

Department: Communications

General Learning Outcomes Assessment

Learning Outcomes: Communications, Information Literacy and Critical Thinking

Course	Assessment Measure	Learning Outcomes: Communications, Information Literacy and Critical Thinking
<p>ENC1101 Freshman Composition I</p>	<p>Essay assignments and class discussions will document the writing, critical-thinking, and research fundamentals learned</p> <p>Completion of the Library Orientation training</p> <p>Written communication. --Reading comprehension. --Essay formation. --Language skills.</p> <p>Critical thinking. --Assessment of a subject. --Analysis. --Comparative identification</p> <p>Information literacy. --Research skills. --Research quality. --Research evidence in the correct form.</p> <p>Technology literacy. --Technology use for production. --Technology comprehension.</p> <p>Performance Standard: Students</p>	<p><u>2010-2011</u> <u>Results</u> Grammar conventions are an area of strength. Evidence usage is an area of weakness</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Revised Research Paper Adapted data collection process to increase sampling frame Revised standardized essay assignment to generate a more uniform essay to apply rubric to (anticipated increase in evidence usage due to this change).-</p> <p><u>2011-2012</u> <u>Results:</u> Overall Average Score 2.11 Average Score in Concept Development: 2.02</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Increase performance standard to 3.0 overall and in each category Revise Scoring Rubric Increase participation among all department faculty, including adjunct and dual enrollment faculty Revise sampling distribution Revise and standardize tool valuation</p>

	<p>will demonstrate adequate evidence of skill development by scoring at least a 2 overall on a scale from 1 - 4</p>	
<p>SPC 2608 Public Speaking</p>	<p>Students will perform a series of speeches which will be graded by rubrics.</p> <p>Students must score at least 508 points out of 725 points-cumulative (70%)</p> <p>Student performance will be rated in the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-Critiques of performance strengths and weaknesses • Colleague Critiques • Research topics, cite sources, and provide bibliography • Incorporate the use of technology in speech delivery • Complete the library orientation at the beginning of the class • Class exams 	<p><u>Results:</u> 2009-2010 – 85% of students scored at least 70% cumulative rating. 2010-2011 – 96% of students scored at least 70% cumulative rating 2011-2012 – 88% of students scored at least 70% cumulative rating 2012-2013 – 87 % of students scored at least 70% cumulative rating 2013-2014 – 80 % of students scored at least 70% cumulative rating</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Teaching strategies are reviewed at the end of each term by faculty to determine ways student learning can be improved or strengthened.</p> <p>The assessment tool for hybrid courses was revised to include the use of webcams and add at least two mandatory face to face speeches.</p> <p>Strategies to reduce anxiety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are instructed to read the text book before beginning their first speech. • The required speeches start with a 2 minute time limit and builds to a 5 minute time limit • Students must submit an Outline 24 hours before their scheduled speech.

Department: Social Science

General Learning Outcomes Assessment

Learning Outcomes: Critical Thinking and Information Literacy

Courses	Assessment Measure/Standard	Critical Thinking and Information Literacy
<p>AMH 2010 American History:</p> <p>AHM2020 US History from 1865</p> <p>PSY 2012 General Psychology I</p> <p>DEP 2001 Child Development</p> <p>ECO 2013 Macroeconomics</p> <p>ECO 2023 Microeconomics</p>	<p>Document Comparison: Students will demonstrate the ability to understand and to analyze opposing sides of documents being compared. Students will score at least 18 on a scale of 25 on the grading rubrics</p> <p>Students reference primary sources and write a paper analyzing opposing documents. Required to cite sources and provide a bibliography.</p> <p>Group discussion analyzing two sides of an issue, group consensus, explanation of group consensus.</p> <p>Discussion Board Exercises demonstrating the use of research skills, analysis, and application of information.</p>	<p><u>2011-2012</u> <u>Results</u> Out of 39 assignments, 39 (100%) achieved at least a satisfactory grade. GRADE BREAKDOWN: 5 scored @ 18-19; 16 scored @ 20-22; and 18 scored @ 23-25.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Revise assessment tool to include longer documents and revise the grading requirements with emphasis on grammar/spelling and citation format.</p> <p><u>2013-2014</u> <u>Results:</u> Average over all courses: 84% of students scored at least 70% on the assignments.</p> <p>Students demonstrated the ability to understand and to critically analyze opposing sides of documents being compared. Students demonstrated the ability to research topics, reference primary sources, and correctly cite sources and provide a bibliography.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Revise and expand assignments to make focus clearer and help students be better prepared. The topics will be reviewed and expanded to present more of a challenge.</p>

