

# 2018-2019 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><b>Written Communication - CS1 -</b> Students will develop, interpret, and express ideas through written communication.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> CS1 -Written Communication</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment -</b> An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for written communication using the CS1 rubric.</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criteria was met. Qualified students (N=12,207) scored as follows on the sections of the CS1 rubric: Organization - 89.06%; Development - 84.22%; Language Skills - 87.82%; and Format - 82.88%. For further information see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The Committee will update the current CS1, CS2, and CS3 college student learning outcomes as well as the college rubrics for CS1, CS2, and CS3 from three separate CSLO's to one in order to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. Further, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that further oversight and</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">WrittenCommunicationRubricCS1Rev1.11.13.docx</a></p> <p><a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>		<p>feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 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 2020 semester. The assessment for written communication should be based on an individual writing assignment as opposed to a group writing assignment. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p><b>General Education Assessment - A</b> 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 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><b>Criterion:</b> At least 70% of the students from the sample achieved or exceeded the objective (scored a</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>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 more information, see CS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2018.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">CS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that further oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 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 2020 semester. The assessment for written communication should be based</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
	2 or 3) based on the performance indicator defined on the Written Communication rubric.		<p>on an individual writing assignment as opposed to a group writing assignment. Specifically, the Task Force had the following recommendations:</p> <p>*Botany – the assignment used for the written communication college student learning outcome should align more closely with the approved rubric. There was no continuity between the writing assignment and the writing sample. Students (and the task force) should be provided a document that clearly indicates the assignment. From evaluation of the samples, there appeared to be no required format and missing information/requirements as outlined by the approved college rubric. Therefore, the assessment tool for this course needs to be re-evaluated and re-submitted to the general education committee for approval in the Fall 2019 semester with full implementation and re-evaluation in the Spring 2020 semester.</p> <p>* Biology – it appears that some professors may not be following the same guidelines for the general education assignment. The task force suggests that all professors teaching these biology courses be reminded of the guidelines. However, the task force notes that the majority of the samples were consistent. The task force recommends that the</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
			<p>biology department return to its normal sample cycle.</p> <p>* Chemistry – the writing section was a small portion of the overall assignment. The task force notes that the labs tend to be more about critical thinking than writing. The task force suggests that the department consider a longer assignment or replacing the written communication outcome to another college student learning outcome.</p> <p>*Overall Recommendations – the more that the assignment aligns with the approved college rubric the easier it is to evaluate the objectives of the college student learning outcome. While it is acceptable to add clarity to the rubric, the rubric's original wording should not be omitted. Short assignments are hard to evaluate so it is suggested that submissions be a minimum of five paragraphs. Mandatory training for faculty and department chairs needs to be provided at the beginning of the semester. (08/27/2019)</p>
<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019  <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met            72.62% of student survey respondents (N=526) 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 - 75.00% (N=4);</p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 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>traditional - 70.83% (N=192); and non-traditional - 74.18% (N=306). 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><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p>competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked CS 1 as 5th (5 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked CS 1 as 1st (1 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). (08/27/2019)</p>
<p><b>Oral Communication - CS2</b> - Students will develop, interpret, and express ideas through oral communication.  <b>Outcome Type:</b> CS2 - Oral Communication  <b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for oral communication using the Oral Communication rubric.  <b>Criterion:</b> Each objective/criteria on the Oral 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><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.  <b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">OralCommunicationRubricCS2Rev1.1.1.13.docx</a>  <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019  <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met  The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Oral Communication Rubric: Develop Support - 90.92% met criterion (N=2489) and Express Ideas - 93.43% met criterion (N=2488). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08.09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The Committee will ask for examples from departments where improvements within these outcomes are addressed and discussed. The Committee will update the current college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for EQS 2 to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. To 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 the assessment purposes for clarity. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p><b>Survey</b> - The General Education Section of the Student Assessment</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019  <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>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><b>Criterion:</b> 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>72.81% 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 - 50.00% (N=4); traditional - 69.27% (N=192); and non-traditional - 76.15% (N=306). 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><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p>notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked CS 2 as 3rd (3 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked CS 2 as 4th (4 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). This outcome is scheduled for further sampling in the 2020-2021 academic year. (08/27/2019)</p>
<p><b>Visual Communication - CS3 -</b> Students will develop, interpret, and express ideas through visual communication.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> CS3 - Visual Communication</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment -</b> An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for visual communication using the Visual Communication rubric.</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Visual Communication Rubric: Develop Support - 86.53% met criterion (N=2928) and Express Ideas - 86.92% met criterion (N=2922). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The committee notes that the criteria was met. The committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The committee will update the current CS 1, 2, and 3 college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for CS 1, 2, and 3 from three separate CSLO's to one in order to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. (11/20/2019)</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">VisualCommunicationRubricCS3Rev1.11.13.docx</a></p> <p><a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>		
	<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>73.19% of student survey respondents (N=526) 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 - 50.00% (N=4); traditional - 72.92% (N=192); and non-traditional - 74.51% (N=306). 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><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked CS 3 as 9th (9 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked CS 3 as 10th (10 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). This outcome is scheduled for sampling in the 2021-2022 academic year. (08/27/2019)</p>
<p><b>Critical Thinking - CT1</b> - Students will generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> CT1 - Critical Thinking 1</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> Each objective/criteria on the Critical Thinking 1 rubric will be achieved or exceeded, based on the performance indicators defined on</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Critical Thinking 1 Rubric: Position - 87.57% met criterion (N=11,294); Explanation - 84.86% met criterion (N=11,304); Evidence - 82.69% met criterion (N=11,310); and Conclusion - 85.88% met criterion (N=11,291). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.</p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> 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 through</p>



Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>the rubric, by at least 70% of the qualified students assessed.</p> <p><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CriticalThinkingRubricCT1Rev1.11.13.docx</a>  <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>	<p>pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>the sampling process. The Committee has also received the following recommendations proposed by faculty in fall 2019 in order to improve student learning for this outcome. First, many faculty members emphasized the need for relaying the importance of Evidence as part of CT-1. Part of this outcome includes proper citation methods. Second, it is noted that CT-1 could be improved by more opportunities to practice these skills. Opportunities could come in the following forms: discussions, student participation in problem-solving thinking, a model assignment provided by faculty, and review of previously submitted assignments to enhance student success. Third, faculty members noted that CT-1 requires time to develop. The Committee will update the current CT 1-3 college student learning outcomes as well as the college rubric for CT 1-3 from three separate CSLO's to two in order to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. The Committee will communicate the suggestions to improve student learning to department chairs. In addition, this outcome has been selected for sampling during the spring and fall 2020 semesters. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p><b>General Education Assessment - A</b>  sample of general education assessments evaluated by a General</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019  <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met  The criterion was met. 76.04% of the students (N=96)</p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force</p>



Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p>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><b>Criterion:</b> 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 1 rubric (average of items 1-4).</p>	<p>achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For further information, see CT 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CT 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>believes that further oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments as well as rubric continuity) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 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 2020 semester. The Committee recommended that Communication courses resubmit their samples in Spring 2020. The Committee also noted that several courses did not submit any samples: Economics, Geography, History, and Government. These courses will be sampled and evaluated in the Fall 2019 semester. (08/27/2019)</p>
	<p><b>Survey -</b> 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019  <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met  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 the subgroups, the following percentage of student survey respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to generate and communicate ideas by combining, changing, or reapplying existing information (CT-1): dual credit - 75.00% (N=4); traditional - 70.83% (N=192); and non-traditional - 73.21% (N=306). (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked CT 1 as 1st (1</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	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).	<a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a>	out 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked CT 1 as 9th (9 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). Student performance on CT was further investigated through sampling during the 2018-2019 academic year. Based on the sample collected, additional sampling in Communications, Economics, Geography, History, and Government will occur during the 2019-2020 academic year. (08/27/2019)
<b>Critical Thinking - CT2</b> - Students will gather and assess information relevant to a question. <b>Outcome Type:</b> CT2 - Critical Thinking 2 <b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014	<b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for critical thinking using the Critical Thinking 2-3 rubric. <b>Criterion:</b> 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. <b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment. <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">CriticalThinkingRubricCT2-3Rev1.11.13.docx</a> <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a>	<b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019 <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Not Met The criterion was not met. Students scored 64.16% (N=6577) on the Evidence section of the Critical Thinking 2-3 Rubric. For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019) <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a>	<b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes mixed results in the meeting of the four criteria in CT 2-3. Data shows that students are Meeting Criterion in Evaluation and Synthesis, and scored much better in Evidence and Analysis, compared to the previous two years. For 2018-19, Analysis is only 3.57% below "Meets," and Evidence score is only 5.84% below "Meets." CT 2-3-1 (Evidence) has a 2018-2019 result of 64.16%, which is a Criterion Not Met, but it is an improvement from 61.07% in 2017-18, and 48.01% in 2016-17. That shows considerable progress in three years. We believe faculty are using data from prior years to provide more focused teaching of outcomes and to create

