1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area II: Humanities

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..
   
   SLO 11: Students will understand and appreciate the arts and aesthetics as ways of knowing and engaging with the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You my cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   For this class, ARCH 2600 Architecture Appreciation, an assessment method was developed that benchmarked student’s intelligence concerning Architecture when they initially arrived at the class and compared this data with additional data collected throughout the course of the entire semester. To be clear, the students were given a 50 question test on the first day of class. The test was not about facts and did not count toward their final grade, but was about the tools of visual analysis students would be able to apply to buildings after completion of the class. With the proper instruction students would be able to look at a building and appreciate how culture, place, technology and society have influenced the appearance of buildings all around us. In order to collect subsequent data, the Professors teaching ARCH 2600 embedded these same 50 questions into the 4 tests given throughout the rest of the semester. Responses to the initial test were then able to be directly compared to results from the later tests. In our first report last year, other methods of assessment were included but were not well received by the committee as they did not provide hard data. Although we continue to use other methods of subjective assessment in these classes, we are not including them in this report. To summarize: A benchmark test was given to students at the beginning of class. The test was 50 questions long and meant to measure Architectural Intelligence, not dates and facts. These same test questions were re-distributed throughout subsequent tests. Results from both tests were directly compared.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   ARCH 2600 was offered once in the spring of 2012 to 98 students, in the summer of 2012 to 20 students. 2 sections are currently in session. Data was collected during the spring and summer session via scan sheets. The answers to specific questions could be isolated using the scan sheet data. The data discussed here represents 100% of the students. Again, a benchmark test was given to all students (50 questions): Summer 2012 (20 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 32.7 with a High of 44.0 and Low of 14.0. Spring 2012 (103 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 32.0 with a High of 58.0 and a Low of 0.0. At the end of the Semester the same 50 Questions (re- distributed throughout 4 tests): Summer 2012 (19 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 65.2 with a High of 80.0 and a Low of 46.0. Spring 2012 (98 Students): On a scale of 100 the Average Score was 55.0 with a High of 100.0 and a Low of 0.0. This average score does not mean that students failed the class. These questions, were meant to evaluate Architectural Intelligence not the student’s ability to memorize facts, did not count against their grade when given as the benchmark test. Students could have done very well on the subsequent 4 tests without answering these redistributed questions accurately. Please see the attached graphs.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

The faculty heard the comments from the Core Curriculum Committee last year and worked diligently to improve their methods of assessment. They feel they have done that- instituting a form of student intelligence benchmarking and substantially increasing the sample size for evaluation from 10% to 100%. We have not abandoned the subjective assessment methods we reported on last year, because they are still useful in the class, but have not included them in this report. The faculty that teaches ARCH 2600 had the following reaction to the data: they felt it validated their teaching methods. An increase in the average score in each data set suggested that Student’s Architectural Intelligence DOUBLED after taking this class (32.7% to 65.2% and 32% to 55%). Of course there is always room for improvement, but now the faculty feel that they have a new tool to evaluate their effectiveness in the class. With the carefully designed test questions distributed through the year’s tests, they can narrow their focus on specific areas of content (architectural style, regional variation, technological impact on building form, societal changes on building form, or architectural communication).

6. **Additional Comments:**

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

Changes to the ARCH 2600 assessment structure were made due to the nature of comments received last year from the Core Curriculum Committee. We feel we have addressed last year’s concerns directly- benchmarking and increasing the sample size. We have isolated the content of this report to only include the assessment methods that produce data, as opposed the subjective assessment methods that continue to be used in the class by the faculty.

7. **Committee Comments**

Mean of rubric score = 3.65 (out of 4)I was involved in the writing of this report. I will be the first to admit that there probably needs to be clearer description of the questions chosen, why they contribute to the learning objectives of the class, and how students scored on the individual questions. The presentation of the data in bulk format is detrimental to our understanding of what students are learning and what they are not learning. Perhaps we are not using the tool (data collection and assessment) properly. The report for THEA continues to be our aspirational report for SLO #11. We should adopt suggested measure
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..
   - SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.
   - SLO 9: Students will understand and appreciate diversity of an within societies of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You my cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]
   During the previous two academic years (2010-2011 and 2011-2012), The World History program assessed achievement of Student Learning Outcomes 8 and 9. While SLO 8 stipulates that “students will be informed and engaged citizens of the United States and the world”, SLO 9 requires that “Students will understand and appreciate the diversity of among within societies of the United States and the world”. We used the same assessment method for both academic years. Basically, the method entailed linking 6 questions on an objective exam to the 6 SLOs, then gathering the data generated by scantron on student responses to each question. We then determined the total number of correct and incorrect student responses for each SLO for all 1010 sections and all 1020 sections, and then developed an average from the total number of students taking the exam for 1010 sections and 1020 sections. Instructors first submitted 12 questions to the world history coordinator, who reviewed these, and then approved which 6 questions each instructor would link to each SLO and then place on the exam.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   During the 2011-12 academic year, the history department completed another round of assessment of general education student learning outcomes in world history sections. We used the same process of direct measurement enlisted in the 2010-2011 academic year. Assessment of SLOs occurred in 11 sections of 1010 and 8 sections of 1020. This does not include honors sections, sections in which instructors did not use an objective exam format, sections in which instructors failed to complete assessment, or sections in which instructors did not complete the assessment process correctly. We did, however, complete assessment in the majority of world history sections taught in 2011-2012. Assessment yielded interesting results in 2011-2012. In the 1010 sections, the highest percentage of students answering correctly an SLO tagged question was 85% (SLO8.1), and the second highest was 82% (SLO8.2). This was a much better result than the previous year. However, the lowest result was 60% on SLO9.1, which was lower than the previous year. In the 1020 sections, the highest percentage of students answering correctly an SLO tagged question was 84% (SLO9.3), and the lowest was 67% (SLO8.1), which was a poorer performance than the previous year. Moreover, 1010 students still performed most poorly on SLO9.1, and 1020 students still performed the best on SLO9.3.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]
   A couple of mitigating factors should be considered in evaluating the meaning of the assessment results from 2011-12. First, in terms of the poor showing by 1020 sections, fewer of these sections were assessed than would normally be the case. Three of these sections, comprising approximately 400-600 students were never
assessed in Spring 2012. Had these students been assessed, the results for the 1020 sections may well have been different. Certainly, that difference could have been either better or worse. Second, although the world history faculty agreed to include the SLOs explicitly on their syllabi for the 2011-2012 academic year, less than half of the world history faculty and instructors actually followed through with that pledge. Certainly, whether or not the SLOs appear on a syllabus alone is not sufficient to account for the quality of student performance on the assessment measure. However, we need a more concerted effort to at least include the SLOs on world history syllabi and to address them explicitly at least once during the course of the semester, in addition to the multiple ways each of our courses already address these themes via our individual historical content. Moreover, this assessment requirement needs to be communicated to instructors and adjuncts who teach a significant portion of world history sections.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   None

7. **Committee Comments**
   Mean of rubric score = 2.91 (out of 4) They seem to be more concerned with getting the faculty to acknowledge the SLOs for appearance sake than what they mean. There is no data present to this end. It is assumed that since there was discussion about including the SLOs in the syllabi there was contact with the faculty. Does HIST 1010 and 1020 faculty meet to discuss? Do you have a subset of say full time tenure track faculty on an assessment committee? How many instructors submitted questions for inclusion on the exam? Report shows evidence of discussion among relevant teaching faculty.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.

   SLO 9: Students will understand and appreciate diversity of an within societies of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   The Technology and Civilization program assessed achievement of the two SLOs directly through essays and indirectly through surveys. Faculty members included essay questions addressing each SLO in their final in both terms (Appendix A: Direct Assessment Essay Questions: Fall 1011, Spring 2012). At the end of the fall term, they administered a survey but for the spring term, faculty administered a survey both at the beginning and at the end of the term. The survey consisted of ten statements which students answered by filling in scantron bubbles. The program coordinator read and assessed the essays using the attached rubric (Appendix B: Direct Assessment Essay Rubric). The Office of Information Technology processed and collated the scantron survey results.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   Direct assessment: A total of 338 students enrolled in the Technology and Civilization program in the academic year 2011-2012: 185 students in the fall and 153 students in the spring. The program coordinator selected 18 essays in the fall and 15 in the spring (10%) using a random letter generator. Faculty members photocopied selected essays and submitted them to the coordinator for assessment. Assessments of student answers to essay questions are combined in the chart below for fall and spring terms. Following the rubric, the program coordinator graded each category on a scale of 5-1, attempting to assess how well students demonstrated that, for SLO 8, they were informed, analytical, and engaged, and for SLO 9, that they recognized diversity, made meaningful distinctions, and demonstrated awareness of the need for diversity. See attached full report for data.

