UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
PULASKI TECH

Assessment Report: General Education 2020-2021 Program Level

The University of Arkansas – Pulaski Technical College calls for each program (AS, AA, AAS, CP, and TC) to have an assessment plan for each academic year that includes the following:

- **Program learning outcomes**
- **Procedures for assessing the achievement of student learning**
- **Procedures for analyzing and interpreting assessment results for the continuous improvement of the program.**

A primary goal for each instructional department's assessment is to include at least one direct measure of student learning, which is accomplished usually through the use of locally developed tests, student portfolios, capstone assessment measures, embedded assignments, or through licensure exams and standardized national tests. In addition to direct measures, most areas may also use indirect methods to assess student achievement. Graduation rates and graduation and employer surveys are frequently used as indirect indicators of student achievement.

This form presents template of questions that must, at minimum, be addressed by instructional departments when filing an assessment plan. While an electronic version of this form will be made available, instructional departments may include additional information not specifically addressed in this form as long as the template questions are addressed.

Other Assessment Considerations:

- The College expects programs/departments/divisions to make curriculum changes and budget requests based in part upon assessment findings. Assessment of student learning should be a catalyst for quality instruction and improvement across the college community.
- All programs will be asked to submit an annual assessment report to the Assessment Committee by October 10 of each year. (If October 10 falls on a weekend, please submit reports on the following Monday.)
- For technical and occupational programs, please consider the role of your advisory committee in your student learning objectives.

This form must be completed by October 10 of each academic year. Complete each part of this form. Please follow highlighted instructions.

Part A: Identification and Student Learning Outcomes

1. Name of program: *General Education*

2. Names of individuals compiling report: *Members of the General Education Curriculums and Alliances Committee: Jennifer Atkins-Gordeeva, Chelsea Choate, Shelley Hanson, Barry McVinney, and Mark Perry*

3. Date of submission: *November 9, 2021*

4. Academic year: *2020-2021*

5. Is the assessment plan (*Check or highlight one*)

☐ an initial plan for the program ☒ a revision of an old plan ☐ unaltered from previous year

6. Provide a mission statement of the program to include a description of the jobs/careers for which students are being prepared. Also, list the learning outcomes for your program.

It is the goal of the General Education program at the University of Arkansas – Pulaski Tech to develop a foundation for the lifelong pursuit of learning in all students and prepare them for university transfer. Our core classes are designed to enable students to develop to their fullest potential by communicating effectively and developing knowledge and skills necessary for critical inquiry in an ever-changing world.

Programs of Study included in the General Education Assessment Process include the following:

- Associate of Arts
- Associate of Science in Liberal Arts and Sciences
- Associate of Science in Business
- Associate of Science in Education
- Associate of Science in Technology and Engineering
- Associate of General Studies* and Certificate of General Studies**

Once students have completed one of the above listed Associate degrees at UAPTC the student will be able to:

GELO 1: Communicate Effectively: Create oral presentations or written compositions that are informative, well-reasoned, organized and demonstrate knowledge of conventions.
GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively: Apply mathematical methods using symbolic, graphical, numerical, and written representations to solve problems using modeling and/or general problem-solving processes, and use appropriate technology to construct or analyze quantitative data to draw conclusions about the reasonableness of the results.
GELO 3: Analyze Works: Analyze major works of fine arts or literature and articulate the analysis using terminology or methodologies appropriate in the field.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts: Synthesize information through a historical or social lens that demonstrates proficiency in the usage of terms and concepts relevant to the social sciences.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries: Apply the scientific method, understand the criteria for scientific evidence and use that evidence to draw conclusions and make informed decisions.

7. Complete the curriculum map below. Please mark an X in the map below to indicate which courses correspond with learning outcomes. If applicable, you can also use I, D, or M to indicate that a learning outcome is introduced, developed to foster more sophistication, or demonstrated at a level of mastery acceptable for graduation within the program. Additional courses may be marked with an R to indicate reinforcement of a program learning outcome.

