally, with regard to Effective Expression – Aesthetic, results show students need to improve in evaluating effective structures of artistic expression; engaging in critical discourse about artwork/performance relevant to the discipline; and in identifying formal components within artwork/performance that contribute to its content.

A summary of the assessment results follows.

Content Areas

Basic Communication - Written

Overall Campus Ratings for Basic Communication – Written are as follows:

Basic Communication - Written	Enrolled		Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	516		492	95%	47	9%	311	63%	101	21%	33	7%
Students demonstrate their abilities to revise and improve such texts.	172		164	95%	14	8%	99	60%	38	23%	13	8%
Students will produce coherent texts within common college-level written forms.	172		164	95%	16	9%	110	67%	33	20%	5	3%

Students will research a topic, develop an argument, and organize supporting details.	172	164	95%	17	10%	102	62%	30	18%	15	9%
---	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	----	----

Selected Comments

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Will spend more time on techniques for improving papers
- Will assign a grade for each segment of the research paper

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- Results showed that the SWW students (i.e., students who have multiple weaknesses in writing) are performing at the college level.
- Students need additional support with grammar, sentence construction, developing thesis statements, organization, integrating sources, and idea development. They seem uncomfortable or are reluctant to revise their work—“once ‘finished’ they would rather never look at it again.”

Faculty’s suggestions for improving the assessment process

- Randomize who gets selected. [Note: The sample is always randomized.]
- Assign a similar essay topic instead of just essay type to all instructors teaching this GE course.

Diversity

Overall Campus Ratings for Diversity are as follows:

Diversity	Enrolled		Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	834		776	93%	239	29%	379	49%	132	17%	26	3%
Students will analyze and synthesize sources objectively, incorporating some primary sources in the voices of that group.	278		258	93%	72	26%	111	43%	54	21%	21	8%
Students will describe the historical, social, cultural, or political perspectives in the U.S. society of at least one cultural, ethnic, racial, or historically underrepresented group	278		259	93%	95	34%	129	50%	32	12%	3	1%

towards itself and its place in society.											
Students will identify national and global forces that have influenced or shaped the perspectives of others towards the underrepresented group(s) being studied.	278	259	93%	72	26%	139	54%	46	18%	2	1%

Selected Comments

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Require a graded proposal as part of the research paper to prevent students from rushing to complete the assignment at the last minute.
- Require students to visit the Writing Center for their first writing assignment to assess their analytical capabilities.
- Spend more time discussing how to use primary and secondary sources.
- Incorporate more fictional works (e.g., Octavia Butler).

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- Some students lack background information about underrepresented groups. Much teaching must occur to provide the historical perspectives for such students to grasp the significance of current developments in human rights.
- Some students demonstrated a willingness to explore the perspectives of minorities and underrepresented groups, and to do so with cultural sensitivity. They understood how national and cultural circumstances affected the perspectives of their authors, and they could speak confidently about the changes and continuities that occurred between the historical periods of their two authors. Their essays demonstrated both close reading skills and cultural contextualization.
- One instructor used primary sources generated by Black and Latina women and reportedly had students take notice of the leadership capability of the women in their lives. She found that the reflections on the readings and students' lived experiences created one of her best semesters she had experienced and that the students seemed more invested in the class.
- Another instructor noted that when the learning outcomes were included on the actual assignment, students were more likely to exceed or meet the established standards, and that the overall quality of the essays was much higher.

Faculty's suggestions for improving the assessment process

- Perhaps let faculty submit their syllabi and have someone centrally write up an assessment plan.

- Since the process has been streamlined with clearer requirements for instructors and a more organized way to enter the data, the process is much less ambiguous and less stressful overall.
- Assessment should be based on the instructor's specific focus, not on a standardized objective.

Foreign Languages

Overall Campus Ratings for Foreign Languages are as follows:

Foreign Languages	Enrolled		Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
	N		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	488		396	81%	127	26%	175	44%	62	16%	32	8%
Students will demonstrate basic proficiency in the understanding and use of a foreign language.	244		198	81%	56	23%	91	46%	35	18%	16	8%
Students will demonstrate knowledge of the distinctive features of culture(s) associated with the language they are studying.	244		198	81%	71	29%	84	42%	27	14%	16	8%

Selected Comments

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Require more reading homework and check whether the homework is being completed.
- Begin measuring the correlation between language and culture learning on a student by student basis.
- Seek colleagues' suggestions regarding what might be done to improve students' written French.
- Include more cultural materials in the course and address language skills using those materials rather than using a grammar-based approach. Change the textbook and give fewer online homework assignments.