   Indirect assessment: While ten percent of Technology and Civilization were sampled for the direct assessment, one hundred percent were surveyed for the indirect assessment. At the beginning of the fall term and at the beginning and end of the spring term, faculty members distributed a list of ten questions, which students answered by filling scantron bubbles. In the fall 178 students completed the post-course survey; in the spring 148 students completed the pre-course survey while 141 completed the post-course survey. The pre-survey attempted to elicit how students assessed their own level of awareness while the post-survey attempted to measure how or if the course changed it. Both pre-and post-course surveys are attached (Appendix C: Assessment Survey Statements: Pre- and Post-Course Surveys). Generally speaking, we found the results of the surveys unenlightening and largely incongruous with the results of the essays. Combined in the chart below are the mean or average rankings for the academic year under review. For each of the ten statements or questions students had five choices: A=Disagree Strongly, B=Disagree, C=Neutral, D=Agree, and E=Agree Strongly. Following standard practice the list was presented in reverse order with the first choice, “A,” registering highest disagreement and the last choice, “E,” registering the most agreement. One explanation for the relatively low mean values across surveys may be that students assumed that “A” represented highest approval and “E” the lowest. Nevertheless a majority of students on all three surveys registered “neutral,” “agree,” and “agree strongly” responses. See attached full report for data. Only three questions, one on each
survey, received a mean score of 2.5, and none higher. In fall 2011, 54% of 178 students “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that “The course helped me apply the lessons of the past to contemporary issues” (Statement 4), a position reinforced in the sampled essays. In spring 2012 on the pre-course survey for the same statement, 49% either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that “I apply the lessons of the past to contemporary issues.” On the post-course survey 73% of 141 students either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” but the statement received a mean score of 2.1. Statement 7 received the highest score (2.5) in the spring post-course survey. Fifty percent of students surveyed believed that that “The course gave me a new appreciation for cultures and religions other than my own.” The “neutral” response recorded by 49 students (34.8%) bumped up the mean value. The value contrasted favorably with the reciprocal pre-course survey question, “I appreciate cultures and religions other than my own,” which received a mean value of 1.9. These two statements suggest that students entered the course with some knowledge of diversity (constructed perhaps as non-American) and that the course augmented that knowledge, expanding their awareness and appreciation. The essays demonstrated that students want even more exposure to non-American, non-European cultures. Also noteworthy was the student response to statement 8: Pre-Course: “I value intercultural diversity”; Post-Course: “The course increased my awareness of intercultural diversity.” The mean value increased from 2.0 in the pre-course survey to 2.4 in the post-course survey. Here again is evidence that the spring term, ostensibly perceived as Eurocentric, actually broadened students’ perspectives on diversity, broadly conceived and defined.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**

[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

What the sampled essays suggest was a mixed record of satisfaction and disappointment. For both fall 2001 and spring 2012, the essays demonstrated that students had become informed and engaged. They wrote, sometimes eloquently, on historical topics from antiquity up to the present, situating issues and artifacts in appropriate contexts and relating them to current circumstances. Even when they struggled with historical details they formed meaningful associations. Even as they struggled with the meaning of diversity they nevertheless acquired awareness and sensitivity to religious, class-based, and gendered differences. The Technology and Civilization faculty intend to incorporate ideas students shared with them in order to improve course outcomes and program goals. Additionally faculty members intend to make learning outcomes clearer to students, particularly SLO 9 and the concept of diversity. Faculty members also need to address the problem several spring term students displayed in their essays namely their struggle to recall events accurately and chronologically. Faculty members should also rethink their assessment essay questions for both fall and spring.

6. **Additional Comments:**

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

None

7. **Committee Comments**

Mean of rubric score = 3.48 (out of 4) Lots of details were presented about direct and indirect assessment. The details were also presented about the rubric and student responses. A detailed report was attached by stopped at page 11 before Appendix A to E. Lengthy report describes methods in great details. Excellent for assessment! However, could not find appendices in the attachment. In spite of this, the report does provide a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name / number</th>
<th>HIST1210/1217, HIST1220/1227</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A clear description of all methods. It was obvious that the person who wrote the attached assessment report was well informed as to the course material and this implies much discussion with relevant faculty. It was rather complete. Did the faculty meet to discuss? Of the thirteen sections how many of the faculty are on this committee?
AGSC Content Area of Alignment: Area III: Science and Math

1. SLO(s) being assessed: Student will...
   SLO 10: Students will understand and appreciate methods and issues of science and technology.

3. Assessment Method(s):
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].
   The Freshman Chemistry CORE SLO Assessment Devise was administered to all students taking freshman Chemistry at the end of the Spring 2011 semester. Students taking the exam were given 5 points towards their grade to increase student participation and ensure the questions were being answered to the best of their abilities. The exams were organized and proctored by the Freshman Chemistry Coordinator, Steve Swann, and were graded by Steve and his staff. The five chemistry courses described below were the test: Chem1020- second semester of a terminal course sequence that combines general and organic chemistry, Chem1030 and 1040-two semester general chemistry courses. Chem1120-second semester of general chemistry for scientists and engineersChem1127-second semester of honors chemistry. The exam was comprised of 25 multiple choice questions, and were constructed so that each question covered a subsection of SLO#10 as listed below: Questions 1-5/SLO10-1 Historic perspectiveQuestions 6-10/SLO10-2Scientific methodQuestions 11-15/SLO10-3Data interpretationQuestions 16-20/SLO10-4Social ImpactQuestions 21-25/SLO10-5Demonstrate understanding of science. The historic perspective questions were modified based on the material covered in that respective course. All other questions related to a specific subsection of SLO10 were the same. There was a definitive answer for SLO1,2,3, and 5. The questions for SLO-5 were subjective based on how the course changed their view on different social issues. The answers were: A. Strongly agree, B. Agree, C. no difference, D. disagree, E. strongly disagree. The exams for the five courses are available to the committee upon request.

4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?
   The findings from the Freshman chemistry CORE SLO Assessment Devise are presented in Table 1.
   Number of Participants and % correct answers from 2012
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name / number</th>
<th>SLO1010/1011, CHEM1020/1021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   that took the exam the average correct answers for the exam for SLO1,2,3 and 5 were less than 50%. The majority of students felt that their understanding of specific Social Impacts (SLO4) was no different from when they started the course. Chem1030-out of the 725 students that took the exam the average correct answers for the exam for SLO1,2,3 and 5 were at 50% or less. The majority of students felt that their understanding of specific Social Impacts (SLO4) was no different from when they started the course. Chem1040-out of the 533 students that took the exam the average correct answers for SLO2 and 3 were at 50%. There was a clear increase in the percent of correctly answered questions related to Historical Perspective (SLO1) compared to Chem1030. The Historical Perspective is related to Scientists correlated with specific principles covered in the course. While unclear, the increase in correct answers may reflect the student being exposed to these principles in both Chem1030 and 1040. This was also observed in their understanding of Science (SLO5), which significantly increased in the second semester of General Chemistry. The majority of students felt that their
understanding of specific Social Impacts (SLO4) was no different from when they started the course. Chem1120-out of the 81 students that took the exam there was a significant increase in the average correct answers for SLO1,2,3 and 5 compared to Chem1040 students. This is a second semester course; therefore, many of the concepts have been reinforced over two semesters. In addition to the course being more rigorous than the General Chemistry courses (Chem1030 and 1040), these students may have taken advanced chemistry courses in high school. The majority of students felt that their understanding of specific Social Impacts (SLO4) was no different from when they started the course. Chem1127-out of the 87 students that took the exam there was an increase in the correct answers for SLO1,2,3, and 5 compared to Chem1040 and Chem1120 students. The majority of students felt that their understanding of specific Social Impacts (SLO4) was no different from when they started the course. Since the honors laboratories and the honors lectures are coupled together the course material is reinforced during lab time. In addition, these students often have taken advanced chemistry courses in high school.