Supporting Courses	GELO 1	GELO 2	GELO 3	GELO 4	GELO 5
	Communicate Effectively	Reason Quantitatively	Analyze Works	Synthesize Concepts	Make Scientific Inquiries
ANTH 2310 Cultural Anthropology				X	
ARTS 2300 Introduction to Visual Art			X		
BIOL 1400 Biology for General Education (Lecture)					X
BIOL 1100 Biology for General Education (Lab)					X
BIOL 1401 Biological Science (Lecture)					X
BIOL 1102 Biological Science (Lab)					X
ECON 2323 Principles of Macroeconomics				X	
ENGL 1311 English Composition I	X				
ENGL 1312 English Composition II	X				
ENGL 2337 World Literature from the Beginning to 1650			X		
ENGL 2338 World Literature from 1650 to Present			X		
HIST 1311 History of Civilization I				X	
HIST 1312 History of Civilization II				X	
HIST 2311 U.S. History to 1877				X	
HIST 2312 U.S. History since 1877				X	
MATH 1302 College Algebra		X			
MATH 1300 Mathematical Reasoning		X			
MUSC 2300 Introduction to Music			X		
PHIL 1310 Introduction to Philosophy			X		
PHYS 1307 Earth Science (Lecture)					X
PHYS 1107 Earth Science (Lab)					X
PHYS 1300 Physical Science (Lecture)					X
PHYS 1100 Physical Science (Lab)					X
POLS 1310 American National Government				X	
PSYC 2300 Psychology and the Human Experience				X	
SOCI 2300 Introduction to Sociology				X	
SPCH 1300 Speech Communication	X				
THEA 2300 Introduction to Theater			X		

8. How does your assessment report connect to institutional learning outcomes?

To help with mapping your assessment data to the school's overall institutional outcomes, please check the boxes for the institutional outcomes directly associated with the assessment data presented in this report. For details on each outcome, see Appendix A.

X ILO #1 – Information Literacy. This ILO connects to GELO's 1 and 3.

X ILO #2 – Technology Literacy. This ILO connects to GELO's 1 and 3.

X ILO #3 – Communication. This ILO connects to GELO 1.

X ILO #4 – Critical Thinking. This ILO connects to GELO's 3, 4, and 5.

X ILO #5 – Quantitative Reasoning. This ILO connects to GELO 2.

X ILO #6 – Cultural Awareness. This ILO is loosely connected to GELO's 3 and 4.

☐ ILO #7 – Professionalism

Part B: Assessment Methods and Data Sources

In this section of the assessment plan, learning outcomes for the program will be defined. Also, assessment methods and data sources for each outcome must be defined. Follow the instructions below to define and relate the program learning outcomes.

1. **Complete the chart below or attach documentation of the assessment process that includes the data included below.**