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- Using the Writing Rubric is challenging because we are having students perform writing tasks beyond the expectation of ACTFL but using the ACTFL rubric to rate them. Similar to the 101 students, 102 students are learning new material but 'Meeting' standard is set at a higher level. Maybe we either need to make the task simpler for the 101 students or adjust the standard for 102 students.
- Our department serves both students who just want to satisfy their GE requirement and those who plan to major/minor in language. The writing tasks we ask of all of our students meet the needs of students planning to major/minor, but for those who will use the language more

casually, the ACTFL tasks and standards are just right. Maybe we need to consider a separate track for non-majors.

- Students come to the Intermediate II with below level skills, especially if they are placed at Interim II level. It is a very taxing experience for students to come up to the level to meet learning outcomes by the end of the semester. Continuous short writing assignments, oral proficiency-based activities, contextualized on relevant cultural information, works very well to improve overall proficiency in the language.

Faculty's suggestions for improving the assessment process

- Every instructor should conduct the assessment and every class should be assessed.
- It has been a really valuable experience.
- Our department did not norm the rubric as a whole group for the 2013 Assessment, when the rubric at the 102 level was changed to reflect the ACTFL guidelines. Consideration should be given to inviting ACTFL to conduct a workshop on their Writing Proficiency Assessment or there should be a departmental discussion and norming of the Writing rubric.
- The assessment process is a great way to ensure that students are able to achieve the learning outcomes for the course. It allows one to see gaps in teaching that may prove as barriers to learning and it provides feedback to students for areas to improve. It would be good to obtain feedback from students regarding what would help them to meet learning standards.
- Assign mentors to faculty who only teach one or two courses or to those who are new in the department.

Mathematics

Overall Campus Ratings for Mathematics are as follows:

Mathematics	Enrolled		Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
	N		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	275		245	89%	128	47%	60	22%	40	15%	17	6%
Students will employ quantitative methods such as arithmetic, algebra, geometry or statistics to solve problems.	55		49	89%	41	75%	4	8%	3	6%	1	2%
Students will estimate and check mathematical results for reasonableness.	55		49	89%	29	53%	4	8%	10	20%	6	12%
Students will interpret and draw inferences from mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables and schematics.	55		49	89%	32	58%	12	24%	3	6%	2	4%
Students will recognize the limits of mathematical and statistical methods.	55		49	89%	6	11%	25	51%	13	27%	5	10%

Students will represent mathematical information symbolically, visually, numerically and verbally.	55	49	89%	20	36%	15	31%	11	22%	3	6%
--	----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	----	-----	---	----

Selected Comments

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Need to identify the students who are struggling sooner.
- Looking forward to collaborating with colleagues to discuss how to better engage students with the material and motivate them to work outside of the classroom and take the initiative to seek assistance when needed.
- Provide students more practice with interpretation and conceptual understanding, possibly in the lab component.
- Remind students more frequently of the learning objectives for course.
- Raise level of questions at the outset of the class to get students used to higher level of thinking sooner.

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- Fewer students than expected are meeting or exceeding the standards, particularly for this section of the course. Many students have difficulty putting theory and process into words
- Students find it easier to learn how to employ formulas to get the right answer, but have more difficulty with interpretive problems or abstract concepts.
- The assessment can assist in providing awareness of what course topics require more attention/homework/evaluation to further student fluency. The reference-to-standards categories of Exceeding, Meeting, Approaching, Not Meeting positively differentiate levels of understanding and are a reminder of a continuum from Not Meeting to Exceeding.
- The assessment reminded me that teaching methods and skills might be improved by monitoring current practice. I can better appreciate how an assessment can illumine a path to new teaching approaches and ultimately contribute to student learning.
- The biggest struggle for students was to recognize the limits of the methods. Because the limits of a system can only be addressed after the system has been introduced and applied, the homework prompting students to think about these limits was assigned only at the very end of the semester, and so perhaps did not leave enough time for assimilating feedback on that work.

Faculty's suggestions for improving the assessment process

- By participating in the assessment, I've come to appreciate its value and I look forward to implementing changes to my teaching practices if I teach College Algebra in the future.
- This process is very helpful.
- I think this is very time consuming.
- The conversations among colleagues [concerning teaching strategies] provided by the assessment is one of the singular benefits.

