

# General Education Annual Assessment Report

## Curriculum Committee

Fall 2013

The assessment of General education for the academic year 2013-14 consisted of a complete review of all assessment rubrics and assignments for general education. This had not been completed since the formation of universal rubrics and several general education areas desired changes. All content areas discussed their rubrics and provided feedback to the committee. Any and all changes to the rubrics was determined by faculty who teach in the content areas. Changes to the rubrics were then put into the assessment system and began use. Additional assessment was completed for the content areas of: Value, Diversity and Meaning. These three content areas were due their detailed assessment of student learning. There is data on the assessment of those areas only.

The below information is a summation of the comments from content area faculty.

### Communications

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures:  
New, condensed rubric forthcoming – this will give clear definitions of each performance category and should also solve the “no response” problem.
- The recommended benchmark(s): 80% at development or higher
- Juried assessors need to have graduate-level study in the field required.

### Critical Thinking

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures:  
No response.

- The recommended benchmark(s):20% Exemplary, 40% Proficient, 30% developing, 10% insufficient
- Juried assessors need to have related areas of study, teach critical thinking courses or have academic background

## **Fine Arts**

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures: See rubric.
- The recommended benchmark(s):Yearly improvement is an important component in this: 60% proficient or above 1<sup>st</sup> year      65% 2<sup>nd</sup> year      70% 3<sup>rd</sup> year (Based on 1<sup>st</sup> year results)
- No response on juried assessor criteria.

## **Natural Sciences**

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures: New rubric and examples are forth coming
- The recommended benchmark(s): Exemplary 10%, Proficient 50%, Developing 35%, Insufficient 5%
- Yes, juried assessors need to have related areas of study.
- Our recommendation is that juried assessors be from outside the University, with similar size & mission statement. They need to have Science and/or Math Background and/or Interest in science and understands it is an evidence-based field.

## **Mathematics**

- For Mathematics, we consider exemplary work to be someone who understands a problem and can clearly show all steps to arrive at a solution. A proficient student also understands the problem, but may not be able to show all the necessary steps in the solution, although they are still able to solve the problem.

- The benchmark for Mathematics will be 80% of students score “exemplary” or “proficient” on each of the Mathematics sub-objectives.
- We feel the assessors do need to have a related area of study, or have some background in mathematics.
- We feel having a math, science, or business background would be a suitable criterion for an assessor.

The committee looked at the Math results from last spring’s assessment. Student performance was close to the expected standards, but there were three main issues raised:

1. The data was more complex than that of other departments--there were multiple lines of data corresponding to the same GE objective, and it seemed that results were being reported for the same objective in multiple charts. Chris explained, however, that Math faculty have broken their overall rubric into its 5 individual components, and then one artifact is presented for each of these components. This explains the complexity of their data. Another potential reason for the multiple data entries was that some math faculty are using an older rubric on Tk20, and Tk20 is giving back the combined results of the new and old rubrics, thus creating the confusion. Math’s artifacts are geared to the multi-rubric model, but Tk20 may have accidentally associated the old (combined) rubric with the new artifacts. Finally, the three GE math courses are very different, and this necessitates the multi-rubric model.
2. The results did not meet the Math benchmark of 80% proficient or exemplary. Though this is a high benchmark, Chris pointed out that in math, a student's work is either correct or incorrect--there is no real middle ground, or "developing" stage in the process of completing a math problem. As such, the math department wants to keep their current benchmark and let these results stand, while working towards improving student performance in the future.
3. There were several "No Response" entries. Chris plans to talk to the other Math faculty about this, and Carrie will talk to Roger to see if there are technical problems preventing some students from uploading artifacts.

## Social Science

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures: email examples to E. Wilson by Dec. 1.
- Recommended benchmark for CS area in measurable terms: 20% Exemplary      40% Proficient      20% Developing      20% Insufficient
- Yes, juried assessors need to have related areas of study.

## History

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures: See the rubric and examples are forthcoming.
- The recommended benchmark(s): 75% Exemplary and Proficient
- No comment on juried assessors' criteria recommendations

## Juried Assessment Content

### Value (Ethical Reasoning)

<b>Students will consider ethical problems in terms of competing interests, historical and cultural roots of conflict, and use various models or theories of ethical reasoning to resolve moral dilemmas. (CS Objective 5)</b>							
	% Exemplary	% Proficient	% Developing	% Insufficient	% No Response	Total Response	Mean
<b>1) Identify interested parties and their claims.</b>	55.38%	24.62%	16.92%	3.08%	12.16%	65	3.32
<b>2) Locate cultural and/or historical bases of conflict.</b>	41.54%	26.15%	24.62%	7.69%	12.16%	65	3.02
<b>3) Apply varied models and theories to approach moral dilemmas.</b>	40%	29.23%	23.08%	7.69%	12.16%	65	3.02
<b>Total/Percentage</b>	45.64%	26.67%	21.54%	6.15%	12.16%	195	