Program Learning Outcomes	**Course**	**Assessment Method and/or Data Source**
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	ENGL 1311 English Composition I	Direct - portfolio - contains evidence of course outcomes through paper assignments, invention techniques, and rough drafts as well as a final reflection that discusses development of those skills. Graded using a standard rubric that is normed and tested. Course Learning Outcomes 1, 2, 3, and 6 correspond to GELO 1. The portfolio is used to measure all of these. CLO 1: Rhetorical Knowledge. Respond appropriately to various rhetorical situations, purposes, and audiences CLO 2: Critical Thinking. Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating CLO 3: Academic Integrity. Integrate original ideas with those of others. CLO 6: Knowledge of Conventions. Demonstrate knowledge of structure, paragraphing, tone, mechanics, syntax, grammar, and documentation.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Method and/or Data Source
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	ENGL 1312 English Composition II	Direct - portfolio - contains evidence of course outcomes through paper assignments, invention techniques, and rough drafts as well as a final reflection that discusses development of those skills. Graded using a standard rubric that is normed and tested. Course Learning Outcomes 2 and 3 correspond to GELO 1. The portfolio is used to measure both. CLO 2: Critical Thinking/Writing and Reading. Use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating CLO 3: Academic Integrity. Integrate original ideas with those of others.
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	SPCH 1300 Speech Communication	Indirect – student assessment of presentation in portfolio– Students assess their performance on their introduction speech on verbal and nonverbal presentation skills. CLO 3: Demonstrate effective verbal and non-verbal presentation skills.
GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively	MATH 1302 College Algebra	Direct – exam. A common, comprehensive, multiple choice final exam is used. It is administered online through MyMathLab. The CLO's addressed: CLO 1: The ability to perform and solve basic function operations and algebraic problems using appropriate vocabulary. CLO 2: Critical thinking to formulate decisions and problem solving based on reasoning and analysis. CLO 3: The appropriate use of technology to supplement and enhance conceptual understanding, visualization, and inquiry. CLO 4: The ability to synthesize information from a variety of sources to solve problems and interpret results.
GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively	MATH 1300 Mathematical Reasoning	Direct – exam. Students complete the final comprehensive two-hour exam in MyLab, but also submit their written work to their instructor, through Blackboard. Course level instructors developed the final exam, and selected the questions aligned to each course learning outcome. The CLO's addressed are: CLO 1: Identifying problem-solving strategies and applying them to contemporary everyday problems, both in work and in personal lives. CLO 2: Analyzing reports from media to determine completeness and accuracy noting assumptions both stated and unstated. CLO 3: Critiquing public consumer and political information for better understanding, completeness, and accuracy.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	ARTS 2300 Introduction to Visual Art	Direct – short paper (3-5 pgs.) - visual analysis, which identifies and analyzes elements of art/principles of design and uses appropriate vocabulary to discuss artwork, using a standard rubric. CLO 1: Identify and analyze visual elements and principles of design. CLO 2: Write a short analysis based on an original work of art using terminology appropriate to the course. CLO 3: Identify varied media associated with art processes. Identify selected works of various artists.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Method and/or Data Source
GELO 3: Analyze Works	ENGL 2337 World Literature from the Beginning to 1650	Direct - essay - literary analysis, which articulates a clear thesis statement and incorporates secondary sources, using a standardized rubric. CLO 4: Complete a significant analytical writing component. Students will write a minimum of 10 pages total in analytical assignments that will be divided between a number of shorter writing assignments and at least one longer literary analysis essay that will incorporate multiple critical sources and discuss historical and cultural connections. Implied within the report: that "critical thinking" and "literary context" are being assessed and reported. Though it is clear how those might relate to GELO 3, the stated CLO 4 does not clearly connect.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	ENGL 2338 World Literature from 1650 to Present	Direct –analytical writing literary essay; using a standardized rubric. ACTS: "Complete a significant analytical writing component." Students will write a minimum of 10 pages total in analytical assignments that will be divided between a number of shorter writing assignments and at least one longer literary analysis essay that will incorporate multiple critical sources and discuss historical and cultural connections. Assessment report: "Students will write a minimum of 10 pages total in analytical papers…"
