

2017-2018 Annual Assessment Report



Academic Affairs - General Education/Core Curriculum

Tyler Junior College Mission Statement: The mission of Tyler Junior College is to provide a comprehensive collegiate experience that is anchored in the rich traditions of a quality education, vibrant student life and community service.

Assessment Unit Purpose: In November 2011, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) adopted recommendations for a revised Texas Core Curriculum centered on increasing student learning and improving student success. The THECB summarizes the guiding philosophy of its core revisions in this Statement of Purpose: "Through the Texas Core Curriculum, students will gain a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, develop principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse world, and advance intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning."

The General Education Core Curriculum at Tyler Junior College creates a coherent core that provides multiple opportunities to develop the skills, foundational knowledge, and principles expressed in the Statement of Purpose. The General Education Core courses share a uniform set of expectations, competencies, definitions, and guidelines in the areas of Critical Thinking, Communication, Empirical and Quantitative Skills, Teamwork, Social Responsibility, and Personal Responsibility.

The knowledge and skills that Tyler Junior College students gain from the General Education Core Curriculum should prepare them to lead lives as informed citizens, productive workers, and lifelong learners.

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
<p>Written Communication - CS1 - Students will develop, interpret, and express ideas through written communication.</p> <p>Outcome Type: CS1 -Written Communication</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for written communication using the CS1 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Written Communication (CS1) rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criteria was met. Qualified students (N=11,127) scored as follows on the sections of the Written Communication rubric: Organization - 84.17%; Development - 79.70%; Language Skills - 82.53%; and Format - 78.58%. For further information see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/13/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to evaluate the assignment. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee advised departments that teach these courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to evaluate the assignment through the sampling process</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: WrittenCommunicationRubricCS1Rev1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>		(11/20/2019)
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Written Communication - Items 4c and 12c (2016 CCSSE).</p> <p>Item 4c: Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in.</p> <p>Item 12c: Writing clearly and effectively.</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "often or "very often" to CCSSE item 4c and "quite a bit" or "very much" to item 12c - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Not Met The criterion was met. For both items, the TJC student responses were within 5% of the Large College frequency.</p> <p>For question 4c: Combined frequency of positive TJC student responses in spring 2018 did not exceed the Large College frequency: TJC frequency - 47.4%; Large Colleges frequency - 51.2%; 2018 Cohort frequency - 50.90%. However, the TJC frequency was within 5% of the Large Colleges frequency.</p> <p>For question 12c (this question was not the same number on the 2018 CCSSE--the new number is 11b): Combined frequency of positive TJC student responses in spring 2018 did not exceed the Large College benchmark frequency: TJC frequency - 55.5%; Large Colleges frequency - 60.4%; 2018 Cohort frequency - 60.7%. However, the TJC frequency was within 5% of the Large Colleges frequency.</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - CS-1.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - CS-1.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were below the Large Colleges frequency but within 5% of the frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>General Education Assessment - A sample of general education assessments for the Written Communication College Student Learning Outcome evaluated by a General Education Task Force. The Task force is provided the rubric for</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met The criterion was met. 89.04% of the students (N=73) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For more information, see CS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. In addition, sample</p>	<p>Use of Results: Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that more oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed. To</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>evaluation, discusses each item on the rubric to improve inter-rater reliability, evaluates the student work, and provides recommendations for improvement. Student work is evaluated once by the instructor of the student sample. If the first evaluation by the Task Force rater does not agree with instructor evaluation, the sample is evaluated one more time.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of the students from the sample achieved or exceeded the objective (scored a 2 or 3) based on the performance indicator defined on the Written Communication rubric.</p>	<p>may also be found under Related Documents. (05/23/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>CS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 1.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 2.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 3.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 4.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5a.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5b.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5c.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5d.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6a.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6b.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6c.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6d.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6e.pdf</p> <p>CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6f.pdf</p> <p>Writtent Communication 1 - Artifact 1.pdf</p>	<p>facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will provide training sessions during the Fall 2018 semester so that assessment tools can be developed and/or refined, execution of assessments can be planned, and collection of a sample may take place in the Spring 2019 semester. The assessment for written communication should be based on an individual writing assignment as opposed to a group writing assignment. Information about general education assessment should become a part of the faculty boot camp (new faculty orientation) or the Canvas training. Finally, the dean of the department that did not submit data needs to be notified so that all evaluation can proceed next time. The Team believes that these outcomes should be re-evaluated next year. (05/23/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Director for Institutional Effectiveness provided training sessions as needed on assessment tool development. Information was provided to Department Chairs so that data collection for the Spring 2019 semester would proceed smoothly. The Committee stressed that the written communication tool should be based on an individual writing assignment as opposed to a group</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>writing assignment. The dean of the department that did not submit data was notified. The outcomes were re-evaluated during the 2018-2019 academic year.</p> <p>Results are as follows: The criterion was met. 88.78% of the students (N=98) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. (08/27/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to develop, interpret and express ideas through written communication (CS-1). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to develop, interpret and express ideas through written communication (CS-1).</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>72.62% of student survey respondents (N=840) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through written communication (CS-1). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through written communication (CS-1): dual credit - 66.44% (N=435); traditional - 80.51% (N=195); and non-traditional - 81.82% (N=33). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/23/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf</p> <p>SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 6.45% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 83.33% (N=48) indicated that their students develop, interpret and express ideas through written communication; 19.44% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. This outcome was also evaluated by sample selection in the Spring 2018 semester. Professional development is scheduled for the Fall 2018 semester, and evaluation by sample selection is schedule for the Spring 2019 semester. For further information,</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. (05/23/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, professional development was provided to all who requested it. The more popular method of training was by meeting one-on-one with department chairs to answer questions about the general education sample collection. This outcome was evaluated by sample collection during the Spring 2018 semester. Results showed that the criterion was met. 88.78% of the students (N=98) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p>