Department: Humanities

**General Learning Outcomes Assessment
Learning Outcomes: Cultural Awareness and Critical Thinking**

Course	Assessment Measure	Cultural Awareness and Critical Thinking
<p>HUM2020 Introduction to Humanities</p> <p>HUM2551 Philosophy and Religion</p> <p>PHI2010 Introduction to Philosophy</p>	<p>Rubric is used as chief measurement tool coupled with content specific post-final test or embedded final exam questions</p> <p>Writing assessment focusing on reflection.</p> <p>Students will achieve at least a 65% (score 13 out of 20) on assignment in the area of reflection.</p>	<p>2010-2011 Results: Basic Awareness of culture: a) Post-test scores within 90% of courses averaged 78% or better. Fall 08 to Fall 2010: post-tests result of 85% or higher</p> <p>2) Awareness of compare/contrast of Cultures: embedded final exam questions 88% or higher of students achieved an extrapolated score of 16 or higher</p> <p>3) Tolerance: 90% and higher of students achieved an extrapolated score of 8</p> <p>Use of Results: There was a discrepancy between instructors greater than 15% in students' achievement of learning outcomes. Instructors were mentored to improve students' achievement of the learning outcomes. The department will review and discuss revising the assessment measures to make the assessment more meaningful.</p> <p>2012-2013 Results: 95% of HUM students achieved learning outcomes of 80 or higher for each specific learning outcome. Embedded questions on final exam were used and correlated to ABC rates for each course to determine data points and percentages.</p> <p>Use of Results: All expectations were achieved, but for a small cohort or 5% of students. This 5% cohort was isolated to a specific course within the HUM tier, and also specific to one teacher, who is no longer teaching this HUM course. Results will be reported to faculty involved, and specific teachers monitored, especially new adjuncts, to make sure their final exams have requisite embedded questions as to learning outcomes</p> <p>2013-2014 Results: Learning Outcomes 1, 2 and 3: 92% of HUM students achieved learning outcomes of 80 or higher for each specific learning</p>

	<p>outcome. Embedded questions on final exam were used and correlated to ABC rates for each course to determine data points and percentages.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> All expectations were achieved, but learning outcomes for REL did not meet the norm or expectations, given the low success rates on final exam, with embedded questions. Solutions being considered include offering classes to a new adjunct and compare the results in subsequent semesters.</p> <p>Also: for the next cycle, some consideration is being discussed to return to the pre-test versus post-test model that we use in the very beginning of the evaluation process years ago.</p> <p><u>Critical Thinking: Results:</u> Average score was 67%.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Revised assessment tool and criteria. New Assessment: Embedded objective questions on final plus capstone final measured in terms of PAC. Students will score at least 66 on objective questions which measure critical thinking and 70 percent of students will be able to construct a PAC formatted essay.</p> <p><u>2013-2014</u></p> <p><u>Cultural Awareness Results:</u> 92% of HUM students achieved learning outcomes of 80 or higher for each specific learning outcome. Embedded questions on final exam were used and correlated to ABC rates for each course to determine data points and percentages.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> All expectations were achieved, but learning outcomes for REL did not meet the norm or expectations, given the low success rates on final exam, with embedded questions. Solutions being considered include offering classes to a new adjunct and compare the results in subsequent</p>
--	---

		<p>semesters. Also: for the next cycle, some consideration is being discussed to return to the pre-test versus post-test model that we use in the very beginning of the evaluation process years ago.</p> <p><u>Critical Thinking Results:</u> Average score of 71%.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Though we are pleased with the progress or learning shown, consideration is being given to pre-test and post-test measurement tool in the next cycle.</p>
--	--	--

Department: Mathematics

**General Learning Outcomes Assessment
Learning Outcomes: Quantitative Reasoning and Critical Thinking**

Courses	Assessment Measure	Learning Outcomes: Quantitative Reasoning and Critical Thinking
<p>MAC 1105 College Algebra</p> <p>MGF1106 Mathematics for Liberal Arts</p> <p>STA2023 Elementary Statistics</p>	<p>Departmental Final Exam</p> <p>80% of students will score at least 75% on the final exam.</p> <p>At least 75% of students will demonstrate success on each critical thinking question.</p> <p>Percentage of overall correct responses is greater than 75%.</p>	<p><u>2010-2011</u> <u>Results:</u> Student scores did not meet the identified performance criteria. Analysis of this information indicates that the curriculum and final exam need to be revised.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Curriculum changes Revision to departmental final. Faculty professional development on promoting classroom discourse and use of the TI Navigators will be offered through 2012</p> <p><u>2011-2012</u> <u>Results:</u> Student scores did not meet the identified performance criteria. Analysis of this information indicates that the curriculum and final exam need to be revised.</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Curriculum Changes were implemented Spring 2013. The department was re-organized in Fall, 2013</p> <p><u>MGF 1106:</u> Certain scores did not meet the identified performance criteria, but results varied widely. 1. Line item analysis break down for questions labeled as measuring critical thinking GLO: #1: 85.16% #2: 85.81%</p>