GELO 3: Analyze Works	MUSC 2300 Introduction to Music	Direct – Culminating Essay (2 pgs.) - subjective and objective observations of a concert performance; also demonstrating knowledge gained from listening & reading assignments during semester; using a rubric. CLO – Experience, observe, and react – Attend a live performance (or view online during the pandemic) and write a critique of the experience using terminology appropriate to the course.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	PHIL 1310 Introduction to Philosophy	Direct – essay or essay exams (depending on class/instructor), which clearly & concisely explain philosophical issues, and develop criticisms or arguments in agreement, using a standardized rubric. CLO 1: Students should demonstrate a familiarity with important philosophical topics such as metaphysics, philosophy of religion, epistemology, philosophy of mind, ethics, and value. This will include classic as well as modern philosophers from all over the world, although most emphasis will be placed on the Western tradition. CLO 2: Students should demonstrate the ability to explain abstract ideas in concrete terms, critically analyze philosophical views, and develop their own arguments.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	THEA 2300 Introduction to Theater	No data is available for this course.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	ANTH 2310 Cultural Anthropology	Direct – Discussion Question in Blackboard - "Explain the process of ethnographic fieldwork and discuss the impact ethnocentrism might have on that process." - Question overlaps with ACTS objective 3 & 5. The assessment is for ACTS objective 2: Understanding of ethnocentrism and cultural relativity. There is overlap with CLO's 3 and 5.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Method and/or Data Source
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	ECON 2323 Principles of Macroeconomics	Direct - due to COVID, assessment format was changed to a Final Exam – encompasses all CLO's (e.g., Monetary Policy, Money and Banking, and Fiscal Policy) in both multiple choice and essay forms. CLOs assessed corresponding to GELO 4 were: Identify, describe and/or apply the concepts of Aggregate Supply and Demand, National Income Accounting, Business Cycles, Money and Banking, Fiscal Policy, Monetary Policy, Economic Growth, and International Finance (Trade).
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 1311 History of Civilization I	Direct – Essay Questions – identifying a specific topic (e.g., an early civilization) and demonstrating critical thinking, communication & historical understanding, and cultural awareness, using a standard rubric. This is the assessed CLO for this year: "Communication and Historical Understanding. The student will develop and utilize critical thinking and communication skills in order to gain historical perspective."
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 1312 History of Civilization II	Direct – Essay Questions – identifying a specific topic (e.g., an absolute ruler) and demonstrating critical thinking, communication & historical understanding, and cultural awareness, using a standard rubric. This is the assessed CLO for this year: "Communication and Historical Understanding. The student will develop and utilize critical thinking and communication skills in order to gain historical perspective."
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 2311 U.S. History to 1877	Direct – writing exercises (short answers and essays) demonstrating critical thinking, communication & historical understanding, and cultural awareness, using a standard rubric. CLOs assessed corresponding to GELO 4 were: I. Critical Thinking. Students will develop and utilize critical thinking skills in order to gain a historical perspective. II. Communication and Historical Understanding. Students will develop and utilize critical thinking and communication skills in order to gain historical perspective. III. Cultural Awareness. Students will demonstrate awareness of cultural differences.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 2312 U.S. History since 1877	Direct – writing exercises (short answers and essays) demonstrating critical thinking, communication & historical understanding, and cultural awareness; using a standard rubric. CLOs assessed corresponding to GELO 4 were: I. Critical Thinking. Students will develop and utilize critical thinking skills in order to gain a historical perspective. II. Communication and Historical Understanding. Students will develop and utilize critical thinking and communication skills in order to gain historical perspective. III. Cultural Awareness. Students will demonstrate awareness of cultural differences.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Method and/or Data Source
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	POLS 1310 American National Government	Direct – Essay – based on cumulative knowledge of the course (CLO 1, CLO 2, CLO 3), using a rubric. CLO 1 – prepared for active citizenship and demonstrate an ongoing interest in national and global politics. CLO 2 – critique arguments concerning state and federal policy. CLO 3 – demonstrate substantive knowledge of institutions, processes and values that shape politics within and among states and national government.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	PSYC 2300 Psychology and the Human Experience	Direct – Final Exam. Discussion has begun to include other types of assessment: e.g., adding a final project, practical application and writing assignments. PSYC 2300 uses the ACTS learning outcomes. CLOs assessed corresponding to GELO 4 were: The student will distinguish among major schools of thought and their historical backgrounds. The student will demonstrate an understanding of basic research methods in psychology The student will be able to explain, describe, discuss, recognize, and/or apply knowledge and understanding of the following: · Historical and contemporary perspectives in psychology · Recognition of the cognitive, biological, and social/cultural influences of behavior · Application of psychological knowledge in everyday life and real-world-contexts