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?

[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

A similar rubrics was used in 2011 with the findings listed below.

ParticipantsSLO1SLO2SLO3SLO4SLO5WrittenChem102011741374733(A+B)/46(C)372.3/3.5/
2.4Chem103063935526336(A+B)/45(C)643.3/3.5/2.8Chem104044746557141(A+B)/42(C)76
3.6/4.7/3.8Chem11208057567337(A+B)/44(C)863.6/4.4/4.3Chem11277479737833(A+B)/32
(C)933.1/4.8/3.9Having findings from two different academic years allowed for a more quantitative assessment of student performance. The written portion was removed for the 2012 assessment due to the substantial time required to grade over 1000 exams. Overall there was not a significant difference between the 2010 and 2011 findings. There is an obvious need for improvement in the General Chemistry courses based on the assessment. A primary difference between the General Chemistry and Honors courses is the direct coupling of lecture and lab. Therefore, we need to devise a method to stress the concepts learned in class in the General Chemistry courses in the laboratory environment. In addition, the top Graduate Students in the department are the Graduate Teaching Assistants for the Honors chemistry courses. These students are selected based on their course performance and teaching abilities. Therefore, we need the resources to be able to recruit and compete with other institutions for outstanding graduate students, which we are unable to do at this time due to limited resources. The history component of the SLO does not correlate with the major STEM initiatives as outlined by the National Research Council. It would be beneficial if the Core curriculum Assessment committee met with our department to discuss how the assessment can better address the guidelines established by the STEM initiative.

6. Additional Comments:

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

7. Committee Comments

Mean of rubric score = 2.44 (out of 4)Comments several chemistry courses were evaluated at once such that CHEM 1020 was included in discussion and 1021 was not specifically discussed, writer of report concerned that core curriculum SOLs do not address STEM and Grad Teaching assistants are involved with Honors courses, cite lack of money for support as a problem meeting core. Reviewer is not sure if CHEM provider of assessment
was using the correct SOL criteria.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area III: Science and Math

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..

   SLO 10: Students will understand and appreciate methods and issues of science and technology.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   Each method of assessment that we have used is the same as was given in our plan in the initial course proposal. Our assessment instruments fall into three categories: 1. A survey of self-reported Core Science Literacy (given near the start of Biol 1020/1027, and near the end of Biol 1030/1037). 2. A content quiz (different questions for each course, near the beginning and near the end for each course). 3. An extensive lab hand-in testing student understanding and use of the scientific method, including data presentation (hand-ins differed by course, but they covered similar skills). The Core Science Literacy survey contained demographic questions and self-assessment in three areas. A cluster of ten questions addressed how well students think they are able to do several tasks related to the scientific method and scientific abilities. A cluster of eleven questions addressed how well students think they know concepts that span the range of items taught in this course sequence. Finally, a cluster of five questions addressed how well students think their knowledge of biology helps them understand current scientific issues and their broader impact on society. For each course a short (5-question) multiple-choice quiz covering course content was given to students at both the start of the end of the same semester. These questions were on knowledge of course content, selected from a representative range of course topics. Each course contained an extensive lab exercise where students were graded on their abilities to use the scientific method and to present data. In both cases the activities addressed five areas: hypothesis construction, experimental design, data summary, data presentation, and conclusion. The activity was given about halfway into the semester for both courses. A scoring rubric was used for each category.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   See attached file for assessment data and findings

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**

   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

   Given the difficulties that students have with hypothesis formation and experimental design, we are trying to introduce and emphasize these topics more in other labs beyond the ones used for course assessment with the goal that next year’s assessment will show an improvement in this skill.

6. **Additional Comments:**

   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

   We are considering some changes in how our assessments are administered for the coming year. The Core Science Literacy survey will likely be converted to a Qualtrics survey, and at that point it we may also give it at both the start and end of both courses. The content quizzes will likely be moved to the online homework site.
for these courses (MasteringBiology). Once done, this will make expansion of these quizzes to include more questions possible. In addition one of our faculty is experimenting with a "flipped" classroom format. This pedagogical approach requires students to read lecture notes, watch lecture slides, read in their textbook, and do online homework before topics are addressed in class. The main uses of class time are to address areas of difficulty, highlight key points from the lecture notes and slides, do activities, and take several exams. Areas of difficulty are identified from online homework results, student questions, and common misconceptions. Activities in class include think-pair-share; clicker quizzes; group work on problems, or group work on content reviews/summaries. This course section will be assessed using the same methodologies and we will be interested in the outcomes of this assessment.

7. **Committee Comments**

Mean of rubric score = 3.84 (out of 4) For 10.2, 10.3, 10.5 - methods concur; for 10.1, 10.4, hard to tell how well methods concur beyond self-reporting. Content-knowledge quiz material is broad, highly specific and seemingly random
1. AGSC Content Area of Alignment: Area III: Science and Math

2. SLO(s) being assessed: Student will..
   
   SLO 10: Students will understand and appreciate methods and issues of science and technology.

3. Assessment Method(s):
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You my cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]

   SURVEYSurveys were administered in the first lab of BIOL 1001 and then in the last lab of BIOL 1011. The survey consisted of 6 demographic questions, 10 questions that related to scientific abilities, 11 questions that related to knowledge of concepts, and 5 questions that related to their awareness of current scientific and technological issues. CORE CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT QUESTIONSIn both BIOL 1000 and 1010 students were given 5 general knowledge questions at the start of the semester and the end of the semester to assess their knowledge. The questions for each course are found below. LAB REPORTSStudents were assessed based on their ability to construct a hypothesis, present data, and form a conclusion in BIOL 1001 and BIOL 1011. Both exercises were designed to fit in with their respective course’s current grading scheme. Students performed well on these activities. 100 lab reports were selected randomly from each course and were graded by GTAs teaching the courses. Students were rated on 2 sections for BIOL 1001: “Hypothesis”, and “Data Presentation and Conclusion”. In BIOL 1011, students were rated on 3 sections: “Hypothesis”, “Data Presentation”, and “Conclusion”. The Survey and Core Curriculum Assessment Questions are included in the findings document.

4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?
   
   See attached document

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

   The results from our assessment indicate that students are learning valuable information in the course series that includes BIOL 1000 and BIOL 1010. Student knowledge of basic concepts increased, and their attitudes towards science and the application of science also improved. We will use these results to indicate areas in which we can continue to strengthen the course series. Communication between the faculty and instructors who teach the lectures, and the graduate students who teach the laboratories, will be vital to ensure that we continue to improve our abilities to enhance the student learning experiences in these courses.

6. Additional Comments:
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

7. Committee Comments
   
   Mean of rubric score = 3.67 (out of 4) A very thorough assessment of SLO 10 with varying types of assessment included. Understands the importance of strengthening communication amongst faculty and instructors to continue to enhance student learning competencies.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will:

   - SLO 2: Students will be able to read analytically and critically.
   - SLO 3: Students will be able to critique and construct an argument effectively.
   - SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   For SLO 2 on reading critically and analytically, we used 3 types of assessment methods: (1) exam questions were designed and administered to determine if students were able to explain critical points in the assigned reading materials (used only in HONR 1027), (2) students were assessed in terms of whether they located and critically cited the required number of scholarly articles in their term papers (used only in HONR 1027), and (3) students were assessed using grading rubrics for their term papers, in terms of critical reading of the scholarly source articles for the term papers (used in both HONR 1027 and 1037). For SLO 3 on constructing effective arguments, we used grading rubrics for the term papers in both courses, that evaluated the extent to which students argued effectively for the points they made in their term papers. For SLO 8 on becoming citizens of the world, we also used grading rubrics for the term papers in both courses, that assessed the extent to which students clearly addressed societal and global issues. The term papers for HONR 1027 in Fall 2011 were assessed as to how they addressed issues of food and water sustainability, and the term papers for HONR 1037 in Spring 2012 were assessed as to how they addressed life cycle analyses of consumer goods and related them to environmental and social issues in sustainability. We then compiled the student answers to the above exam questions on critical reading (SLO 2), the numbers of scholarly articles cited in the student term papers as part of their critical reading skills (also SLO 2), and the student scores on the term paper grading rubrics (SLO 3 and 8). The instructors for each course examined these results as a group, and discussed how to improve student achievement of the above SLOs in next year’s courses, and also how to assess these improvements. Here are the 4 exam questions used to assess SLO 2 on critical reading skills: (1) According to the article we read by Jared Diamond, what happened to the people of Easter Island? a. They migrated to another island when resources dwindled. b. They successfully adapted to climate change by changing their irrigation systems. c. They have yet to reach the carrying capacity of the island and continue to thrive. d. They experienced population decline because they overused their resources. (2) In the article Coming in to the Foodshed, the authors distinguish the “foodshed” concept from that of a “watershed.” What do they say is the primary difference between a foodshed and a watershed? a. It is easier to maintain. b. It is more susceptible to overuse. c. It is more cultural than natural. d. There is no difference. (3) In chapter 6 of Enough, the authors argue that U.S. Food Aid: a. Should focus on more exports of U.S. goods to Africa over the next ten years, to meet the needs of a growing population in Africa. b. Is helpful to rural Ethiopian farmers because it increases demand for their products. c. Is a drain on the U.S. economy because it exports to foreign countries the crop surpluses that are badly needed at home. d. Undermines African economies, and disadvantages local African farmers, because it lowers the price of locally-produced products. (4) In the book Enough, the authors state that Ethiopia’s water supply problem is not that they don’t have _______________ water, instead their problem is _______________ to water (fill in the blanks). (5) Here are the 3 grading rubrics used for assessment of SLOs 2, 3 and 8 in the student term papers: HONR 1027 and 1037 | SLO 2: Students will be able
to read analytically and critically. Assessment Rubric for Term Paper [see attached file for clearer rubric tables] Measure54321ScoreAcceptable Sources Group shows full comprehension of how to identify and select scholarly sources for use in the paper. Group shows an acceptable comprehension of how to identify and select scholarly sources for use in the paper. Group fails to identify and select scholarly sources for use in the paper. Identify Argument Group shows full comprehension of the arguments presented within the reviewed body of literature. Group demonstrates some ability to identify the arguments presented within the reviewed body of literature. Group fails to identify or comprehend the arguments presented within the reviewed body of literature. Summarize and Analyze Text Group is able to cogently summarize, synthesize, and analyze the information presented in cited sources. Group is able to cogently summarize the information presented in cited sources. Group does not understand the literature cited, or does not summarize the information presented in these texts. HONR 1027 and 1037 | SLO3: Students will be able to critique and construct an argument effectively. Assessment Rubric for Term Paper

Measure54321ScoreSummary The paper offers a cogent summary of the arguments and data that emerged throughout the literature review. The paper briefly summarizes the arguments and/or data that emerged throughout the literature review. The paper fails to provide a summary of the literature cited and offers no coherent critique of the information presented. Composition Writing style is clear, concise, and points are supported with highly relevant and well-described evidence or examples. Group is somewhat able to articulate their ideas, and some supporting evidence or examples are provided. Grammar, vocabulary, and sentence composition are poor, and ideas are poorly articulated and difficult to understand.

Construction Group is able to organize and develop their argument(s) clearly and succinctly. Group demonstrates some ability to organize and develop their argument(s) but has lapses that render the argument less effective. Group demonstrates poor ability to organize and develop their argument. HONR 1027 | SLO8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the United States and the world. Assessment Rubric for Term Paper | Fall 2011 Measure54321ScoreInformed Group demonstrates full understanding of the triple bottom line and how it ties into their assigned topic. Group demonstrates general familiarity with the triple bottom line as it ties into their assigned topic. Student fails to understand the triple bottom line as it ties into their assigned topic. Engaged Group demonstrates a full awareness of and the ability to engage with a major international or national sustainability-related issue. Group demonstrates partial awareness of and an average ability to engage with a major international or national sustainability-related issue. HONR 1037 | SLO8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the United States and the world. Assessment Rubric for Term Paper | Spring 2012 Measure54321ScoreInformed Group demonstrates full understanding of their assigned object’s lifecycle and how it ties into sustainability. Group demonstrates general familiarity with their object’s lifecycle as it ties into sustainability. Group fails to demonstrate understanding of their object’s lifecycle as it ties into sustainability. Engaged Group demonstrates a full awareness of and the ability to engage in lifecycle research and group understands the broad implications of this analysis. Group demonstrates partial awareness of and an average ability to engage in lifecycle research. Group shows partial understanding of the broad implications of this analysis. Group demonstrates minimal awareness and low ability to engage in lifecycle research and minimal understanding of the broad implications of this analysis.

4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?

Findings: In terms of assessing SLO 2 on critical reading skills, we obtained exam question results from 2 of
the 4 class sections, about half the class. Of this group of 30 students examined on the midterm exam, all of them answered correctly the 2 exam questions on critical reading skills. One the final exam questions, almost all of them answered correctly. This indicates that they were doing the readings, and able to answer analytical questions about the course readings. In order to develop and assess a higher level of reading skills, we plan to use more complex exam questions in 2012-13, and to work with the students in discussion sections on skills for critical reading of texts. Results of Exam Questions to assess critical reading skills (SLO 2, used in HONR 1027) [see attached file for clearer charts and tables] Total correct: Total incorrect: Midterm:

Q1 300Midterm: Q2 300Final Exam: Q3 360Final Exam: Q4

342 In terms of the students being able to locate and properly cite scholarly reading sources, almost all of the approximately 30 student assessed (3-4 students per group in 9 groups that worked on term papers together) were able to locate the required number of 6 articles. In addition, many of them read and used non-peer-reviewed sources such as websites. Results of Assessment of Students’ Peer-Reviewed Article Searches (SLO 2, used in HONR 1027) FINAL RESULTS

Student Group# PR articles# Not PR Other % Success in citing 6 peer-reviewed articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Group 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Group 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Group 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, students did not perform as well in terms of the more qualitative assessments of critical reading comprehension used in the grading rubrics, such as cogent synthesis of the arguments presented in written literature (see grading rubric categories above), in that about a third of them received below average scores in this grading category (see graph below under SLO 2). Results of term paper grading rubric assessments for SLO 2, 3, and 8 in HONR 1027: [see file attached for graph] Students performed better in the spring semester course (HONR 1037) in critical reading skills, in that many of them received excellent scores for SLO 2 outcomes: Results of term paper grading rubric assessments for SLO 2, 3, and 8 in HONR 1037: [see file attached for graph] In terms of SLO 3 on construction of effective arguments, the students’ performance was mediocre during both semesters, as seen in the 2 graphs. Few of the students presented excellent, clear arguments for the points they made in their term papers. We clearly need to work with students this next year on developing their skills for making effective arguments. Finally, in terms of SLO 8 on being engaged citizens of the community and world, students did very well in both semesters in how they connected their term paper topics with major local and international issues, and with all 3 systems considered in sustainability (economics, social systems, and ecosystems). They also engaged the broader implications of their term paper topics. So, we feel as instructors that we have been successful in connecting these students with major societal issues and helping them to become citizens of the world through these courses.

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?

[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

During group discussions by the instructional teams for both courses, we decided to introduce simple pre- and post-test questions at the beginning and end of each course, to gauge students’ awareness about major sustainability issues. This will allow us to better assess whether they come into our courses as highly aware citizens about these issues, and the extent to which they add depth and breadth to their awareness during each course. We plan to retain the exam questions on critical reading comprehension, as we feel this allows us to determine if students are critically reading the assigned articles. However, we plan to design more
complex exam questions to more fully test critical reading skills. We also plan to add course exercises that further develop students’ reading and critical argument skills, and will continue to assess these skills using grading rubrics for student term papers.

6. Additional Comments:
[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

Overall, we felt that the assessment strategies we used were fairly effective in determining student achievement of learning outcomes. They revealed several areas where students need further instruction and exercises to develop skills for critical reading and development of arguments, which will allow us to work on these areas in courses next year.