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures: "Use Steve's examples" (referencing Steve Huenneke's workshop examples)
- The recommended benchmark(s): 20% exemplary, 30% proficient, 30% developing, 20% insufficient
- Juried assessors need to have related area of study, teach courses in ethics or have academic background

## Diversity

Students will analyze the traditions and values of a variety of cultures							
Diversity Rubric	% Exemplary	% Proficient	% Developing	% Insufficient	% No Response	Total Response	Mean
<b>Cultural Awareness</b>	2.9%	53.62%	40.58%	2.9%	11.54%	69	2.57
<b>Interaction with Others</b>	14.29%	47.14%	35.71%	2.86%	10.26%	70	2.73
<b>Understanding Difference</b>	12.86%	62.86%	20%	4.29%	10.26%	70	2.84
<b>Self Understanding</b>	10%	54.29%	31.43%	4.29%	10.26%	70	2.7
<b>Total/Percentage</b>	10.04%	54.48%	31.9%	3.58%	10.58%	279	

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures: On rubric. Will send examples to Greg by Jan 1.
- The recommended benchmark(s): See rubric 70% - Both exemplary and proficient  
30% - Developing or insufficient
- Send Greg examples of artifacts that meet criteria
- No. There are so many different courses and with the new rubric, which is broader, we don't think it's necessary. The reasonable criteria for faculty to assess your CS areas would include intelligent, rational, open-minded, unbiased against particular groups, doesn't think their own culture is the norm.

November 26, 2013 Discussion: Assessment results for the GE area "Diversity" were presented to Diversity representative Mary Mosley. The Diversity benchmark is 70% at exemplary or proficient, with 30% at developing or insufficient. Assessment results did not reach this mark—the "developing" category was larger than expected. However, the committee discussed whether this may be a result of lumping "developing" and "insufficient" under a single percentage outcome. It was pointed out that had Diversity used the same benchmark as Meaning (80% at developing or higher), their results would have not been deemed problematic. Discussion continued as to the value and interpretation of the "developing" category. Dr. Mosley plans to take the discussion to other Diversity professors and ask them to reconsider their benchmark.

## Meaning

**Students will analyze texts (broadly defined) in order to identify central themes and interpret underlying meaning. (CS Objective 4)**

	% Exemplary	% Proficient	% Developing	% Insufficient	% No Response	Total Response	Mean
<b>Identify basic communication components of the text.</b>	33.33%	64.29%	2.38%	0%	12.5%	42	3.31
<b>Interpret the central meaning or theme of the text.</b>	26.19%	57.14%	16.67%	0%	12.5%	42	3.1
<b>Support textual interpretation.</b>	35.71%	54.76%	4.76%	4.76%	12.5%	42	3.21
<b>Total/Percentage</b>	31.75%	58.73%	7.94%	1.59%	12.5%	126	

- Concerning exemplary, developing proficient and insufficient assessment measures:  
On rubric
- The recommended benchmark(s): 80% at developing or higher
- Juried assessors need to have experience in field and graduate-level training in one of the areas covered by William Woods University's "meaning" classes

Nov 26, 2013 Discussion: Assessment results for the "Meaning" GE area were presented to Meaning representative Matt Dube. The results were positive, meeting the Meaning benchmark of 80% at "developing" or higher. The committee asked Dr. Dube to look closely at the scores and identify any areas of concern. There was some discussion of the 80% benchmark and the reasoning behind it. Committee members felt the current benchmark was philosophically sound and academically reasonable.

Conclusion Dr. Dube noted that assessors could be confused by the options "insufficient" and "no response" when faced with a blank artifact, as both responses seem appropriate for that situation. Instead, Dr. Dube suggested that there be a "no artifact" button. This would prevent confusion as to how an assessor is to respond to a blank artifact.

## Faculty Concerns

Tk20/Assessment Process (nov 5, 2013)

*These were pulled from the faculty feedback forms submitted at the Oct. 26 Professional Development meeting*

1. Writing a single program that bridges Owlnet, Moodle, and Tk20—this was a repeated concern.
2. Informing adjuncts of the assessment process and the steps involved in submitting artifacts.
3. Adjuncts need total access to and training in Tk20 so they can be involved in the assessment process
4. Ensure that the instructor—not the student—is choosing the artifacts
5. Make sure that the description of the artifact, the corresponding rubric, and the artifact itself are visible all on the same screen
6. Does Tk20 have the ability to pull a set number of random artifacts while excluding blank artifacts?
7. Shopping for a better assessment platform (other than Tk20)