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	SOCI 2300 Introduction to Sociology	Direct – Class Project to assess CLO 4 (Social Stratification in the Global Perspective) broken down into two parts: Students look at 20 scenarios and identify what form of poverty/measure of resource inequality is described. Short Essay – students define and describe various forms of poverty that exist in societies throughout the world. CLO assessed corresponding to GELO 4 was: CLO 4: Students will describe the relationship between social institutions, socialization, social inequality, and global disparities in health, wealth, and human development.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1300 Biology for General Education*, also called Biology for Non-Majors Lecture	Direct – essay CLO 2: Describe the characteristics and basic needs of living organisms. Indirect – set of ten questions on a standardized test CLO 3: Analyze the processes of growth and inheritance in individuals and populations. Standardized test of their knowledge and understanding of cell division (mitosis and meiosis).
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1100 Biology for General Education*,	Indirect – set of ten questions on a standardized test. CLO 3: Analyze the processes of growth and inheritance in individuals and populations.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Method and/or Data Source
	also called Biology for Non-Majors Lab	There were 10 common multiple-choice questions; these questions will be testing their knowledge and understanding of cell division (mitosis and meiosis).
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1302 Biological Science*	Direct – exam questions, essay. The department assessed the three CLOs with a direct measure. Three quizzes, one per CLO, are administered to students following chapters 3, 6, and 8. These chapters correlate to CLOs 1, 2 and 3. Faculty members administer the quizzes and report the data to the course lead. The data and effectiveness are discussed by the faculty. CLO 1: Define the levels of the organization and related functions of bacteria, plants, and animals. CLO 2: Describe the characteristics and basic needs of living organisms. CLO 3: Analyze the processes of growth and inheritance in individuals and populations. In the class students were also required to produce a paper covering an environmental impact report. This paper is scored using the rubric developed by the faculty members, its results are shown in this assessment, and they address GELO 5 and the ILO for Information Literacy.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1102 Biological Science* Lab	Direct – essay. CLO 1: Test a hypothesis that is formulated from observations. CLO 1 is measured directly through a student lab paper. The collected experimental data is used to prepare a journal style scientific paper. CLO 2 is measured directly through a student examination and laboratory practical, but the results are not reported here.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1307 Earth Science Lecture	Direct – Exam, and research paper. The final cumulative exam measures CLO's 2-6 and Research paper measures CLO 1. CLO 1: The student will be able to apply the scientific method to aid in problem solving and will be able to use multiple different measurement systems. CLO 2: The student will be able to identify the particles that make up an atom and how those particles interact with other atoms to create bonds via chemical reactions involving the earth materials such as minerals and rocks. CLO 3: The student will be able to explain the occurrence of some of the natural phenomenon such as Earthquakes, volcanism, glacial formations, plate tectonics, weathering, and erosion. Student will also be able to describe how earth processes create hazards to life and property CLO 4: The student will be able to distinguish between weather and climate and list the major gases composing Earth's atmosphere. CLO 5: The student will be able to discuss the extent and distribution of oceans and continents on earth, summarize various techniques used to map the ocean floor and discuss the factors that create and influence surface ocean currents and effects these currents have on climate. CLO 6: The student will be able to explain the principle of uniformitarianism/catastrophism, distinguish between numerical and relative dating, define fossils and principles to determine a time sequence of geologic events, outlines the major stages in Earth's evolution and geologic events.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Method and/or Data Source
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1107 Earth Science Lab	Direct – Lab. The lab data for the assigned experiment is collected and analyzed for the assessment purpose each semester. CLO 3: "Students will apply Earth Science concepts to various processes in the lab setting."
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1300 Physical Science*	Direct – Exams. In the fall, CLO's 1 and 2 are assessed with the Chemistry Assessment, then CLO's 1-4 are assessed with the final. In the spring, CLO's 3 and 4 are assessed with the Physics Assessment, then CLO's 1-4 are assessed with the final; the finals assessment and CLO 4 are not accounted for here. CLO 1: The student will be able to apply the scientific method to aid in problem solving and will be able to use multiple different measurement systems. CLO 2: The student will be able to identify the particles that make up an atom and how those particles interact with other atoms to create bonds via chemical reactions. CLO 3: The student will be able to analyze motion and calculate measures of motion along with how force changes and object's motion.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1100 Physical Science (Lab)	Direct – Lab. CLO 3 is being assessed: "The student will analyze motion, its relationship to force, and the effects of objects in motion when they collide with each other."