<p>Oral Communication - CS2 - Students will develop, interpret, and express ideas through oral communication.</p> <p>Outcome Type: CS2 - Oral Communication</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for oral communication using the Oral Communication rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Oral Communication rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Oral Communication Rubric: Develop Support - 91.11% met criterion (N=1688) and Express Ideas - 90.92% met criterion (N=1630). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. To improve student learning as well as improve the assessment of this outcome, the Committee will ask Department Chairs for the courses where this outcome is taught to review the assignment used for assessment purposes for</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: OralCommunicationRubricCS2Rev1.1.1.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>clarity. In addition, the Department Chairs will be asked to review the rubric with instructors to ensure that the assignment aligns with the rubric. Further, the Committee will ask Department Chairs to provide any suggestions to improve the rubric. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee sent a survey to all department chairs and faculty giving them an opportunity to provide suggestions for possible rubric changes. The Committee also offered meetings during Convocation to give faculty an opportunity to make suggestions to improve the rubric. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Oral Communication - items 4a, 4b and 12d.</p> <p>4a: Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</p> <p>4b: Made a class presentation</p> <p>12d: Speaking clearly and effectively</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "often or "very often" to CCSSE items 4a, and 4b and "quite a bit" or "very much" to item 12d - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students responded within 5% of the Large College frequency for each item. Students responded as follows:</p> <p>4a: TJC frequency - 60.0% (N=1,018); Large Colleges frequency - 64.3% (N=79,407); 2018 Cohort frequency - 66.1% (N=301,452).</p> <p>4b: TJC frequency - 34.5% (N=1,018); Large Colleges frequency - 34.8% (N=79,048); 2018 Cohort frequency - 34.7% (N=300,133).</p> <p>11d. (Note that question 12d was renumbered to 11d in the 2018 CCSSE) TJC frequency - 56.4% (N=995); Large Colleges frequency - 56.8% (N=77,759); 2018 Cohort frequency - 57.5% (N=295,821).</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - CS-2.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were below the Large Colleges frequency but within 5% of the frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p> <p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through Oral Communication (CS-2). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through oral communication.</p>	<p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - CS-2.pdf</p> <p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met 73.96% of student survey respondents (N=841) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through oral communication (CS-2). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through oral communication (CS-2): dual credit - 66.21% (N=435); traditional - 82.65% (N=196); and non-traditional - 84.85% (N=33). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 11.02% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 76.19% (N=48) indicated that their students develop, interpret and express ideas through oral communication; 5.56% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. This outcome will be monitored in the 2018-2019 academic year and is scheduled for further sampling in the 2021-2022 academic year. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, this outcome was monitored. 72.81% of student survey respondents (N=841)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through oral communication (CS-2). This is statistically the same as the 2017-2018 academic year. Due to the consistency of the outcome, the Committee will continue to monitor the outcome and keep it on its sampling schedule for the 2021-2022 academic year. For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)
<p>Visual Communication - CS3 - Students will develop, interpret, and express ideas through visual communication.</p> <p>Outcome Type: CS3 - Visual Communication</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for visual communication using the Visual Communication rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Visual Communication rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: VisualCommunicationRubricCS3Rev1</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Visual Communication Rubric: Develop Support - 79.44% met criterion (N=1761) and Express Ideas - 79.29% met criterion (N=1758). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to evaluation the assignment. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The committee made a Canvas shell course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for CS-3. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results to faculty. (11/20/2019)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf		
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to develop, interpret and express ideas through visual communication (CS-3). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to develop, interpret and express ideas through visual communication (CS-3).</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>77.62% of student survey respondents (N=840) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through visual communication (CS-3). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to develop, interpret, and express ideas through visual communication (CS-3): dual credit - 72.41% (N=435); traditional - 85.13% (N=195); and non-traditional - 75.76% (N=33). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf</p> <p>SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 4.03% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 83.33% (N=48) indicated that their students develop, interpret and express ideas through visual communication; 2.78% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. This outcome will be monitored in the 2018-2019 academic year and is scheduled for further sampling in the 2021-2022 academic year. (05/24/2018)</p>