The Arts

Overall Campus Ratings for The Arts are as follows:

The Arts	Enrolled		Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
	N		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	238		238	97%	101	42%	85	37%	32	14%	12	5%
	238		230	97%	101	42%	85	37%	32	14%	12	5%

Selected Comments

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Make a more concise schedule for students to follow and discuss basic art concepts more thoroughly before beginning the assignment. Since many students were freshmen and not art majors they did not consider some basic principles (composition and color) while making their design and initial printing processes. The goal was to allow students to have a certain level of artistic freedom, but a more constructed basis for the assignment would have been helpful.
- I do not think I would make changes to this specific project. It yielded some of the strongest finished results of the semester and I received positive feedback from my students. However, I would change the meeting format for the course if I could. Beginners and Intro students need feedback more than once a week to be able to grow and develop skills. I think the 6-hour, once-weekly course is better suited for intermediate students. This course better functions in the 3-hour, twice-weekly schedule.

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- Changes in the way I teach and approach the course were successful in terms of overall student performance.
- I have always taught this course with a mind to applying the skills to other disciplines. The assessment was helpful in that it reaffirmed what I was already doing and, as an adjunct, gave me an opportunity to compare my methodology with that of tenured professors. It also gave those of us teaching the same course the chance to ensure that, though our approaches and specialties may differ, our learning outcomes and major assignments are aligned toward the same goals.
- Many of the students are very talented, but their depth of understanding and their interest level could be greater.
- This assessment gave me an opportunity to objectively review my teaching effectiveness. It reinforced my instinctual notion that teaching technical skills and demonstrations are an effective way to disseminate knowledge, but that results are dependent on the investment of the student.
- Through doing this assessment, I was really able to see which teaching methods were working the best.

Faculty's suggestions for improving the assessment process

- It should not be so structured. All that is worthwhile about assessment is that instructors are encouraged to think about how they can improve their classes and their teaching. Such encouragement to self-assess is what should be the point of assessment.
- None at this time. The process is seamless and easy to use. Thanks for that!
- The assessment process was moderately disorganized. The rubrics and questionnaires reflecting on the project should be included somehow in the online submission process. The online submission only reviews a small portion of the information I was able to obtain through the assessment. A truly thorough assessment should take more of the information into consideration.

Critical Thinking

Overall Campus Ratings for Critical Thinking are as follows:

Critical Thinking	Enrolled		Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	750		662	88%	190	25%	228	34%	116	18%	128	19%
Students will develop well-reasoned arguments.	375		331	88%	104	28%	112	34%	53	16%	62	19%
Students will identify, analyze and evaluate arguments as they occur in their own and others' work	375		331	88%	86	23%	116	35%	63	19%	66	20%

Selected Comments

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Further emphasize how to read through a problem and identify the information necessary to evaluate the necessary approach.
- Increase the use of critical thinking and reflection as well as verbalization of mathematical ideas.
- Use more examples to help students understand main concepts.
- Spend more time developing critical thinking skills that focus on analysis and evaluation of others' arguments.

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- Although students were able to develop their own arguments, they had difficulty analyzing and evaluating those arguments.
- Clarity of the instructions is important for helping students to succeed in their assignments and it also makes grading the assignment easier.

- In preparing students to respond to essay questions on exams or assignments, I should provide more examples when I want the students to include arguments from others' work. I have also learned that many of my students are able to develop well-reasoned arguments.
- Some of the questions need to be rewritten to more closely match the objectives.

Faculty’s suggestions for improving the assessment process

- The assessment process at New Paltz is helpful and provides valuable information about how we are doing with meeting the GE objectives in our course. The process helps us to look at our instructional methods and continue to find better ways to serve our students. It also helps us continue with our own learning experience as educators.
- As always, this assessment process is helpful for me to look at a portion of my teaching and give me ideas for revising and enhancing my instructional methods.
- The June 1st deadline is really helpful.
- This has been my first experience with the assessment process and I think it went fine.

Effective Expression - Aesthetic

Overall Campus Ratings for Effective Expression – Aesthetic are as follows:

Effective Expression - Aesthetic	Enrolled		Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
	N		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
	1420		1356	95%	447	31%	416	31%	380	28%	113	8%
Students will address subject matter in artwork and evaluate effective structures of artistic expression.	355		339	95%	116	33%	100	29%	92	27%	31	9%
Students will construct narrative or symbolic content through visual or performative means.	355		339	95%	125	35%	115	34%	83	24%	16	5%
Students will engage in critical discourse about artwork/performance relevant to the discipline.	355		339	95%	102	29%	100	29%	111	33%	26	8%
Students will identify formal components within artwork/performance that contribute to its content.	355		339	95%	104	29%	101	30%	94	28%	40	12%

Selected Comments

We invited faculty to (a) describe the changes that they would make if they were to teach the course again, (b) tell us what they learned from the assessments, and (c) suggest how we might improve the

assessment process at New Paltz. I have excerpted some of the faculty's responses below. Many comments regarding how we might improve the assessment process at New Paltz reveal that more needs to be done to inform faculty about the assessment process and about assessment in general. Much of this work will best be undertaken by departments with support from the GE Board and me.