7. Committee Comments
Mean of rubric score = 3.84 (out of 4)They are, with the caveat that the exam questions show the mastery more of facts of the class rather than whether students could "explain critical points in the assigned reading materials." There's no explanation in multiple choice -- that said, they tested this particular SLO from a variety of angles, which mitigates this point some. 'Seems to be more in the area of simple recall than analysis or synthesis of ideas'This submission clearly shows discussion among the faculty. /One of the strongest examples of discussion among faculty
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:**  Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed: Student will..**

   SLO 9: Students will understand and appreciate diversity of an within societies of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You my cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   At the end of the Spring and Summer 2012 semesters, students in all sections of SOCY 1000/1007 were asked to complete a 15-item assessment exam to identify the degree to which course content is consistent with SLOs for the course. Questions were designed to reflect these content areas. This assessment was administered electronically via Qualtrics. (Students were not required to complete this examination.)  (1) The Study of Society • Sociology Defined • Major Sociological Paradigms (Functionalist, Conflict, Symbolic Interaction) • Sociological Research Process and Methods  (2) Social Structure, Culture, and Everyday Life • Social Structure • Culture and Everyday Life • Socialization • Groups and Organizations • Conformity and Deviance  (3) Social Institutions • Family • Economy • Government • Education • Religion  (4) Stratification and Inequality • Class/Economic • Race/Ethnicity • Gender • Sexuality  (5) Social Stability and Change • Demography • Environment • Technology • Collective Behavior

   **SLODescription** Exam Questions9-1Relationship between individual and culture/society2, 3, 5, 8, 159-2Human variation and diversity4, 7, 9, 10, 119-3 Appreciation of cultural differences1, 6, 12, 13,14

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   Spring 2012 Results. According to the results, students completing his exam (n=170), on average, 78.9 percent, or 11.84 of 15 questions. For individual questions, student response information is as follows:QuestionPercent
   Correct018102830378048505460688078708730986
   1086117612911383148915525Summary data for student responses according to SLO category are as follows:SLOAverage Percent Correct for Question Groups9-166.409-284.009-386.40Summer 2012 Results. According to the results, students completing this exam (n=22), on average, correctly answered 14.27 of 15 questions, for a mean score of 95.13 percent. For individual questions, student response information is as follows:QuestionPercent
   Correct0195021000310049105860610007100081
   00091001010011100128213100141001573 Summary data for student responses according to SLO category are as follows:SLOAverage Percent Correct for Question Groups9-191.809-298.009-395.40Results Summary. In review of the aggregate data for both semesters, excluding the section pertaining to SLO 9.1 in Spring 2012, students achieved overall high scores on this assessment exam. Of the fifteen questions included in the examination, students tended to have more problems with two items (5 and 15). These questions require understanding of key theoretical concepts within the conflict tradition and both are related to SLO 9-1 (relationship between the
individual and culture/society). The information listed above shows that of the three SLOs measured, scores for 9-1 are the lowest. It should also be noted that for Summer 2012, only one section of SOCY 1000 was offered.

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?

[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

The Spring 2012 program meeting consisted largely of discussion of 2011 assessment results. The changes implemented for this year resulted from these discussions, primarily the decision to implement Qualtrics for the purpose of administering assessment. All 2012 assessment results and findings will be shared with program faculty for the purpose of identifying ways to improve the course. In doing so, program faculty (including the program director and department chair) will: • discuss possible changes to the list of approved texts for the course, including the option of adopting a common textbook for all sections; • review assessment results in detail for the purpose of identifying modifications to the assessment exam, including the addition of more individual items corresponding with each SLO; • determine differences (if any) in student scores by course instructor; • upon evaluation of the assessment results, discuss and implement measures to address areas requiring additional attention and/or improvement. For example, assessment results suggest (similar to results for 2011) that in comparison to other outcomes, SLO 9-1 warrants examination. In doing so, program faculty will identify ways to facilitate including this information into course content for the purpose of giving additional emphasis to the theoretical bases of the relationship between the individual and culture/society.

6. Additional Comments:

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

While not requiring a common textbook for all sections, sociology program faculty developed a list of representative works used for an introductory course. Course text adoptions take into consideration the above list of objectives yet allow the instructor autonomy to select text(s) according to her/his individual preferences.

7. Committee Comments

Mean of rubric score = 3.26 (out of 4) Information was there and complete. What percentage of all students participated? It looks like 24% based on eight sections and 720 students in Spring 2012. How many of the eight sections were used? Is it part of the syllabus? Do students earn course points for completing the survey.

Mapping the questions to the specific student objection in the over all SLOs was appropriate. Last year we requested the questions. Cannot determine if appropriate. There is no data present as to what was done last year or the changes but it was mentioned that in the future it will be shared with program faculty for the purpose of identifying ways to improve the course. Plan to meet with course faculty. Plans are in place to do this. 2011 review comment: Some possible remediation measures for improving are mentioned, but the two I can see do not reflect changes in TEACHING, but changes in the textbook used and changing the exam!
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will.
   
   SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You my cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   Assessment was conducted using common questions included in multiple choice exams for sections of ECON2020 and ECON2030. The questions were developed by a committee composed of department faculty, including all affected instructors, and other interested persons. Questions differed between ECON2020 and ECON2030. Four questions were used in both cases. The assessment questions were designed to evaluate the abilities of students to apply basic economic principles to problems of global/international significance. Competence in basic economics applied to international economic relations was felt by the department committee to be a necessary skill for informed participation as envisioned in SLO8.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   A total of 897 students, taking classes from six different instructors, answered the questions used in ECON 2020, Principles of Microeconomics. A sample of 440 students did so for ECON 2030, Principles of Macroeconomics, covering three sections of the course for Spring 2012. Frequencies of correct answers were compiled for each question for each section. While differences in the frequencies of correct answers across instructors may be useful information for pedagogical purposes, the assessment reported here aggregates the results across all sections/instructors because our focus is purely on assessment of our performance in the context of SLO8. Proportions of correct answers are: ECON 2020 Principles of Microeconomics1: 82.22. 86.83. 54.54. 86.2group average 77.4ECON 2030 Principles of Macroeconomics1: 56.42. 93.93. 51.34. 84.3group average 71.5We also noted particularly low or unexplained scores or unusual variation in scores across sections. In most cases, investigation revealed these results were due to omission of some particular information from some courses.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**

   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

   While we intend to use some results to assist several instructors in specification of their syllabi and course content, our focus here is solely on the use of the aggregate results for curriculum improvement. We compared our frequencies of correct responses this time with our previous results. (The questions we use are highly similar, but are adjusted a bit each time to change their appearances.) We noted at least some modest success in several areas we previously identified as requiring tweaking. First, we had a significant improvement in students' abilities to identify important public figures associated with economic policy, viz. Ben Bernanke. Connecting our lectures to news items associated with the ongoing financial crises in Europe and the U.S. appears to be at least somewhat effective in this regard. The kids also find it interesting. Second, feedback from our previous assessments did appear to lead to some improvement in the students' grasp of basic principles such as comparative advantage. We have identified this as perhaps the most important economic
concept in global trade and international economic relations, at least in the long run, so this is a worthwhile outcome. While relative improvements are desirable, we remain somewhat disenchanted with student performance in a few areas identified by our questions, and critical to effective national and global citizenship. First, we remain dismayed at how many students seem to think that increases in the legal minimum wage is a desirable means to address either income inequality or youth unemployment. As economists we suspect that this myopia results from the constant repetition of this idea in the media among political actors and ideologues. We intend to discuss this further. We are also not satisfied with students' basic understanding of national income accounting, and the roles of international trade in these accounts. Those teaching macroeconomics will discuss this problem.

6. Additional Comments:  
[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]  
We have fulfilled our earlier commitment to expand the assessment process fully to ECON 2030, Principles of Macroeconomics. This course is a natural component of our effort to promote SLO8: it is, in fact, easier to focus on engaged citizen themes in ECON 2030 than in ECON 2020. However, we have not yet settled on an entirely satisfactory set of assessment questions. This is a very challenging problem because the department tries to allow individual instructors as much freedom in curriculum design as is consistent with our overall programmatic needs. In Microeconomics, on the other hand, there is almost no disagreement on what material should always be included in any principles-level course. We will have further discussions to refine the questions for macroeconomic applications.