<p>Critical Thinking - CT1 - Students will generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information.</p> <p>Outcome Type: CT1 - Critical Thinking</p> <p>1</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for critical thinking using the Critical Thinking 1 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Critical Thinking 1 rubric will be</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Critical Thinking 1 Rubric: Position - 83.58% met criterion (N=10,249); Explanation - 80.78% met criterion (N=10,242); Evidence - 77.25% met criterion (N=10,244); and Conclusion - 81.49% met criterion (N=10,241). For further information,</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: CriticalThinkingRubricCT1Rev1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>alignment with rubric used to evaluation the assignment. In addition, this outcome has been selected for sampling during the Spring 2019 semester. To do this, a sample of general education assessments will be evaluated by a General Education Task Force. During this process, the Task force is provided the rubric for evaluation, discusses each item on the rubric to improve inter-rater reliability, evaluates the student work, and provides recommendations for improvement. Student work is evaluated once by the instructor of the student sample. If the first evaluation by the Task Force rater does not agree with instructor evaluation, the sample is evaluated one more time. At the same time, the Task Force may provide suggestions to improve the assignment and/or improve student learning/performance. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for CT-1. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results with faculty. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Critical Thinking 1 - items 4d, 5c, 5e, 5f and 12e.</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met The criterion was met. Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency on three of the four items (one item was not measured in the 2018 CCSSE instrument). The weighted average for the four categories was as follows: Tyler Junior</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were above the Large Colleges frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>4d: Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources (INGEGRAT)</p> <p>5c: Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways (SYNTHESZ)</p> <p>5e: Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or new situations (APPLYING)</p> <p>5f: Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill (PERFORM)</p> <p>12e: Thinking critically and analytically. (GNANALY)</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "often or "very often" to CCSSE item 4d and "quite a bit" or "very much" to items 5c, 5e and 12e - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>College - 67.0%; Large Colleges - 65.7%; and 2018 Cohort - 66.0%.</p> <p>4d: Students scored below the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 65.4% (N=1,013); Large Colleges frequency - 67.4% (N=78,851); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 66.6% (N=299,550).</p> <p>5c: This item did not appear of the 2018 CCSSE.</p> <p>5e: Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 62.1% (N=1,006); Large Colleges frequency - 60.3% (N=78,732); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 60.5% (N=299,111).</p> <p>5f: Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 68.6% (N=1,012); Large Colleges frequency - 64.9% (N=78,988); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 66.0% (N=300,043).</p> <p>12e: Students scored below the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 71.9% (N=998); Large Colleges frequency - 70.1% (N=77,685); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 71.1% (N=295,675).</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - CT-1.pdf under Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - CT-1.pdf</p>	<p>on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>74.50% of student survey respondents (N=843) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information (CT-1). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to generate</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 8.33% (N=744) indicated that they</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information (Critical Thinking 1). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information (Critical Thinking 1).</p>	<p>and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information (CT-1): dual credit - 70.48% (N=437); traditional - 79.49% (N=195); and non-traditional - 87.88% (N=33). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</p> <p>CT 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</p>	<p>believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 80.00% (N=45) indicated that their students generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information; 11.11% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, this outcome was investigated through additional student sampling and faculty evaluation. Therefore, students may have been more cognizant of this outcome. Survey respondents answered this question similar to the respondents during the 2017-2018 academic year. 72.05% of student survey respondents (N=526) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information (CT-1). For further information, see CT-1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS -</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)
<p>Critical Thinking - CT2 - Students will gather and assess information relevant to a question.</p> <p>Outcome Type: CT2 - Critical Thinking 2</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for critical thinking using the Critical Thinking 2-3 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: The first Objective/Criterion on the Critical Thinking 2-3 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: CriticalThinkingRubricCT2-3Rev1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>The criterion was not met. Students scored 61.07% (N=4131) on the Evidence section of the Critical Thinking 2-3 Rubric. For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was not met. During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Committee will work with Department Chairs and faculty to improve student learning and/or student performance by 1) reviewing the current assignment used for assessment purposes for clarity; 2) sampling the assignment (additional evaluation); and 3) providing a "Best Practices" module in Canvas that faculty can access at any time. In addition, the Chair of the General Education Committee will ask to attend Department meetings and/or ask that information about this general education outcome be provided to faculty during departmental meetings. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty use, which provides examples, resources, and content for the assessment of CT 2-3. Convocation sessions were presented in both Fall and Spring semesters which familiarized the use of results to faculty. Department chairs are being included more frequently in an expanded Assessment Committee,</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			to acquaint chairs with the importance of General Education assessment, proper reporting of data, and the keeping of artifacts which can be used to document Assessment Methods, Results, and Analysis. Extensive mentoring is being given to department chairs by TJC's assessment and compliance officials, which allows for greater understanding and better communication of what chairs (and faculty) need to provide. (11/20/2019)
<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Critical Thinking 2 - items 5b and 12e.</p> <p>5b: Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory (ANALYZE)</p> <p>12e: Thinking critically and analytically (GNANALY)</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "quite a bit" or "very much" to items 5b and 12e - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. The weighted average for the two categories was within 5% of the Large Colleges. The weighted average for the two categories was as follows: Tyler Junior College - 70.3%; Large Colleges - 70.4%; and 2018 Cohort - 70.4%.</p> <p>5b: Students scored below (but within 5% of) the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 68.7% (N=1,012); Large Colleges frequency - 70.7% (N=78,766); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 69.7% (N=299,170).</p> <p>11d (formerly 12e): Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 71.9% (N=998); Large Colleges frequency - 70.1% (N=77,685); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 71.1% (N=295,675).</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - CT-2.pdf under Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - CT-2.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were below the Large Colleges frequency but within 5% of the frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>	
<p>General Education Assessment - A sample of general education</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met</p>	<p>Use of Results: Although the criterion was met, the General</p>	