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Focus more on specific rhetorical devices of the writers whose voices the students adopted for their writing exercises. Many students grasped partially the way to mix content and tone, but many honed in on one or two aspects. I would like to see more well-rounded papers.
- Keep the same assignment as a part of each exam given during the semester using different pairings of works of art for the students to analyze.
- Provide more individual assistance
- Since the weakest area was with technical accomplishments, I would stress this more when I teach the course again.

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- Generally, this was a very strong class and I felt very good about the results. The only area that could be improved is in the instruction of technical and formal elements. This is not surprising since these are non-art majors who are not used to working formally and are not used to perfecting an artistic technique.
- I need to be clearer about the goals of the assignment so that all students understand the intention of the assessment of their work, as opposed to the grading of their work.
- This was one of the College-Community Chorale's most successful performances, perhaps because the program consisted almost entirely of a single major work, allowing ample time for rehearsal.

Faculty's suggestions for improving the assessment process

- It is a useful tool for clarifying one's own presentation of course objectives.
- Make GE more transparent for students. This may be unrelated to this particular sort of assessment, but be sure they know about the various types of competencies and why they are assessed. Students don't seem to know much about GE based on my casual conversations with them.
- The assessment process seems fair and not too onerous.
- The rubric handout should match the objective categories online.

Effective Expression – Written

Overall Campus Ratings for Effective Expression – Written are as follows:

	Enrolled	Assessed		Exceeding		Meeting		Approaching		Not Meeting	
		N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Effective Expression - Written	1803	1642	91%	624	35%	655	40%	265	16%	98	6%
Students will critique written discourse.	601	542	90%	187	31%	217	40%	98	18%	40	7%
Students will research topics, present arguments, and organize evidence.	601	550	92%	227	38%	214	39%	80	15%	29	5%
Students will write coherent and persuasive texts.	601	550	92%	210	35%	224	41%	87	16%	29	5%

Selected Comments

Based upon these assessment data, what changes might you make if you were to teach this course again?

- Begin with a short paper early on to assess writing skills, especially with the Turkish students who are taking the course as a General Education requirement but are Business majors.
- For this class, I asked students to do a great deal of reading, much of it quite challenging. In addition, they were required to post regular responses to the reading on the class Blackboard site. For some of the students newer to college, keeping pace with the reading and writing assignments proved challenging, and when it came time to write a final paper for the class, they struggled to complete it. Were I to teach this class again, I would reduce the number of longer texts the class read by two, and spread the reading of the remaining texts over the extra classes. In addition, for several of their Blackboard responses--at least until the midterm--I would direct them to comment on one or two selected passages from the work in question, as another way to develop their skills at written analysis.
- I think that I might spend additional time talking through the assignment requirements and my expectations emphasizing the need for analysis and for a concluding argument.
- I think students' achievement could increase if I provided more detailed rubrics for assignments and used more case studies in conjunction with the educational theory I teach in the class.
- I've been considering adding an ungraded assignment at the beginning of the semester where I show students examples of answers that succeed (and fail) at presenting and critiquing arguments. They already get feedback on their own work, though that only focuses on any strengths or weaknesses that their paper happens to have at that time. I think it's especially important that they see what's involved in critiquing written discourse. Of course, we do this all the time in my class -- both in the readings and in class discussion -- but they need to see it in the format of the essays that they produce to be assessed.

Please describe what you learned from your assessment.