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p><b>General Education Assessment - A</b> 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>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><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CT 2 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>assignments which can be assessed more accurately. The Committee will seek advice from department chairs on how to improve student learning for CT 2-3-1 in their areas. Departments whose students did Meet Criteria can be polled to find what methods could be shared with colleagues in departments whose students still need to improve. The CT2 rubric will be updated to improve clarity, by combining CT-3 into CT-2.  (11/20/2019)</p> <p><b>Use of Results:</b> Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that further oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 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 2020 semester. The assessment for critical thinking – 2 should be based on an individual assignment as opposed to a group assignment. Specifically, the Task Force had the following recommendations:</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
			<p>*Botany – the assignment used for the critical thinking – 2 college student learning outcome should align more closely with the approved rubric. In addition, every student should be assessed on each section of the approved rubric. The assignment does not fit this requirement. Student work was hand-written and difficult to evaluate. Therefore, the assessment tool for this course needs to be re-evaluated and re-submitted to the general education committee for approval in the Fall 2019 semester with full implementation and re-evaluation in the Spring 2020 semester.</p> <p>Overall Recommendations – the more that the assignment aligns with the approved college rubric the easier it is to evaluate the objectives of the college student learning outcome. While it is acceptable to add clarity to the rubric, the rubric’s original wording should not be omitted. Mandatory training for faculty and department chairs needs to be provided at the beginning of the semester. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The Director for Institutional Effectiveness communicated with the Department Chair for Biology regarding the issue with Botany. The Department Chair for Biology called a meeting of all instructors of Botany. After much discussion, it was decided that the</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>77.18% of student survey respondents (N=526) strongly agreed or agreed that they are able to gather and assess information relevant to a question (CT-2). For the 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 - 75.00% (N=4); traditional - 74.48% (N=192); and non-traditional - 79.74% (N=306). 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><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">CT 2 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>assignment was not the issue but rather that the assignment that is used to evaluate CT 2 must be done individually. The laboratory report(s) that would be completed individually were selected--these labs must be completed after mid-term. Botany will test the individual report in the Fall 2019 semester and submit the samples selected in the Spring 2020 semester. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked CT 2 as 8th (8 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked CT 2 as 8th (8 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). This outcome was also selected for additional sampling in the 2018-2019 academic year. The results were positive. The criterion was met. 92.55% of the students (N=94) achieved or exceeded objective (scored a 2 or 3) based on the</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
<p><b>Critical Thinking - CT3</b> - Students will analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> CT3 - Critical Thinking 3</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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 qualified students assessed.</p> <p><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CriticalThinkingRubricCT2-3Rev1.11.13.docx</a>  <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Not Met</p> <p>The criterion was not met. Students scored as follows on the Critical Thinking 2-3 Rubric: Analysis - 66.43% met criterion (N=6274); Evaluation - 71.18% met criterion (N=5998); and Synthesis - 74.46% met criterion (N=5386). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>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><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was not met. The Committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The Committee will ask for examples from departments where improvements within these outcomes are addressed and discussed. The Committee will update the current CT1, CT2, and CT3 college student learning outcomes as well as the college rubrics for CT1, CT2, and CT3 from three separate CSLO's to two in order to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. Further, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that further oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 semester so that assessment tools can be developed and/or refined, execution of assessments can be</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			planned, and collection of a sample may take place in the Spring 2020 semester. The assessment for critical thinking - 3 should be based on an individual assignment as opposed to a group assignment. (11/20/2019)
	<p><b>General Education Assessment - A</b> 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. 82.98% of the students (N=94) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For further information, see CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that further oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 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 2020 semester. The assessment for critical thinking – 2 should be based on an individual assignment as opposed to a group assignment. Specifically, the Task Force had the following recommendations:</p> <p>* Botany – the assignment used for the critical thinking – 3 college student learning outcome should align more closely with the approved rubric. In addition, every student should be assessed on each section of the approved rubric. The assignment does not</p>