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>assessments evaluated by a General Education Task Force. The Task force is provided the rubric for evaluation, discusses each item on the rubric to improve inter-rater reliability, evaluates the student work, and provides recommendations for improvement. Student work is evaluated once by the instructor of the student sample. If the first evaluation by the Task Force rater does not agree with instructor evaluation, the sample is evaluated one more time.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of the students from the sample achieved or exceeded the objective (scored a 2 or 3) based on the performance indicator defined on the Critical Thinking 2-3 rubric (item 1).</p>	<p>The criterion was met. 91.36% of the students (N=81) achieved or exceeded objective (scored a 2 or 3) based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For more information, see CT 2 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. In addition, sample artifacts may also be found under Related Documents. (05/23/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: CT 2 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf Critical Thinking 2-3 - Artifacts.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 1.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 2.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 3.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 4.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5a.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5b.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5c.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5d.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6a.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6b.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6c.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6d.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6e.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6f.pdf CT 2 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</p>	<p>Education Evaluation Task Force believes that more oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will provide training sessions during the Fall 2018 semester so that assessment tools can be developed and/or refined, execution of assessments can be planned, and collection of a sample may take place in the Spring 2019 semester. The Team believes that these outcomes should be re-evaluated next year. (05/23/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Director for Institutional Effectiveness met with department chairs as needed regarding CT 2 and sample submissions. The outcomes were re-evaluated in the Spring 2019 semester. The criterion was met. 92.55% of the students (N=94) achieved or exceeded objective (scored a 2 or 3) based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For further information, see CT 2 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met 72.62% of student survey respondents (N=840) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to gather and assess information relevant to a question (CT-2). For the</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to gather and assess information relevant to a question (Critical Thinking 2). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to gather and assess information relevant to a question (Critical Thinking 2).</p>	<p>subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to gather and assess information relevant to a question (CT-2): dual credit - 77.12% (N=437); traditional - 87.76% (N=197); and non-traditional - 90.91% (N=33). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf</p>	<p>Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 3.49% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 89.58% (N=48) indicated that their students gather and assess information relevant to a question; 2.78% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. This outcome was also evaluated by sample selection in the Spring 2018 semester. Professional development is scheduled for the Fall 2018 semester, and evaluation by sample selection is schedule for the Spring 2019 semester. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p>
<p>Critical Thinking - CT3 - Students will analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information.</p> <p>Outcome Type: CT3 - Critical Thinking 3</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for critical thinking using the Critical Thinking 2-3 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: The second through fourth objective/criteria on the Critical Thinking 2-3 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>The criterion was not met. Students scored as follows on the Critical Thinking 2-3 Rubric: Analysis - 54.08% met criterion (N=4340); Evaluation - 55.84% met criterion (N=4527); and Synthesis - 54.70% met criterion (N=4340). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee noted that the criterion was not met. However, sampling showed 76.54% of the students (N=81) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. (For more information, see CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents.) To improve</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: CriticalThinkingRubricCT2-3Rev1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf</p>	<p>student performance in the 2018-2019 academic year, the Committee will ask Department Chairs to review the assignment used for assessment as well as the rubric used to evaluate the assignment. Further, the Department Chairs will be asked to review the Canvas reporting system so that the most up-to-date rubric and rubric settings are being used. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee asked Department Chairs to review the assignment used for assessment as well as the rubric used to evaluate the assignment. Further, the Department Chairs asked to review the Canvas reporting system so that the most up-to-date rubric and rubric settings are being used through the sampling process (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Critical Thinking 3 - items 5d and 12e.</p> <p>5d: Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods (EVALUATE)</p> <p>12e: Thinking critically and analytically (GNANALY)</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "quite a bit" or "very much" to items 5d and 12e - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. The weighted average for the two categories was as follows: Tyler Junior College - 64.6%; Large Colleges - 63.1%; and 2018 Cohort - 63.6%.</p> <p>5d: Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 57.4% (N=1,001); Large Colleges frequency - 56.1% (N=78,606); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 56.1% (N=298,753).</p> <p>11d (formerly 12e): Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 71.9% (N=998); Large Colleges frequency - 70.1% (N=77,685); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 71.1% (N=295,675).</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - CT-3.pdf under Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were above the Large Colleges frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p> <p>General Education Assessment - A A sample of general education assessments evaluated by a General Education Task Force. The Task force is provided the rubric for evaluation, discusses each item on the rubric to improve inter-rater reliability, evaluates the student work, and provides recommendations for improvement. Student work is evaluated once by the instructor of the student sample. If the first evaluation by the Task Force rater does not agree with instructor evaluation, the sample is evaluated one more time.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of the students from the sample achieved or exceeded the objective based on the three performance indicators defined on the rubric. To achieve or exceed the objective on the rubric, the student must have an average score of the three indicators above 1.49 (Critical Thinking 2-3 Rubric average of items 2, 3, and 4).</p>	<p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - CT-3.pdf</p> <p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met The criterion was met. 76.54% of the students (N=81) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For more information, see CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. In addition, sample artifacts may also be found under Related Documents.</p> <p>Related Documents: CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf Critical Thinking 2-3 - Artifacts.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 1.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 2.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 3.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 4.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5a.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5b.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5c.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 5d.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6a.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6b.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6c.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6d.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6e.pdf CS 1 and CT 2-3 - Artifacts - 6f.