- All students, including those who did not meet the standard, were competent at describing the sources. Where those who did not meet the standard and who approached the standard fell short was that their analysis was weaker. Those who approached but did not meet usually lacked a conclusion that compared the ethical traditions. Thesis statements, too, tended to be absent. Those who exceeded the standard balanced description with analysis and produced well-argued conclusions. Those who exceeded also went beyond the course text, although that was not required. On the other hand, by linking the assignment with the text, this may have limited the scope of the students' inquiry. Lack of recognition of diversity of opinion in some papers in fact reflected how the text handles the issue under discussion. I therefore learned that although I thought that I had stressed diversity in my teaching this might require reinforcement perhaps by supplying additional sources.
- I find it very difficult to design an assignment that actually matches the assessment criteria, nor do I think it makes sense to design an assignment just in order to match them - this would be the tail wagging the dog. Thus, the essay assignment I used (and one I believe is valuable for both my course material/content and to evaluate analytical thinking) was good for assessing the first two criteria above, but not that useful for assessing criteria three. In fact, I think it would be more valuable to select one criteria per assignment each term (as we do for our capstone project/senior thesis) and try to assess that alone in more depth.
- My assessment revealed that students learned and mastered certain skills more easily than others. My students were generally successful at learning to carefully analyze and interpret written texts; in comparison, they struggled to master the form of academic argument, including the crafting of specific, arguable claims and of logical transitions. While I had structured the course's assignments to develop the skill of academic argument, I think on reflection that these assignments would have benefited from further scaffolding and in-class lessons on writing essays.
- Students were engaged with their topics and were generally able to research, present evidence and organize their evidence. Some had trouble integrating the evidence with their evaluation of the texts and many still struggle with writing a persuasive argument.
- This assessment taught me the utility and value of group-wise writing workshops as a tool indicating to students the demarcating line between good writing and bad. Learning in concert with their colleagues different means to constructing sentences that render paragraphs and essays complete, convincing and beautiful, my students surprised me with their competent writing that often verged on excellence. I learned students learn a lot more from each other than I had previously considered. I learned this from assessing not just the writing, but the development of the writing of 9 out of 11 students in my class.

Faculty's suggestions for improving the assessment process

- A large class makes it very difficult to monitor students' engagement, preparation, as well as their needs. The majority of students in this course are first semester students facing all common challenges faced by this cohort of students. The course is massive, although it is a 200 level class, because we are covering a vast geographical area, for the most part very new to the students, believe it or not. On top of it, it is an interdisciplinary course.
- For adjunct instructors such as myself, being required to participate in the assessment process without some form of financial compensation for the time and energy we must devote to it

seems problematic, at the very least. If our input into the assessment process is to be mandated, then we should be adequately remunerated for it.

- How can we make it actually useful to the faculty and how can we make students aware of it and actively participate in it?
- I actually could gauge more of the students' comprehension and growth in terms of content through informal journaling, which allows for creativity, personal response, and anecdotes. I don't like the uniform essay question and the rigid responses it engenders.
- I found it went smoothly and was not difficult to follow the process.
- It is a very important tool in educational process.
- None, it is really going quite beautifully, don't you think?
- That there is a need to address the issue of student expectations in terms of achievement that can discourage faculty from awarding lower grades. I try to include a substantial amount of objective testing (factual quizzes) which can be graded mathematically (right or wrong), which produces a fixed result. However, judging the quality of a critique or whether an argument is persuasive does not rest on exact science. More sharing of grading technique, how points on the scale are awarded for description, analysis, coherence, structure, ability to develop, test and sustain and argument, and produce a conclusion, might help to standardize the process.
- The process gets me thinking about how I could improve my teaching, which is useful.

C. Addressing issues arising from the spring 2014 GE Assessments

- With respect to supporting faculty, the Office of the Associate Provost (a) sponsored webcasts on assessment, (b) funded faculty and staff attendance at assessment focused/assessment-related conferences, and (c) gave part-time faculty a small stipend for participating in norming (rubric calibration) sessions and for conducting the GE assessments. Although I provided information to faculty about the GE assessments, several part-time faculty reported that they needed more help to carry out the GE assessments. Departments will again be encouraged to support all faculty, particularly part-time faculty, to teach and assess the GE courses.
- Although I extended the GE submission deadline, several faculty fail to meet that deadline.
- Now that we have a new GE curriculum, we will need to revise our campus-wide GE assessment plan. The revised campus-wide GE assessment plan will address relevant feedback from faculty.

D. Actions taken by faculty to address their spring 2015 GE Assessment Findings

The GE areas assessed in spring 2015 were United States Studies, Other World Civilizations, and Basic Communication – Oral. We also assessed courses in these categories that have the Critical Thinking competency as well as courses with the Ethical Reflection, Effective Expression – Oral, and Information Management competencies.

Some of the actions taken by faculty to address the spring 2015 course assessments results include the following:

- More opportunities were provided to students to develop their own arguments, to give more oral presentations throughout the course of the semester, to practice writing skills, to analyze arguments and to evaluate the justifications behind arguments about morality, etc.
- Faculty reported that they discussed their courses and course assessments with colleagues.

- Faculty calibrated their rubrics to ensure validity and reliability of instrument used.

Concluding Remarks

The assessment results show that a significant number of students met or exceeded the GE student learning outcomes assessed. Results also show that many students approached or did not meet some of the SLOs. It therefore is expected that instructors will modify their GE courses to help student improve areas of weakness.

Associate Provost: _____

Date: _____