7. Committee Comments  
Mean of rubric score = 3.41 (out of 4)Methods seem clear enough. /Methods are clear but not tied directly to goals. Hard to understand the rationale all the way through/Tell me what the specifics of the four essay questions.I'm never going to agree that asking multiple choice questions is sufficient for SLO 8. I understand that there are a lot of students in the class, so it's not necessarily the department's fault. That said, the gist of SLO 8 is analysis and description, and I just don't think that can be covered with multiple choice questions -- especially ones that don't measure against something else (like a early semester pre-test). Again, the fault here is systemic, not with the class -- but we need some original thinking here to figure out ways to really measure this. / There is large variation in the percent correct so a group average is meaningless. It would be nice to know that these four questions represented. The answers to the questions they ask show improvement from the last set, but also areas of concern. These seem like perfectly logical conclusions to draw/Clear and logical conclusions. It is difficult to see how the findings were used to change teaching strategies.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 9: Students will understand and appreciate diversity of an within societies of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   PSYC 2010 is associated with SLO9. We used two measures to assess SLO9: 1) a 7-item misconceptions quiz containing items regarding misconceptions of mental illness, aging, ethnicity, and gender differences, and 2) 15-item Content Area Quiz that assesses their knowledge and understanding of content areas related to diversity (i.e. developmental, abnormal, and social psychology). These methods were originally proposed to examine SLO9 and Core Assessment of PSYC 2010: Introduction to Psychology and have been in place for approximately two years. Misconceptions quiz was based on Griggs and Randsell (1987, Misconceptions Tests or Misconceived Tests? Teaching of Psychology, 14, 210–214). Sample item: Mentally ill or retarded individuals are no more likely to be violent than normal people (T/F). Content areas questions were generated from faculty who regularly teach these content areas. Developmental Psychology Sample item: Which of the following determines whether a person will exhibit a particular psychological trait (e.g., openness to experience)? A) nature, B) nurture, C) both a and b, or D) either a or b, depending on age of the person. Social Psychology Sample item: A person of a given ethnic group believes that all people belonging to a different ethnic group are lazy, even though she has never met an individual of that ethnic group. Having such a belief based exclusively on an individual’s pertinence to an ethnic group is known as a) ethnic bias, b) prejudice, c) stereotype, or d) cognitive distortion. Abnormal Psychology Sample item: the DSM is a) treatment manual for personality disorders, b) diagnostic manual for psychopathological conditions, b) self-report diary in which people keep track of their feelings, or d) research tool used with vulnerable populations (e.g., children). To increase online assessment response rates from last year (42%), PSYC 2010 Introduction to Psychology students completed the assessment online with an opportunity to earn extra credit for its completion. The Misconceptions Quiz was assessed twice: at beginning of semester: pre and at end of the semester: post. Completion rates were as follows for the Fall 2011 semester (Pre: 668 students, 68% response rate and Post: 628 students or 64% response rate), and Spring 2012 semester (Pre: 654 students: 64% response rate and Post; 559 students, 58% response rate). Content Area Quiz was assessed at the end of the semester with the post Misconception quiz).

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   Misconception Quiz results: Fall 2011 Results: Pre-Test Total Score: Mean (SD) = 3.18 (1.21), and Post-Test Total Score Mean (SD) = 3.31 (1.09), and Spring 2012 Results: Pre-Test Total Score: Mean (SD) = 3.27 (1.21) and Post-Test Total Score Mean (SD) = 3.31 (1.09). Content Area Quiz Fall 2011: Developmental Percent Correct (SD) = 63.28 (19.13), Abnormal Percent Correct (SD) = 58.12 (23.57), Social Percent Correct (SD) = 67.35 (22.25), and Spring 2012: Developmental Percent Correct (SD) = 61.37 (21.25), Abnormal Percent Correct (SD) = 59.36 (24.45), Social Percent Correct (SD) = 66.25 (22.54)

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

The Department of Psychology’s Undergraduate Committee (comprised of 4 faculty members--2 who teach PSYC 2010 regularly, 1 staff, and a graduate student member who teaches PSYC 2010) met to discuss the results and feedback from the CORE Assessment Committee. The committee reflected on the lack of improvement on the Misconceptions Quiz. The committee believes that the Misconception Quiz can capture SLO9, however, some of the items are a bit misleading (e.g., item 5 regarding split personality) and/or are worded ambiguously. The Resolution is to improve wording for all items for next administration. In terms of content area quiz, the committee agreed that the items in social, developmental, and abnormal content areas capture SLO9, however, neuroscience and learning content do not capture SLO9, therefore, the latter two content areas will not be included in future administrations. Furthermore, the department of Psychology is planning to implement modules that capture SLO9 that will be provided to all PSYC 2010 instructors and students will be testing on the content of these modules. This will ensure that all students who enroll in PSYC 2010 will receive the same information regardless of instructor. The initial proposal for SLO9 indicated that the assessment measures would be included in the final exam. However, after discussion with the PSYC 2010 instructors, undergraduate committee and faculty members in the department of psychology, the consensus was that this would place additional demands on the student and would be unfair to include assessment measures as part of their grade. Thus, assessment measures should be completed online at the end of the semester. To increase response rate in assessment measures, students enrolled in PSYC 2010 will complete the assessment in a large computer lab (e.g., Biggin Center) during one of their class periods at the end of the semester.

6. **Additional Comments:**
[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

7. **Committee Comments**
Mean of rubric score = 3.37 (out of 4) The assessment was divided into a misconception quiz (pre- and post test) and a concept area quiz (post quiz). Having a reference for the misconception portion and an examples of each was helpful. How do these three questions and the remaining twelve questions relate to the SLO9 and it's three subparts. Do you have five questions mapped to each of the three subparts for the 15 question content area quiz? Last year we asked how these questions let us know if students can: relate contributions of groups or individuals, critically analyze ones own culture and others? I do believe the questions can demonstrate knowledge or demonstrate understanding of cultures and diversity. Not sure if the concept area quiz is a measure of student knowledge rather than related to SLO9. The elimination of portions of the concept quiz seem very logical. I am not certain we can say are students are achieving SLO9 if we by design if we are not measuring more than one third of our students (36-37 percent). We may have a selection bias with the students who choose to participate. They have a committee assembled to discuss this SLO9 and the course in general comprised of 4 faculty members--2 who teach PSYC 2010 regularly, 1 staff, and a graduate student member who teaches PSYC 2010. It mentioned that the wording will be improved on some questions but does not expand on this. How would SLO 9 questions on a final place additional demands on students? Wouldn't the final already contain many diversity questions for a course the supports SLO 9 learning goals (including the new modules you plan on adding)?
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Provide details on how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO was conducted. Describe the method used to grade the course as a whole. Map out the faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]

   The Political Science Department has been slow in aligning its assessment efforts in GED courses with the way the University wants those courses to be assessed. This is not to say that there has been no assessment of those courses. In fact, a review of course syllabi for POLI 1050 and 1090 for AY 2011-12 shows a rich and diverse battery of means by which to assess student success in meeting course goals. Students are given the traditional midterm and final examinations or other regular general tests during the semester. There are also numerous quiz formats, typically of course readings. Despite the resource constraints involved in teaching large sections with minimal GTA support, instructors typically build regular or extra credit writing assignments into the course framework. Usually these are thought pieces, based on course reading assignments or web-based applications. Student success also is assessed through other means such as simulations, and participation in blogs and chats. Some instructors administer surveys to students that contain various indicators of subject matter mastery and engagement in politics—either at the end of the semester or in a pre-/post-test format at the beginning and end of the semester. This is a very prominent approach to assessment in the Political Science discipline. The major point here is that a good bit of assessment is and has been conducted in Political Science GED courses for some time. The plurality of approaches and indicators used is entirely appropriate, especially in that there is no “silver bullet” in assessment of social science learning, which is to say one disciplinary-endorsed approach. The pluralism in assessment thus should be applauded as it informs the assessment effort itself. Having said all of this, the fact remains that POLI 1050 and 1090 must be subjected to some Department-wide assessment, even while allowing for additional and individualized assessment tools at the discretion of instructors. While the Department is beyond the curve on this, a plan is now in place. First, the Department impaneled an Assessment Subcommittee on its Standing Committee on Teaching Effectiveness so assessment is now institutionalized in the Department. Second, that Subcommittee now is at work development an initial assessment instrument that will produce measure results for this academic year. The most direct approach being considered is a survey that will elicit attitudinal data assessing how our students measure up with respect to SLO8. There will be surveys for attitudes involving engagement with national (POLI 1090) and international (POLI 1050) issues. Third, the data will be aggregated at the end of spring semester and distributed to the faculty. Fourth, there will be a faculty meeting at the end of spring semester devoted exclusively to a discussion of the implications of the findings for how we teach the courses, and how we might improve the means of assessment. All of this should place the Department firmly on track to utilize valid assessment measures to improve our delivery of GED courses.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   Please see above