		<p>#25: 50.32% #26: 40.65% #29: 67.10%</p> <p>2. Scores did not meet the identified performance criteria. Fall 2013: 68.75% (N = 47) Spring 2014: 66.34% (N = 75) Summer 2014: 68.76% (N = 33)</p> <p>Use of Results MGF 1106:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curriculum changes: We will revise the content of the course to focus more on conceptual understanding, problem solving, critical thinking, and technology. We will also examine core topics' depth to ensure the curriculum level is appropriate. 2. The department will diversity teaching responsibilities so more faculty teach this course. 3. Results of the line item analysis will be shared with faculty. <p>2013-2014</p> <p>Results: STA 2023: Certain scores did not meet the identified performance criteria, but results varied widely.</p> <p>3. Line item analysis break down for questions labeled as measuring critical thinking GLO:</p> <p>#12: 90.42% #17: 44.91% #18: 86.83% #19: 59.28% #21: 73.05% #22: 46.11% #24: 55.69% #25: 55.69%</p>
--	--	---

		<p>#26: 62.87%</p> <p>4. Scores did not meet the identified performance criteria, but were within 2 percentage points. Scores remained fairly stable:</p> <p>Fall 2013: 74.84% (N = 61) Spring 2014: 72.97% (N = 71) Summer 2014: 73.85% (N = 35)</p> <p>Use of Results Curriculum changes: We will revise the content of the course to focus more on conceptual understanding, problem solving, critical thinking, and technology. We will focus less on computations, hand calculations, and other forms of procedural fluency. The department will diversity teaching responsibilities so more faculty teach this course. Results of the line item analysis will be shared with faculty.</p>
--	--	---

Department: Science

**General Learning Outcomes Assessment
Learning Outcomes: Scientific Reasoning and Critical Thinking**

Course	Assessment Measure/Standard	Learning Outcomes: Scientific Reasoning and Critical Thinking
<p>BSC2010 C General Biology I with Lab</p> <p>BSC2085 Anatomy and Physiology I</p> <p>CHM 2045 General Chemistry I</p> <p>MCB 2010 Microbiology</p>	<p>Nationally normed final exam</p> <p>Departmental final exams.</p> <p>Student success rates for all courses at least 77%</p> <p>Research Paper with rubric Structure: /5, organization:/5 quality: /5, amount:/5 sources:/5, info game/ unknown: /5</p> <p>Standardized departmental exam periodically</p>	<p><u>2010-2011 Results</u> FGC scores are higher than the national norm. Evidence usage scores are lower than acceptable. Scientific methodology scores lower than acceptable.</p> <p><u>Use of Results</u> Increase sampling frame. Revised standardized assignment & apply to other papers (anticipated increase in evidence usage due to this change). Revised instruction and lab assignments to obtain a higher percentage of proficiency in scientific methodology An embedded exam will randomly be given in various courses</p> <p><u>2011-2012 Results:</u> AP and Chemistry Students consistently score above the national norm on the national exam. The student success rate in the sciences is over 80% The biology departmental final exam average was 66.9%, lower than the expected 70%. The results were better than expected 21/25 instead of the baseline of 20/25. Student scores on the ETS assessment averaged 70% in natural sciences 2012</p> <p><u>Use of Results:</u> Increase the average to at least 70% on the departmental final. Biology: make adjustments in the content, content delivery, and textbook. The entire science department plans to continue to utilize technology to facilitate the learning and increase in student success.</p>

		<p>The rubric didn't work for lab write-ups or activities so the rubric will be modified to use with labs that can be randomly collected and will indicate the student's ability to apply the concepts and data to natural phenomena. By utilizing a modified rubric we can utilize it in more courses.</p> <p>The data collected periodically indicates we still need to work on the application of the scientific methodology.</p>
--	--	--

Department: Library

General Learning Outcomes Assessment
Learning Outcomes: Information Literacy

Course	Assessment Measure/Standard	Learning Outcomes: Information Literacy
Library Orientation/Online Tutorial	Students are required to complete the online orientation before using library resources. Students will score at least 80% in Library Skills and Plagiarism Awareness	2009-2010 Results: 2008-2009: Library Skills = %100 Plagiarism = 75% 2009-2010: Library Skills = 99% Plagiarism =78% Use of Results: Revised Orientation Develop classroom orientations to be presented by Research Librarian 2012-2013 Use of Results: Improve online library orientation for more streamlined service Create a self-paced, self-grading class/test There will be a testing component to assess efficacy of new online orientation, compared with current library orientation.