<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
			<p>fit this requirement. Student work was hand-written and difficult to evaluate. Also, it appeared that students had no clear understanding between “analysis” and “evaluation” as required by the assignment and rubric. Further, there was no clear place for evidence to be provided. Therefore, the assessment tool for this course needs to be re-evaluated and re-submitted to the general education committee for approval in the Fall 2019 semester with full implementation and re-evaluation in the Spring 2020 semester.</p> <p>Overall Recommendations – the more that the assignment aligns with the approved college rubric the easier it is to evaluate the objectives of the college student learning outcome. While it is acceptable to add clarity to the rubric, the rubric’s original wording should not be omitted. Mandatory training for faculty and department chairs needs to be provided at the beginning of the semester. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Follow-Up:</b> The Director for Institutional Effectiveness communicated with the Department Chair for Biology regarding the issue with Botany. The Department Chair for Biology called a meeting of all instructors of Botany. After much discussion, it was decided that the assignment was not the issue but</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>76.04% of student survey respondents (N=526) 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 - 75.00% (N=4); traditional - 72.40% (N=192); and non-traditional - 78.43% (N=306). 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><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>rather that the assignment that is used to evaluate CT 2 must be done individually. The laboratory report(s) that would be completed individually were selected--these labs must be completed after mid-term. Botany will test the individual report in the Fall 2019 semester and submit the samples selected in the Spring 2020 semester. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked CT 3 as 10th (10 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked CT 3 as 2nd (2 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). Additional sampling on this outcome was completed during the Spring 2019 semester. Thus, students may have been more familiar with this outcome. Sampling results were positive. The criterion was met. 82.98% of the students (N=94) achieved or exceeded objective</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
<p><b>Empirical and Quantitative Skills - EQS1</b> - Students will manipulate and analyze numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> EQS1 - Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">EmpiricalAndQuantitativeRubricEQS1Rev1.11.13.docx</a></p> <p><a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Numerical Data Rubric: Manipulate - 84.21% met criterion (N=1793); Analyze - 76.82% met criterion (N=1430); and Conclusion - 82.70% met criterion (N=1792). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For further information about sampling results, see CT 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The Committee will update the current EQS 1 &amp; EQS 2 college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for EQS 1 &amp; EQS 2 from two separate CSLO's to one in order to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p><b>General Education Assessment</b> - 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</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. 81.69% of the students (N=71) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For further information, see EQS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">EQS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that further oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments as well as rubric continuity) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
	<p>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><b>Criterion:</b> 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 Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1 rubric (average of items 1-3).</p>	<p><a href="#">pdf</a></p>	<p>development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 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 2020 semester. Specifically, the Task Force had the following recommendations:</p> <p>* Mathematics – electronically submitted assignments did not allow the task force to see instructor feedback. The task force needs to see these comments and the grading rationale so that the work can be fairly evaluated. The task force questioned how to distinguish between a 2 or 3 on the rubric for the assignment—clarity needs to be added. Some submissions had only the student work but the actual assignment (problems) were missing. Faculty need to utilize the original rubrics rather than creating their own rubric—while clarification may be added, the original rubric language needs to be retained. The task force recommends that the mathematics sample be collected and re-evaluation in the Spring 2020 semester.</p> <p>* Economics – the Government and Economics Department did</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>not submit any samples for review—specifically for ECON 2301. Therefore, the task force recommends that the Department collect samples in the Fall 2019 semester and submit them for evaluation in December 2019.</p> <p>Overall Recommendations – the more that the assignment aligns with the approved college rubric the easier it is to evaluate the objectives of the college student learning outcome. While it is acceptable to add clarity to the rubric, the rubric’s original wording should not be omitted. Mandatory training for faculty and department chairs needs to be provided at the beginning of the semester. (08/27/2019)</p>
	<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Not Met</p> <p>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). 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 - 25.00% (N=4); traditional - 64.06% (N=192); and non-traditional - 65.03% (N=306). 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><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked EQS 1 as 4th (4 out 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked EQS 1 as 5TH (5</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	numerical data and arrive at an informed conclusion (Empirical and Quantitative Skills 1).	<a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">EQS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a>	out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). 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 on the sampling, see EQS 1 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)
<b>Empirical and Quantitative Skills - EQS2</b> - Students will manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion. <b>Outcome Type:</b> EQS2 - Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2 <b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014	<b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - 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 2 rubric. <b>Criterion:</b> 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. <b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment. <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">EmpiricalAndQuantitativeRubricEQS</a>	<b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019 <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Not Met The criterion was not met. Students scored as follows on the Empirical and Quantitative Skills Rubric: Manipulate - 61.86% met criterion (N=5502); Analyze - 84.59% met criterion (N=10,251); and Conclusion - 81.55% met criterion (N=10,155). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019) <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a>	<b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was not met. The Committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The Committee will ask for examples from departments where improvements within these outcomes are addressed and discussed. The Committee will update the current college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for EQS 2 to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. (11/20/2019)