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that more oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed. It is important to note that the percentage of students in the sample meeting this objective are much lower than the percentage who met the Critical Thinking 2 objective (76.54% versus 91.6%). To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will provide training sessions during the Fall 2018 semester so that assessment tools can be developed and/or refined, execution of assessments can be planned, and collection of a sample may take place in the Spring 2019 semester. Additional information about improving performance on this objective will also be presented. In addition, the Task Force questioned if sociology and psychology measured this outcome as well. The Team believes that these outcomes should be re-evaluated next year. (05/23/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>academic year, the Director for Institutional Effectiveness provided training session to interested individuals. Most often, training occurred with Department Chairs individually as needed. Sampling occurred in the Spring 2019 semester. The criterion was met. 82.98% of the students (N=94) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. One course, Botany, still had issues with its assessment tool. This issue will be further discussed in the 2018-2019 assessment report for general education. (08/27/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information (Critical Thinking 3). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information (Critical Thinking 3).</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>82.09% of student survey respondents (N=843) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information (CT-3). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information (CT-3): dual credit - 77.88% (N=434); traditional - 87.76% (N=196); and non-traditional - 87.88% (N=33). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf</p> <p>SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 4.44% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 79.59% (N=48) indicated that their students analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information; 22.22% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. This outcome was also evaluated by sample selection in the Spring 2018 semester. Professional development is</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
<p>Empirical and Quantitative Skills - EQS1 - Students will manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion.</p> <p>Outcome Type: EQS1 - Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for empirical and quantitative skills using the Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: EmpiricalAndQuantitativeRubricEQS1Rev1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Numerical Data Rubric: Manipulate - 72.24% met criterion (N=1459); Analyze - 71.69% met criterion (N=1459); and Conclusion - 70.88% met criterion (N=1456). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>scheduled for the Fall 2018 semester, and evaluation by sample selection is schedule for the Spring 2019 semester. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. To further investigate student learning on this outcome, the Committee will sample this outcome in the Spring 2019 semester. To do this, a sample of general education assessments will be evaluated by a General Education Task Force. During this process, the Task force is provided the rubric for evaluation, discusses each item on the rubric to improve inter-rater reliability, evaluates the student work, and provides recommendations for improvement. Student work is evaluated once by the instructor of the student sample. If the first evaluation by the Task Force rater does not agree with instructor evaluation, the sample is evaluated one more time. At the same time, the Task Force may provide suggestions to improve the assignment and/or improve student learning/performance. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee sampled this outcome in the</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>Spring 2019 semester. Sample general education assessments were evaluated by a General Education Task Force. The Task force was provided the rubric for evaluation, discussed each item on the rubric to improve inter-rater reliability, evaluated the student work and provided recommendations for improvement. If the evaluation by the Task Force rater did not agree with the original instructor evaluation, the sample was evaluated a third time by a different task force member. The task force provided suggestions to the Committee for improving the assignment and/or student performance. The Committee also made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for EQS 1. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results to faculty. (11/20/2019)</p>
<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1 - items 12f and 12g.</p> <p>12f: Solve numerical problems (GNSOLVE)</p> <p>12g: Using computing and information technology (GNCMPTS)</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of</p>		<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met The criterion was met. Students responded within 5% of the Large Colleges frequency.</p> <p>11e (formerly 12f): Students scored below the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 53.1% (N=999); Large Colleges frequency - 55.5% (N=77,755); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 55.9% (N=295,787).</p> <p>Item 12g was not a part of the 2018 CCSSE instrument.</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - EQS-1.pdf under</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were below the Large Colleges frequency but within 5% of the frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>TJC students responding positively - "quite a bit" or "very much" to items 12f, and 12g - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - EQS-1.pdf</p>	<p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion (Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion (Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1).</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>62.16% of student survey respondents (N=835) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion (EQS-1). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion (EQS-1): dual credit - 58.85% (N=435); traditional - 68.04% (N=194); and non-traditional - 68.75% (N=32). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf EQS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was not met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 11.42% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 75.00% (N=48) indicated that their students manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion; 13.89% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. This outcome is scheduled to be evaluated by sample selection in the Spring 2019 semester. Professional development is scheduled for the Fall 2018 semester, and evaluation by sample selection is scheduled for the Spring 2019 semester. For further information,</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, 64.26% of student survey respondents (N=526) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion (EQS-1). This outcome was selected for sampling in the 2018-2019 academic year. The criterion was met. 81.69% of the students (N=71) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. The difference between student perception and student performance suggests that perhaps students lack confidence rather than skill in manipulating and analyzing numerical data to arrive at an informed conclusion. For further information, see EQS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p>
Empirical and Quantitative Skills - EQS2 - Students will manipulate and	Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other	Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Not Met	Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was not

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