2. **Please check or highlight all statements below that apply to your program assessment. Also, for each program outcome, if applicable, attach any assessment instruments, grading rubrics, or exemplars of student performance used at the program level.**

   ☐ Rubrics and/or standardized tests were pilot-tested and refined.

   ☐ Rubrics were shared with students.

   ☐ Reviewers were calibrated with high inter-rater reliability or norming workshops.

   X None of the above.

Because we assess the General Education program by reviewing reports from the supporting courses' annual course level reports, we have not yet assessed our assessments. We rely on the supporting courses to share, refine, and calibrate their rubrics and other assessment methods. Fall of 2020 and Spring of 2021 included a review of all AY 2019-2020 course level reports to ascertain our ability to make claims concerning whether students in our General Education program had met GELO's 3, 4, and 5. Following that review, and its conclusion that we were not able to make claims from those reports, GECA worked with the AAC to make changes in language and data. These changes are described in item B9, below.
Starting in Spring 2022, we will begin to assess our method of assessment.

3. **Also discuss any additional data sources that may be used to gauge success (e.g., charts, graphs, surveys, rates).**

Because the General Education program serves many programs in the institution, one might use the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 enrollment reports, found at https://uaptc.edu/ie/data, to

indirectly assess the program's success. At the time of this writing, 2019-2020 graduation rates are not available.

Despite the success of our students as shown in this report with direct measures, we are concerned about retention of our students. That indirect measure might tell more of the story. Those students who complete our courses show facility with the GELO's. Students who do not complete the courses are not represented here. Despite generally high CLO success and high GELO success, too many students are still not successful in our courses. By the end of the semester students remain on our rosters yet they do not complete assessments. Individual course level reports in GELOs 2 and 5 have noted this fact, but we have not fully represented it here.

4. **Describe the process of analyzing the assessment data, including specific discussion of results and collaboration among faculty in the program, for the last academic year. Also, check below any of the following statements that apply to your program assessment.**

The twenty-eight core courses identified as the General Education core submitted assessment reports in September. Each report is compiled from the data provided by all faculty teaching the course during that academic year. For this report, it was AY2020-2021 data. Each course has a designated faculty lead that is responsible for typing and submitting the final report; however, all faculty, full and part-time, are responsible for submitting data and contributing to the conversation that adds to the collective report.

The twenty-eight reports are then collected and submitted to each of the three school assessment leads (School of Math, Science, and Allied Health, School of Technical and Professional Studies, and School of Fine Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences). The school assessment leads and the assessment chair publish all the reports on the UA-PTC website.

The General Education Committee then uses the twenty-eight reports to complete the Program Level Assessment Report. For the 2020-2021year, a workgroup was established to manage the project. The workgroup included the General Education Committee chair and four additional committee members.

Following examination of the course level reports, a few had incomplete or unclear data, and there were immediate corrections. Because the committee continues to assess with the course level report data, we chose to combine all data from sources using this formula:

% of students who met or surpassed expectations for a GELO =

[(# of students from Course A who met the benchmarks) + (# of students from Course B who met the benchmarks) + (# of students from Course *n* who met the benchmarks)] / [(# of students from Course A who completed the assessment) + (# of students from Course B who completed the asessment) + (# of students from Course *n* who completed the assessment)]

This approach is also how we dealt with multiple reported CLOs that seem to pertain to the aligned GELO. This method has some challenges, and we will consider alternate ways to measure this data.