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<a href="#">2Rev1.11.13.docx</a> <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a>		
	<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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 able to manipulate and analyze observable facts and arrive at an informed conclusion (Empirical and Quantitative Skills 2).</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>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). 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 - 50.00% (N=4); traditional - 69.27% (N=192); and non-traditional - 72.23% (N=306). 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> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked EQS 2 as 11th (11 out 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked EQS 2 as 7th (7 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). This outcome will undergo further sampling in the 2019-2020 academic year. (08/28/2019)</p>
<p><b>Teamwork - TW1 &amp; TW2</b> - Students will integrate different viewpoints as a member of a team, and work with others to support and accomplish a shared goal.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> TW1 &amp; TW2 - Teamwork 1 and 2</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for teamwork using the Teamwork 1 and 2 rubric.</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Description of Process or Purpose of</b></p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Teamwork 2 and 3 Rubric: Team Interaction - 92.90% met criterion (N=5103); Individual - 92.91% met criterion (N=5101); and Purpose/Goal - 92.55% met criterion (N=5100). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The Committee will update the current TW 1 &amp; 2 college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for TW 1 &amp; 2 from</p>



Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p><b>Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">TeamworkRubric1-2Rev1.11.13.docx</a>  <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>		<p>two separate CSLO's to one in order to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to integrate different viewpoints as a member of a team (Teamwork 1) and work with others to support and accomplish a shared goal (Teamwork 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 integrate different viewpoints as a member of a team (Teamwork 1) and work with others to support and accomplish a shared goal (Teamwork 2).</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019  <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>Teamwork 1: 70.72% of student survey respondents (N=526) 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 - 75.00% (N=4); traditional - 70.83% (N=192); and non-traditional - 71.57% (N=306).</p> <p>Teamwork 2: 72.62% of student survey respondents (N=526) 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=4); traditional - 70.84% (N=192); and non-traditional - 75.16% (N=306).</p> <p>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> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked TW 1 as 7th (7 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement) and TW 2 as 12th. When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked TW 1 as 12th (12 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement) and TW 2 as 13th. (08/28/2019)</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
<p><b>Personal Responsibility - PR1 -</b> Students will evaluate choices and actions, and relate consequences to decision making.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> PR1 - Personal Responsibility</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment -</b> 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">PersonalResponsibilityRubricPR1Rev 1.11.13.docx</a>  <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Personal Responsibility Rubric: Identification - 87.41% met criterion (N=10,472); Connection - 84.15% met criterion (N=10,489); and Response - 86.26% met criterion (N=5058). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The committee notes that the criterion for Personal Responsibility was met and results improved in all areas. The Committee will send survey results to department chairs to help aid in student clarification and enhance student success in these areas. The Committee will update the PR College Learning outcome to better reflect THECB definition of Personal Responsibility. (Current PR 1. Evaluate choices and actions, and relate consequences to decision making. Proposed Personal Responsibility PR: Students evaluate choices and actions as well as relate consequences to decision-making.) Faculty input recommends the assessment of this outcome should include more real-world scenarios that involve personal responsibility. The Fall Convocation session survey results suggest faculty should spend more time with students on the PR rubric. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p><b>Survey -</b> 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><b>Criterion:</b> At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to evaluate choices and actions, and relate</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>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). 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 - 50.00% (N=4); traditional - 73.44% (N=192); and non-traditional - 77.12% (N=306). For further information, see 2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf, 2018-2019 SAS -</p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	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 making (Personal Responsibility 1).	Traditional - General Education.pdf and 2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf under Related Documents. (08/28/2019)  <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a> <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a>	improve the most, student responses ranked PR 1 as 6th (6 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked PR 1 as 3rd (3 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). (08/28/2019)