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
Core Curriculum Assessment Report
2013_14

Department: Political Science
Representative: Gerry Gryski
Course Name / number: POLI1090/1097

6. **Additional Comments:**
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

7. **Committee Comments**
   Mean of rubric score = 1.29 (out of 4)
   I think this submission is wrong headed in almost every respect. It begins by saying that the department "has been slow in aligning its assessment efforts in GED courses with the way the University wants those courses to be assessed." As far as I understand it, this completely misses the point. The department is to design its own assessments -- if the department feels as though it has a robust enough assessing procedure, even if it is diverse and unique to the professor, then it should aim only to find ways to translate that robust program into results that we can read. It may take some work, but we need some original thought and insight when it comes to assessing large classrooms with minimal TA support. The method that the department has chosen to follow now -- surveys -- will probably not be very informative, given the results from other departments. In other words, if the department feels as though its informal way of assessing for SLO 8 is good enough, then it should just concentrate on making the results of that informal way a bit more formal, rather than assessing in a way that it doesn't seem all that excited about (or, frankly, has put much real thought into). While they highlight the diverse measurement of course materials in relation to SLO 8 they did not aggregate the information.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   The Political Science Department has been slow in aligning its assessment efforts in GED courses with the way the University wants those courses to be assessed. This is not to say that there has been no assessment of those courses. In fact a review of course syllabi for POLI 1050 and 1090 for AY 2011-12 shows a rich and diverse battery of means by which to assess student success in meeting course goals. Students are given the traditional midterm and final examinations or other regular general tests during the semester. There are also numerous quiz formats, typically of course readings. Despite the resource constraints involved in teaching large sections with minimal GTA support, instructors typically build regular or extra credit writing assignments into the course framework. Usually these are thought pieces, based on course reading assignments or web-based applications. Student success also is assessed through other means such as simulations, and participation in blogs and chats. Some instructors administer surveys to students that contain various indicators of subject matter mastery and engagement in politics—either at the end of the semester or in a pre-/post- test format at the beginning and end of the semester. This is a very prominent approach to assessment in the Political Science discipline. The major point here is that a good bit of assessment is and has been conducted in Political Science GED courses for some time. The plurality of approaches and indicators used is entirely appropriate, especially in that there is no “silver bullet” in assessment of social science learning, which is to say one disciplinary-endorsed approach. The pluralism in assessment thus should be applauded as it informs the assessment effort itself. Having said all of this, the fact remains that POLI 1050 and 1090 must be subjected to some Department-wide assessment, even while allowing for additional and individualized assessment tools at the discretion of instructors. While the Department is beyond the curve on this, a plan is now in place. First, the Department impaneled an Assessment Subcommittee on its Standing Committee on Teaching Effectiveness so assessment is now institutionalized in the Department. Second, that Subcommittee now is at work developing an initial assessment instrument that will produce measure results for this academic year. The most direct approach being considered is a survey that will elicit attitudinal data assessing how our students measure up with respect to SLO8. There will be surveys for attitudes involving engagement with national (POLI 1090) and international (POLI 1050) issues. Third, the data will be aggregated at the end of spring semester and distributed to the faculty. Fourth, there will be a faculty meeting at the end of spring semester devoted exclusively to a discussion of the implications of the findings for how we teach the courses, and how we might improve the means of assessment. All of this should place the Department firmly on track to utilize valid assessment measures to improve our delivery of GED courses.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   Please see above.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

Assessment Subcommittee will aggregate the data and there will be a department-wide discussion of how to use the findings to improve delivery of the course and attainment of SLO8.

6. Additional Comments:
[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

7. Committee Comments
Mean of rubric score = 1.29 (out of 4) I think this submission is wrong headed in almost every respect. It begins by saying that the department "has been slow in aligning its assessment efforts in GED courses with the way the University wants those courses to be assessed." As far as I understand it, this completely misses the point. The department is to design its own assessments -- if the department feels as though it has a robust enough assessing procedure, even if it is diverse and unique to the professor, then it should aim only to find ways to translate that robust program into results that we can read. It may take some work, but we need some original thought and insight when it comes to assessing large classrooms with minimal TA support. The method that the department has chosen to follow now -- surveys -- will probably not be very informative, given the results from other departments. In other words, if the department feels as though its informal way of assessing for SLO 8 is good enough, then it should just concentrate on making the results of that informal way a bit more formal, rather than assessing in a way that it doesn't seem all that excited about (or, frankly, has put much real thought into). /This is just simply unacceptable as a way of thinking about measuring SLOs. I think someone needs to give these folks some assistance pretty quickly. /For the future While they highlight the diverse measurement of course materials in relation to SLO 8 they did not aggregate the information.
Core Curriculum Assessment Report
2013_14

Department: Geology and Geography
Representative: David T. King, Jr.
Course Name / number: SCMH1010/1017

1. AGSC Content Area of Alignment: Area III: Science and Math

2. SLO(s) being assessed: Student will..
   SLO 10: Students will understand and appreciate methods and issues of science and technology.

3. Assessment Method(s):
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].
   See attached report.

4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?
   See attached report.

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]
   See attached report.

6. Additional Comments:
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   See attached report.

7. Committee Comments
   Mean of rubric score = 3.56 (out of 4) Lack of pre-test prevents committee from understanding the attainment of student competency levels
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area III: Science and Math

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...
   
   SLO 4: Students will be able to apply simple mathematical methods to the solution of real-world problems.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]

   We collected data by giving tests at the beginning of the fall semester 2011, and based on the analysis of this data, we obtained the histogram and pie chart, which are given in the file attached herewith.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   See the pie chart and histogram for detailed percentages in attached file (section 4).

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

   Based on the discussion with the Chair, we decided to start the process of updating the tests and to plan having separate tests for this course. Also, whenever possible, we will put more experienced and seasoned instructors to teach this course besides having more close supervision of the instructors by more experienced faculty.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

   NIL

7. **Committee Comments**
   
   Mean rubric score= 2.22Report indicates that there is evaluation of the learning outcome across the math courses and that revision of the test items needs to occur, report suggest to have more seasoned faculty teaching courses and closer supervision of instruction by more experienced faculty. The writer indicates that separate tests for each course are needed.; seeing the test questions, especially as they pertain to each measure, would really help the evaluation process.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area III: Science and Math

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...
   
   SLO 4: Students will be able to apply simple mathematical methods to the solution of real-world problems.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]
   
   We did the statistical comparison between pre- and post-test scores, and the statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses for each question of the post- and pre-tests.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   Based on the analysis of assessment data from various assessment methods, we obtained the histograms, curves, and pie charts. The hypotheses tests show that the score of the post-test was higher than the pre-test with a 95% significant level. Statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses (PRR) of each question show that the PRR of the post-test was higher than pre-test for many of the questions. See attached file for details.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]
   
   Although we have seen improvement on student learning, but based on the discussion with the Chair, we decided to start the process of updating the tests and to plan having separate tests for this course. Also, whenever possible, we will put more experienced and seasoned instructors to teach this course besides having more close supervision of the instructors by more experienced faculty.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   
   NIL

7. **Committee Comments**

   Mean rubric score = 2.22Report indicates that there is evaluation of the learning outcome across the math courses and that revision of the test items needs to occur, report suggest to have more seasoned faculty teaching courses and closer supervision of instruction by more experienced faculty. The writer indicates that separate tests for each course are needed.; seeing the test questions, especially as they pertain to each measure, would really help the evaluation process
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area III: Science and Math

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..
   
   SLO 4: Students will be able to apply simple mathematical methods to the solution of real-world problems.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].
   
   We collected data by giving tests at the end of the fall semester 2011, and based on the analysis of this data, we obtained the histogram and pie chart, which are given in the file attached herewith.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   See the pie chart and histogram for detailed percentages in attached file (section 4).