<p>analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion.</p> <p>Outcome Type: EQS2 - Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>assignment which is integral to the course, scored for empirical and quantitative skills using the Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: EmpiricalAndQuantitativeRubricEQS2Rev1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>The criterion was not met. Students scored as follows on the Empirical and Quantitative Skills Rubric: Manipulate - 63.02% met criterion (N=5952); Analyze - 65.67% met criterion (N=5882); and Conclusion - 62.89% met criterion (N=5942). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to evaluation the assignment. The Committee Chair will communicate with the Department Chairs about this outcome to suggest methods to improve student learning and/or student performance. The Committee will provide resources in Canvas that all faculty will have access to at any time of the day or night. In addition, the Committee feels that this outcome is strongly tied to outcomes CT-2 and CT-3. The Committee will review this connection in the Spring 2019 semester and/or Fall 2019 semester. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for EQS-2. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results to faculty. Sampling also occurred for this outcome in spring 2019. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2 - items 4d, 12e and 12g.</p> <p>4d: Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. The respondents were within 5% of the Large Colleges frequency. The weighted average for the categories was as follows: Tyler Junior College - 68.6%; Large Colleges - 68.7%; and 2018 Cohort - 68.8%.</p> <p>4d: Students scored below the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 65.4% (N=1,013); Large</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were below the Large Colleges frequency but within 5% of the frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>information from various sources (INTEGRAT)</p> <p>12e: Thinking critically and analytically (GNANALY)</p> <p>12g: Using computing and information technology (GNCMPTS)</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "often or "very often" to CCSSE item 4d and "quite a bit" or "very much" to items 12e and 12g - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Colleges frequency - 67.4% (N=78,851); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 66.6% (N=299,550).</p> <p>11d (formerly 12e): Students scored below the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 71.9% (N=998); Large Colleges frequency - 70.1% (N=77,685); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 71.1% (N=295,675).</p> <p>Item 12g was not a part of the 2018 CCSSE instrument.</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - EQS-2.pdf under Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - EQS-2.pdf</p>	<p>adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion (Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>73.21% of student survey respondents (N=836) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion (EQS-2). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion (EQS-2): dual credit - 66.82% (N=434); traditional - 83.42% (N=193); and non-traditional - 75.00% (N=32). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 3.90% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 86.05% (N=48) indicated that their students manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion; 0.00% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
	able to manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion (Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2).		<p>needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. This outcome will be monitored in the 2018-2019 academic year and is scheduled for further sampling in the 2019-2020 academic year. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Committee monitored this outcome. Student perceptions remained similar to the 2017-2018 academic year. 70.53% of student survey respondents (N=836) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion (EQS-2). This outcome is still scheduled for further sampling in the 2019-2020 academic year. For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents.</p>
Teamwork - TW1 & TW2 - Students will integrate different viewpoints as a member of a team, and work with others to support and accomplish a shared goal.	Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for teamwork using the Teamwork 1 and 2 rubric.	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Teamwork 2 and 3 Rubric: Team Interaction - 88.38% met criterion (N=2764); Individual - 88.41% met criterion</p>	Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to review the assessment

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
<p>Outcome Type: TW1 & TW2 - Teamwork 1 and 2</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Teamwork 1 and 2 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: TeamworkRubric1-2Rev1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>(N=4685); and Purpose/Goal - 87.97% met criterion (N=4680). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to evaluation the assignment. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for TW 1 & 2. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results to faculty. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Teamwork 1 and 2 - items 4f, 4g and 12h.</p> <p>4f: Worked with other students on projects during class (CLASSGRP)</p> <p>4g: Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (OCCGRP)</p> <p>12h: Working effectively with others (GNOTHERS)</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "often or "very often" to CCSSE items 4f and 4g, and "quite a bit" or "very much" to item 12h - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. The weighted average for the categories was as follows: Tyler Junior College - 47.7%; Large Colleges - 46.2%; and 2018 Cohort - 47.3%.</p> <p>4f: Students scored below the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 51.3% (N=1,002); Large Colleges frequency - 52.1% (N=78,436); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 52.6% (N=297,612).</p> <p>4g: Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 30.2% (N=1,006); Large Colleges frequency - 25.5% (N=78,533); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 26.6% (N=298,271).</p> <p>11f (formerly 12h): Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 61.9% (N=996); Large Colleges frequency - 61.3% (N=77,700); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 62.7% (N=295,757).</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - TW1 and TW2.pdf under Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - TW1 and TW2.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were above the Large Colleges frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>Teamwork 1: 75.03% of student survey respondents (N=837) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to integrate different viewpoints as a member of a team (TW-1). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to integrate different viewpoints as a member of a team (TW-1): dual credit - 70.74% (N=434); traditional - 79.90% (N=194); and non-traditional - 84.38% (N=32).</p> <p>Teamwork 2: 78.67% of student survey respondents (N=839) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to work with others to support and accomplish a shared goal (TW-2). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to work with others and accomplish a shared goal (TW-2): dual credit - 75.00% (N=436); traditional - 84.26% (N=197); and non-traditional - 87.50% (N=32).</p> <p>For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 5.65% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve TW-1 outcome the most; 4.17% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve TW-2 outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 85.71% (N=42) indicated that their students integrate different viewpoints as a member of a team and 86.05% (N=43) indicated that their students work with others to support and accomplish a shared goal. 0.00% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on TW-1 while 2.78% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on TW-2. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. This outcome will be monitored in the 2018-2019 academic year and is scheduled for further sampling in the 2020-</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
(05/24/2018)			