<b>Social Responsibility - SR1</b> - 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 article. <b>Outcome Type:</b> SR1 - Social Responsibility 1 <b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014	<b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for social responsibility using the Social Responsibility 1 rubric. <b>Criterion:</b> Each objective/criteria on 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.  <b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment. <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">SocialResponsibilityRubricSR1Rev1.1.13.docx</a> <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a>	<b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019 <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Social Responsibility 1 Rubric: Recognize - 89.17% met criterion (N=1594) and Describe Effects - 89.16% met criterion (N=1592). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)  <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a>	<b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee will advise departments that teach these courses to continue to emphasize the cultural impact of diversity and how it influences and enriches our society. The Committee will update the current college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for SR1 to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. (11/20/2019)
	<b>Survey</b> - 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-	<b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019 <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met 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	<b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the

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><b>Criterion:</b> 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 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>	<p>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 - 50.00% (N=4); traditional - 69.79% (N=192); and non-traditional - 75.17% (N=306). 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> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p>Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked SR 1 as 13th (13 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked SR 1 as 8th (8 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). (08/28/2019)</p>
<p><b>Social Responsibility - SR2</b> - Students will identify civic responsibility.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> SR2 - Social Responsibility 2</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - An exam, paper, project or other assignment which is integral to the course, scored for social responsibility using the Social Responsibility 2 rubric.</p> <p><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Social Responsibility 2 Rubric: Comprehend - 83.17% met criterion (N=2035); Reflect - 85.24% met criterion (N=2032) and Communicate - 87.41% met criterion (N=2029). For further information, see Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the criterion was met. The Committee recommends faculty continue to identify ways to renew and strengthen the commitment of students to civic life across the campus through service activities. The Committee will update the current college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for SR-2 to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. (11/20/2019)</p>
<b>Description of Process or Purpose of</b>			

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p><b>Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">SocialResponsibilityRubricSR2Rev1.1.13.docx</a>  <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> At least 70% of students overall will strongly agree or agree that they are able to identify civic responsibility (Social Responsibility 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 identify civic responsibility (Social Responsibility 2).</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>73.57% of student survey respondents (N=526) 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 - 50.00% (N=4); traditional - 69.27% (N=192); and non-traditional - 77.45% (N=306). 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> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a>  <a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked SR 2 as 14th (14 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked SR 2 as 14th (14 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). This outcome is scheduled for sampling in the 2021-2022 academic year. (08/28/2019)</p>
<p><b>Social Responsibility - SR3</b> - Students will engage in regional, national, and global communities.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> SR3 - Social Responsibility 3</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 09/01/2014</p>	<p><b>Course Embedded Assessment</b> - 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><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p>The criterion was met. Students scored as follows on the Social Responsibility 3 Rubric: Awareness - 96.16% met criterion (N=1291); Impact - 95.66% (N=1298); and Action - 92.16% met criterion (N=1278). For further information, see</p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The committee notes that the criteria was met. The committee will send 2019 survey responses to the department chairs to help aid in</p>

Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
	<p><b>Criterion:</b> 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><b>Description of Process or Purpose of Assessment:</b> Qualified students are those who have earned at least 20 semester hours credit prior to taking the assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">SocialResponsibilityRubricSR3Rev1.1.1.13.docx</a>  <a href="#">Correlation Chart Core Obj. Found Comp Areas.pdf</a></p>	<p>Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/27/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Gen Ed 2018-2019 Template - With Data - 08-09-2019.pdf</a></p>	<p>student clarification and enhance student success in those areas. The committee will update the current SR 1, 2, and 3 college student learning outcome as well as the college rubric for SR 1, 2, and 3 from three separate CSLO's to one in order to help aid in clarity of student performance indicators. (11/20/2019)</p>
	<p><b>General Education Assessment - A</b> 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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 Social Responsibility 3 rubric (average of items 1-3).</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019  <b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Met  The criterion was met. 82.95% of the students (N=88) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. For further information, see SR 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf under Related Documents. (08/28/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">SR 3 - General Education Sample Collection - Spring 2019.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> Although the criterion was met, the General Education Evaluation Task Force believes that further oversight and feedback (in terms of development and execution of assessments as well as rubric continuity) is needed for certain items. To facilitate the development and execution of these assessments, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will meet with the identified areas during the Fall 2019 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 2020 semester. Specifically, the Task Force had the following recommendations:</p>



<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
			<p>*Psychology and Sociology – the rating on the rubric items by the department was much higher than that of the task force (usually by at least 1 point). The task force suggests that samples of what each rating should look like be determined and provided to all professors in the department. Training on using the rubric is important. The assignment needs to more closely align to what the college student learning outcome and rubric are measuring. Also, better directions to students about the college student learning outcomes should be provided to the students. Lack of clarity in writing caused some difficulty in scoring for this outcome. The assignment for PSYC 2301 could be more explicit in asking the student to discuss community involvement. The Department should be commended for streamlining the evaluation process—it greatly helped the evaluators. The task force recommends that this area remain on its normal evaluation cycle.</p> <p>* Communication – the task force recommends that this assignment be reviewed and refined. The Department should submit samples for evaluation again in Spring 2020.</p> <p>* Education – the task force recommends that this area remain on its normal evaluation cycle.</p>



Outcomes	Assessment Methods	Results and Analysis	Use of Results
			<p>The following courses did not submit samples and are required to complete a Fall 2019 sample submission: Economics, Geography, and History.</p> <p>Overall Recommendations – the more that the assignment aligns with the approved college rubric the easier it is to evaluate the objectives of the college student learning outcome. Departments that did not submit samples should be required to have mandatory training for the department chairs and all faculty (full-time and adjunct) specific to their areas. In addition, departments that did not submit samples should submit samples in December 2019 for evaluation. Mandatory training for faculty and department chairs needs to be provided at the beginning of the semester. (08/28/2019)</p>
	<p><b>Survey</b> - 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><b>Criterion:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Results Year:</b> 2018-2019</p> <p><b>Result Type:</b> Criterion Not Met</p> <p>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). 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=4); traditional - 57.29% (N=192); and non-traditional - 59.15% (N=306). 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</p>	<p><b>Use of Results:</b> The Committee notes that the number of respondents for dual credit is low. During the Fall 2019 semester, the Committee will administer a survey to just dual credit students regarding dual credit students' perceptions about their abilities to complete general education competencies. When students were asked which outcome they believed that they needed to improve the most, student responses ranked SR 3 as 2nd (2</p>

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results and Analysis</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
	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>Documents. (08/28/2019)</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Dual Credit - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Non-traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS - Traditional - General Education.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="#">2018-2019 SAS General Education.pdf</a></p>	<p>out 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). When faculty were asked which outcome they believed that their students needed to improve the most, responses ranked SR 3 as 6th (6 out of 14 with 1 being needs the most improvement). This outcome was evaluated by sampling. 82.95% of the students (N=88) achieved or exceeded objective based on the performance indicator defined on the rubric. There appears to be a disconnect between student perceptions of their ability to successfully accomplish this outcome versus their actual ability to accomplish the outcome when evaluated. This outcome will continue to be monitored for this discrepancy during the 2019-2020 academic year. (08/28/2019)</p>