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]
   
   Based on the discussion with the Chair, we decided to start the process of updating the tests and to plan having separate tests for this course. Also, whenever possible, we will put more experienced and seasoned instructors to teach this course besides having more close supervision of the instructors by more experienced faculty.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   
   NIL

7. **Committee Comments**
   
   Mean rubric score = 2.22Report indicates that there is evaluation of the learning outcome across the math courses and that revision of the test items needs to occur, report suggest to have more seasoned faculty teaching courses and closer supervision of instruction by more experienced faculty. The writer indicates that separate tests for each course are needed.; seeing the test questions, especially as they pertain to each measure, would really help the evaluation process
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area III: Science and Math

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..
   
   SLO 4: Students will be able to apply simple mathematical methods to the solution of real-world problems.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]

   We did the statistical comparison between pre- and pro-test scores, and the statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses for each question of the pre- and pro-tests.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   Based on the analysis of assessment data from various assessment methods, we obtained the histograms, curves, and pie charts. The hypotheses tests show that the score of the pro-test was higher than the pre-test with a 95% significant level. Statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses (PRR) of each question show that the PRR of the pro-test was higher than pre-test for many of the questions.  See attached file for details.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

   Although we have seen improvement on student learning, but based on the discussion with the Chair, we decided to start the process of updating the tests and to plan having separate tests for this course. Also, whenever possible, we will put more experienced and seasoned instructors to teach this course besides having more close supervision of the instructors by more experienced faculty.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

   NIL

7. **Committee Comments**

   Mean rubric score = 2.22 Report indicates that there is evaluation of the learning outcome across the math courses and that revision of the test items needs to occur, report suggest to have more seasoned faculty teaching courses and closer supervision of instruction by more experienced faculty. The writer indicates that separate tests for each course are needed; seeing the test questions, especially as they pertain to each measure, would really help the evaluation process.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area III: Science and Math

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..
   
   SLO 4: Students will be able to apply simple mathematical methods to the solution of real-world problems.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]
   
   We did the statistical comparison between pre- and pro-test scores, and the statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses for each question of the pre- and pro-tests.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   Based on the analysis of assessment data from various assessment methods, we obtained the histograms, curves, and pie charts. The hypotheses tests show that the score of the pro-test was higher than the pre-test with a 90% significant level. Statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses (PRR) of each question show that the PRR of the pro-test was not higher than pre-test for most of the questions. See attached file for details.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]
   
   Based on the data analysis, improvement is needed for this course. After discussion with the Chair, we agreed that more experienced and seasoned instructors needed to teach this course, besides having more close supervision of the instructors by more experienced faculty. Also, we decided to start the process of updating the tests and to plan having separate tests for this course.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   
   NIL

7. **Committee Comments**
   
   Mean rubric score = 2.22Report indicates that there is evaluation of the learning outcome across the math courses and that revision of the test items needs to occur, report suggest to have more seasoned faculty teaching courses and closer supervision of instruction by more experienced faculty. The writer indicates that separate tests for each course are needed.; seeing the test questions, especially as they pertain to each measure, would really help the evaluation process.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will..

   SLO 9: Students will understand and appreciate diversity of an within societies of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You my cut/paste rubics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

   See attached report

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**

   See attached report

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**

   [What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]  

   See attached report

6. **Additional Comments:**

   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

   See attached report

7. **Committee Comments**

   Mean rubric score= 3.45 (out of 4) No pre-test is given to evaluate student learning competency prior to completing the course. Additionally, one test does not fully evaluate student attainment of SLO 9. The creation of a critical analysis workbook could potentially be a great way for faculty to consistently promote critical analysis. Faculty understand the importance and plan on continuing discussions about how to ensure that assessment methods are reflecting all three measures of SLO 9.
1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...

   SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

   [Provide a detailed explanation here.]

   Assessment was conducted using sets of questions included in final examinations for sections of the core courses ECON2020 (Microeconomics) and ECON2030 (Macroeconomics). The questions were developed by a committee of instructors for the relevant courses. Different questions were written for the Micro and Macro courses due to substantial variation in the applicability of their content to the goals and purposes of SLO8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world. Just prior to the development of the questions (4-15-2013), the GenEd committee produced a new set of rubrics to use in evaluation of all of the SLOs, and the nature of the new rubric for SLO8 was used by us to craft our questions. We tested 569 students in spring 2013 sections of ECON2020, Microeconomics, and 275 students in spring 2012 Microeconomics (ECON2030), for a total of 844 total students. (In comparison, our evaluation for 2011-2012 included 897 students, so the scope of our sampling is similar to what we used in the past.) Analysis of the new rubric for SLO8 suggested to us the following division of skills to be demonstrated by the students: the first component refers to knowledge of basic economic systems and institutions; a second component asks that students demonstrate the ability to analyze (economic) systems. For Microeconomics (ECON2030), our questions were:

   1. Which of the following is NOT a function that money serves in the U.S. economy? A) store of value. B) unit of account. C) medium of barter. D) medium of exchange.
   2. Consider the structure of the U.S. Federal Reserve System. The Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC) consists of: A) the 12 Federal Reserve Bank Presidents. B) five of the Federal Reserve Bank Presidents. C) the seven member Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve. D) the Board of Governors plus the five of the Federal Reserve Bank Presidents.
   3. Consider the way that the U.S. Federal Reserve controls the money supply. Suppose the required reserve ratio, rr, is 5%. What does the Fed have to do in order for the money supply to increase by $100 million? A) sell $50 million in government bonds. B) buy $5 million in government bonds. C) buy $50 million in government bonds.
   4. Congress often attempts to impact the U.S. economy through a variety of different fiscal policies. Which of the following is an example of a change in discretionary fiscal policy? A) $1 trillion stimulus package passed by Congress in 2009 to combat recession. B) an increase in unemployment insurance payments during a recession. C) an increase in income tax receipts with rising income during an expansion. D) a decrease in food stamps issued during an expansion or boom.

   The questions in Microeconomics (Econ 2020) were:

   Q1. Most of the advanced market economies around the world have labor markets that are subject to numerous regulations. Changes in regulations that reduce labor costs to employers are likely to: a. Increase the capital intensity of production. b. Raise the prices of final goods. c. Increase employment. d. Decrease firm profits.

   Q2. Consider our basic demand and supply model for a market economy. An increase in the demand for a product is most likely to result in a large price increase for the product if: a. The supply curve of the product is very elastic. b. The good is produced using high priced inputs. c. The supply curve for the product is very inelastic. d. The good is produced using low priced inputs.

   Q3. Consider our most basic model of a market economy. The “Law of Demand” holds that: a. The price and quantity demanded of a good are negatively
related, other things equal.b. The price and production cost of a good are positively related, other things equal.c. The price and demand for a good are positively related, other things equal. d. The price of a good in a market will adjust to reflect the cost of the good.

Q4. Consider the way different goods and services are classified in a market economy. A “public good” refers to a good that is paid for by the government. b. A good that is produced by a competitive industry. c. A good that benefits public sector workers only. d. A good whose quantity supplied is not reduced as more people consume it. We tested a total of n=844 students.

4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?

In aggregate, our findings are as follows. For Macroeconomics, knowledge questions (Q1 and Q2) saw correct answers from 75.5% and 41.0%, respectively. For the analytics (Q3 and Q4), we obtained correct responses from 71.3% and 51.3%. In Microeconomics, Analytic Questions (Q1 and Q2) produced correct answers in 80.8% and 69.4% of cases. Knowledge questions (Q3 and Q4) yielded 69.9% and 65%, respectively.

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?

[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

After discussion we decided to apply the following simple metric: if 80% or more of the students are able, after their principles class, to correctly perform the required task (either analysis or knowledge demonstration), we would consider the result to correspond to “advanced” level as described in the rubric. Similarly, a 60% performance would represent “intermediate” status, and so on. By this metric, we have a ways to go: although correct answers are highly correlated among students (i.e., a student who answered one question correctly had a heightened chance of answering another correctly, across all questions), advanced analytic abilities are demonstrated by only a minority of students. More students appear to perform at the intermediate level. Some surprising gaps were noted: many principles students in microeconomics appear not to understand the basic notion of a “public good”, which is fundamental to economic understanding of the roles of public institutions and government. On investigation, this appears to be due primarily to one large section which, for various reasons, did not cover this idea in much depth.

6. Additional Comments:

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

7. Committee Comments

CCGEC Comments