<p>Personal Responsibility - PR1 - Students will evaluate choices and actions, and relate consequences to decision making.</p> <p>Outcome Type: PR1 - Personal Responsibility</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for personal responsibility using the Personal Responsibility 1 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Personal Responsibility 1 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: PersonalResponsibilityRubricPR1Rev 1.11.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Personal Responsibility Rubric: Identification - 82.67% met criterion (N=8004); Connection - 82.78% met criterion (N=8010); and Response - 82.52% met criterion (N=8005). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee has decided that it will monitor the results of this outcome during the 2018-2019 academic year so that more focus can be placed on the Social Responsibility outcomes, particularly SR-3. The Committee will also review the rubric used to evaluate student work for this outcome. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for PR 1. Convocation sessions were presented in both fall and spring semester discussing results with faculty. Sampling for this outcome will be done in Spring 2020. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Personal Responsibility 1 - items 4n, 4r, 12j and 12l.</p> <p>4n: Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with instructors outside of class (FACIDEAS)</p> <p>4r: Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.) (OOCIDEAS)</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. The weighted average for the categories was as follows: Tyler Junior College - 37.4%; Large Colleges - 33.1%; and 2018 Cohort - 34.3%.</p> <p>4m (formerly 4n): Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 21.4% (N=993); Large Colleges frequency - 18.7% (N=78,271); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 20.0% (N=297,435).</p> <p>4q (formerly 4r): Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 53.2% (N=1,010); Large Colleges frequency - 47.5% (N=78,694); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 48.5% (N=298,883).</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were above the Large Colleges frequency but within 5% of the frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>12j: Understanding yourself (GNSELF)</p> <p>12l: Developing a personal code of values and ethics (GNETHICS)</p> <p>Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "often or "very often" to CCSSE items 4n and 4r, and "quite a bit" or "very much" to items 12j and 12l - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Items 12j and 12l were not included in the 2018 CCSSE instrument.</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - PR-1.pdf under Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - PR-1.pdf</p>	<p>possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to evaluate choices and actions, and relate consequences to decision making (Personal Responsibility 1). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to evaluate choices and actions, and relate consequences to decision</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>80.51% of student survey respondents (N=831) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to evaluate choices and actions and relate consequences to decision making (PR-1). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to evaluate choices and actions and relate consequences to decision making (PR-1): dual credit - 75.52% (N=433); traditional - 86.67% (N=195); and non-traditional - 87.10% (N=31). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 7.80% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 82.50% (N=40) indicated that their students evaluate choices and actions and relate consequences to decision making; 5.56% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. For further</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	making (Personal Responsibility 1).	2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf	<p>information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. This outcome will be monitored in the 2018-2019 academic year and is scheduled for further sampling in the 2019-2020 academic year. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, this outcome was monitored. Student responses were lower than the 2017-2018 academic year. In 2018-2019, 75.47% of student survey respondents (N=526) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to evaluate choices and actions and relate consequences to decision making (PR-1). This outcome is scheduled for further sampling in the 2019-2020 academic year. For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/28/2019)</p>
Social Responsibility - SR1 - Students will demonstrate intercultural competence by recognizing the presence of intercultural influences/elements and describing the effect of the intercultural influences/elements on the artifact or	Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for social responsibility using the Social Responsibility 1 rubric. Criterion: Each objective/criteria on	Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Social Responsibility 1 Rubric: Recognize - 83.45% met criterion (N=1837) and Describe Effects - 83.03% met criterion (N=1833). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related	Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
<p>article.</p> <p>Outcome Type: SR1 - Social Responsibility 1</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>the Social Responsibility 1 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: SocialResponsibilityRubricSR1Rev1.1.1.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>evaluation the assignment. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for SR1. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results to faculty. Sampling also occurred for this outcome in spring 2019. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to demonstrate intercultural competence by recognizing the presence of intercultural influences/elements and describing the effect of the intercultural influences/elements on the artifact or article (Social Responsibility 1). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to demonstrate intercultural</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>69.54% of student survey respondents (N=834) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to demonstrate intercultural competence by recognizing the presence of intercultural influences/elements and describing the effect of the intercultural influences/elements on the artifact or article (SR-1). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to demonstrate intercultural competence by recognizing the presence of intercultural influences/elements and describing the effect of the intercultural influences/elements on the artifact or article (SR-1): dual credit - 62.59% (N=433); traditional - 77.55% (N=196); and non-traditional - 78.13% (N=32). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was not met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 6.18% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 72.22% (N=36) indicated that their students demonstrate intercultural competence by recognizing the presence of intercultural influences/elements and describing the effect of the intercultural influences/elements on the artifact or article; 2.78% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
	competence by recognizing the presence of intercultural influences/elements and describing the effect of the intercultural influences/elements on the artifact or article (Social Responsibility 1).		<p>this College Student Learning Outcome. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. This outcome will be monitored in the 2018-2019 academic year and is scheduled for further sampling in the 2020-2021 academic year. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: This outcome was monitored during the 2018-2019 academic year. Student results did improve: 72.62% of student survey respondents (N=526) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to demonstrate intercultural competence by recognizing the presence of intercultural influences/elements and describing the effect of the intercultural influences/elements on the artifact or article (SR-1). This outcome is scheduled for further sampling in the 2020-2021 academic year. For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/28/2019)</p>
Social Responsibility - SR2 - Students will identify civic responsibility. Outcome Type: SR2 - Social Responsibility 2	Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for social	Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Social Responsibility 2 Rubric: Comprehend - 80.02% met	Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
<p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>responsibility using the Social Responsibility 2 rubric. Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Social Responsibility 2 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: SociallResponsibilityRubricSR2Rev1.1 1.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>criterion (N=3548); Reflect - 82.87% met criterion (N=3544) and Communicate - 84.38% met criterion (N=3535). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to evaluation the assignment. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The Committee made a Canvas Shell Course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for SR-2. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results to faculty. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - Results from Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) items most closely related to Social Responsibility 2 - items 4i and 12m.</p> <p>4i: Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course (COMMPROJ)</p> <p>12m: Contributing to the welfare of your community (GNCOMMUN) Criterion: Combined frequency of TJC students responding positively - "often or "very often" to CCSSE item 4i and "quite a bit" or "very much" to item 12m - will be within 5% or exceed that of the Large College benchmark group for the same year.</p> <p>Related Documents: Alignment of CCSSE Items with Core</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018 Result Type: Criterion Met The criterion was met.</p> <p>4i: Students scored above the Large Colleges frequency: Tyler Junior College frequency - 9.5% (N=1,013); Large Colleges frequency - 8.6% (N=78,835); and 2018 Cohort frequency - 9.1% (N=299,277).</p> <p>Item 12m was not included in the 2018 CCSSE instrument.</p> <p>For further information, see 2018 CCSSE - SR-2.pdf under Related Documents. (08/15/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2018 CCSSE - SR-2.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that student responses were above the Large Colleges frequency. The Committee has decided to review the CCSSE items on the most recent survey to determine if these items still adequately assess the outcome. In addition, the Committee will review other possible assessment options. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: Due to changes in the CSLO's, the committee has decided to discuss CSSE and other possible assessment tools after the new CSLO's are implemented. (11/20/2019)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	competencies.pdf CCSSE Validation Summary.pdf Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>77.09% of student survey respondents (N=838) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to identify civic responsibility (SR-2). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to identify civic responsibility (SR-2): dual credit - 71.26% (N=435); traditional - 83.59% (N=195); and non-traditional - 84.38% (N=32). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 4.44% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 76.32% (N=38) indicated that their students identify civic responsibility; 2.78% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. This outcome will be monitored in the 2018-2019 academic year and is scheduled for further sampling in the 2021-2022 academic year. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Committee monitored this outcome. Student responses were similar to the 2017-2018 academic year: 73.57% of student survey respondents (N=526) strongly</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			agreed or agreed that they are able to identify civic responsibility (SR-2). This outcome is still scheduled for further sampling in the 2021-2022 academic year. For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/28/2019)
<p>Social Responsibility - SR3 - Students will engage in regional, national, and global communities.</p> <p>Outcome Type: SR3 - Social Responsibility 3</p> <p>Start Date: 09/01/2014</p>	<p>Course Embedded Assessment - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for social responsibility using the Social Responsibility 3 rubric.</p> <p>Criterion: Each objective/criteria on the Social Responsibility 3 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment: Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p>Related Documents: SocialResponsibilityRubricSR3Rev1.1.1.13.docx Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Social Responsibility 3 Rubric: Awareness - 87.27% met criterion (N=2827); Impact - 86.44% (N=2803); and Action - 83.00% met criterion (N=2764). For further information, see 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf under Related Documents. (08/14/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2017-2018 General Education Results from Canvas.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to review the assessment assignment for clarity as well as alignment with rubric used to evaluation the assignment. In addition, this outcome has been selected for sampling during the Spring 2019 semester. To do this, a sample of general education assessments will be evaluated by a General Education Task Force. During this process, the Task force is provided the rubric for evaluation, discusses each item on the rubric to improve inter-rater reliability, evaluates the student work, and provides recommendations for improvement. Student work is evaluated once by the instructor of the student sample. If the first evaluation by the Task Force rater does not agree with instructor</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>evaluation, the sample is evaluated one more time. At the same time, the Task Force may provide suggestions to improve the assignment and/or improve student learning/performance. (10/02/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: The committee made a Canvas shell course available for faculty to utilize that provides various resources and content for SR-3. Convocation sessions were also presented in both fall and spring semesters discussing results to faculty. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p>Survey - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment of Services Survey (administered every year) has a question that asks students to rate their agreement (5-point Likert scale) on a statement about their ability to perform a specific College Student Learning Outcome.</p> <p>Criterion: At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to engage in regional, national, and global communities (Social Responsibility 3). Further, at least 60% of students in each subgroup (dual credit, traditional, and non-traditional students) will strongly agree or agree that they are able to engage in regional, national, and global communities (Social Responsibility 3).</p>	<p>Results Year: 2017-2018</p> <p>Result Type: Criterion Not Met</p> <p>54.00% of student survey respondents (N=837) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to engage in regional, national, and global communities (SR-3). For the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to engage in regional, national, and global communities (SR-3): dual credit - 50.00% (N=434); traditional - 60.20% (N=196); and non-traditional - 68.75% (N=32). For further information, see SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf under Related Documents. (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf SAS - Spring 2018 - Overall Results Table.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf SR 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</p>	<p>Use of Results: The criterion was not met. It is important to note that students were also asked which College Student Learning Outcome do you believe you need to improve the most. Overall, 18.68% (N=744) indicated that they believed that the needed to improve this outcome the most. In fact, this is THE outcome that students believed that they needed to improve on the most. When faculty (who teach general education courses) were asked about this outcome, 67.57% (N=37) indicated that their students engage in regional, national, and global communities; 8.33% (N=36) indicated that they believed that their students needed to improve the most on this College Student Learning Outcome. This outcome has been selected for further analysis and development. Professional</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
			<p>development is scheduled for the Fall 2018 semester, and evaluation by sample selection is scheduled for the Spring 2019 semester. For further information, see SAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf and CWAS - General Education Results - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents (05/24/2018)</p> <p>Follow-Up: During the 2018-2019 academic year, this outcome was monitored. Student perceptions did improve slightly: 57.80% of student survey respondents (N=526) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to engage in regional, national, and global communities (SR-3). This outcome was sampled during the 2018-2019 academic year. 82.95% of the students (N=88) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. This indicates that there is a disconnect between what students perceive and actual performance regarding this outcome. For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf, and SR 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf under Related</p>