The first year of this assessment cycle was 2018-2019; it also was the first year of General Education assessment ever at UA-PTC. Following the first draft of GELOs, we changed them and adopted the revised GELOs in Fall 2019, but did not assess with them until this year. This is the third year of this assessment cycle, but it is the first year to use the amended GELOs. An assessment cycle for the Program Learning Objectives (GELOs) has been established and modified by the General Education Committee, as shown here:

Academic Year 2019-2020
- GELO 1: Communicate Effectively
- GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively

Academic Year 2020-2021
- GELO 3: Analyze Critically
- GELO 4: Synthesis Concepts
- GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries

Academic Year 2021-2022
- GELO 1: Communicate Effectively
- GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively

Academic Year 2022-2023
- GELO 3: Analyze Critically
- GELO 4: Synthesis Concepts
- GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries

✠ Comparative data used when interpreting results and deciding on changes for improvements. We will complete this step when comparison data becomes available.

☐ National standards, collaboration with sister programs and/or research data were used to ensure the program was held to high standards.

5. Complete the chart below or attach documentation of the assessment results that includes the data included below. Results should include total number of students assessed, the distribution of scores, relevant and detailed interpretation, student strengths and weaknesses, and whether the target was met.
See Appendix B for the data for this chart.

Program Learning Outcomes	Assessment Results/Conclusion
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively: Create oral presentations or written compositions that are informative, well-reasoned, organized and demonstrate knowledge of conventions.	Total assessments: 2,384 1884 student assessments show that students have met benchmark in courses associated with GELO 1. This is approximately 79% of students assessed for this outcome. These courses clearly connect their CLOs with this GELO: ENGL 1311, ENGL 1312, and SPCH 1300. Our students are strong in these areas relating to effective communication. They are strong using writing and reading for inquiry, learning, and thinking and with academic integrity in

	written communication. Online and concurrent credit ENGL 1311 students scored well in academic integrity and knowledge of conventions in written communication. (See Appendix B.) Some current weaknesses are noted: Only 70% of SPCH 1300 students assessed for verbal and nonverbal communication met the benchmark for that outcome; though this meets the benchmark, attention should be drawn to this result. It is noted that among students assessed for this learning outcome, those in traditional classes were less likely to meet the benchmark than were students in online classes. In addition, only 57% of students in hybrid online (webinar) classes met expectations for academic integrity in ENGL 1311. The target is met for this outcome.
GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively: Apply mathematical methods using symbolic, graphical, numerical, and written representations to solve problems using modeling and/or general problem-solving processes, and use appropriate technology to construct or analyze quantitative data to draw conclusions about the reasonableness of the results.	Total assessments: 1190 ~1012 students met the benchmark in courses associated with GELO 2. This number is approximately 85% of students assessed for this outcome. These courses clearly connect their CLOs with GELO 2: MATH 1300, MATH 1302. Strengths: There is clear improvement from AY 2019-2020 to AY 2020-2021. It is clear that these courses adjusted to meet student needs. Some current weaknesses are noted: There are still too many students who stop attending each semester and stop contacting, despite multiple and varied attempts to communicate and prevent students from disappearing through the semester. Webinar support sections for MATH 1300 showed a drop, so the instruction pivoted to meet student needs. The target is met for this outcome.
GELO 3: Analyze Works: Analyze major works of fine arts or literature and articulate the analysis using terminology or methodologies appropriate in the field.	Total assessments: 989 832 students met the benchmark in courses associated with GELO 3. This number is approximately 84% of students assessed for this outcome. These courses clearly connect their CLOs with this GELO: ARTS 2300, ENGL 2337, ENGL 2338, MUSC 2300, PHIL 1310. Our students were strong in these areas: Intro to Visual Art Instructors noticed improvement to students' writing that they attribute to making available to students examples of outstanding student writing from previous classes. Some current weaknesses are noted: Reluctance of some students to embrace and submit assessment assignments caused some classes to have a lower number of data samples than possible, and sometimes resulted in retention issues with students. The target is met for this outcome.

GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts: Synthesize information through a historical or social lens that demonstrates proficiency in the usage of terms and concepts relevant to the social sciences.	Total assessments: 2,688 2,084 student assessments show that students met the benchmarks in courses associated with GELO 4. This is approximately 78% of students assessed for this outcome. These courses clearly connect their CLOs with GELO 4: ANTH 2310, ECON 2323, HIST 1311, HIST 1312, HIST 2311, HIST 2312, POLS 1310, PSYC 2300, SOCI 2300. Two courses, HIST 1311 and HIST 1312, note that the benchmark was not met for their assessed CLOs. Our students were strong in recognizing, understanding, applying, and using an array of concepts relevant to the social sciences. This proficiency was demonstrated through the breadth of the social science areas assessed. Six different disciplines were included among the courses providing assessment data for GELO 4. Proficiency was also demonstrated by the breadth of assessment instruments used in the courses. Students were assessed with tools including multiple choice and matching items, short answers, essay questions, and class projects. Current weaknesses noted fall into three categories. First, the effects of the pandemic were noted by several courses as problematic to student success. The effects on face-to-face classes were identified as particularly troublesome. A second category involved specific content areas within courses that contributed to student difficulty even when overall success occurred. Examples include challenges with the concepts of "ethnography" and ethnocentrism for Cultural Anthropology and the area of research methods for psychology. Finally, a difficulty reported by more than half of the courses associated with GELO 4 was the percent of students who did not complete the assessment assignments. In courses reporting this issue, up to 22% of students did not complete the assessment. The target is met for this outcome.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries: Apply the scientific method, understand the criteria for scientific evidence and use that evidence to draw conclusions and make informed decisions.	Total assessments: 1211* 1036 students met the benchmarks in courses associated with GELO 5. This is approximately 86% of students assessed for this outcome. These courses clearly connect their CLOs with GELO 5: BIOL 1300, BIOL 1302, BIOL 1102, PHYS 1307, PHYS 1107, PHYS 1300, and PHYS 1100 Our students were strong in these areas: Students in the Earth Sciences courses (PHYS 1300 and PHYS 1107) showed particularly high participation in their assessments and met the benchmarks at high rates, this is partially due to the low numbers of students enrolled in the course. It is not yet clear whether these courses assessed CLOs with this GELO, for this year: BIOL 1100. Though assessment is clear, and

	though the assessed CLO is clearly connected to GELO 5, it is unclear how the assessment method, questions on the exam, completely relate to making scientific inquiries. Some current weaknesses are noted: BIOL 1300 notes that too few students turned in their assessment, a paper. BIOL 1302 notes that Information Literacy, measured by the essay, has the lowest number of available assessments (n=206) among all the assessments in that course and shows the lowest percentage of students who met the threshold, 77.2%. This assessment measure was piloted this year and will be repeated by BIOL 1302. The report and others note retention challenges relating to the pandemic. BIOL 1102 note that the Spring semester was less successful than the Fall, and that that cohort did not meet the benchmark, though they did for the academic year. Faculty in BIOL 1102 are considering a paper assessment. The target is met for this outcome.

6. **Describe your use of results, including planned improvements to the program and/or any follow-up studies that confirmed that changes have improved student learning.**

Currently, we do not have a way of answering this question. We cannot yet compare results from previous years on GELO's 3, 4, or 5.

7. **What specific changes were implemented this year based on last year's results?**

Following 2019-2020's program level report, the General Education Committee worked with the Academic Assessment Committee to identify and correct gaps in information. These gaps included imprecise language, unclear data or terms, and percentages instead of annual numbers. Faculty course leads were supported in Spring 2021 and during 2021-2022 professional development to learn more about assessment and assessment reporting. These efforts resulted in all but one course level report being submitted within the designated period and in fewer course level reports needing additional information. This year ten courses required additional information, and it was provided quickly.

8. **What specific budgetary resources are needed for your program based on your assessment results? Based on the course level reports as an aggregate, the following are needed:**

   A. Continuing education among course leads for reports on course level data. In addition to language and data issues (explained in item 9), it continues to be difficult to see how some measured CLOs connect to the aligned GELO we wish to measure. Because of this issue, we would like for course leads to also respond to how their CLOs connect to the aligned GELO. We continue to support AAC's efforts to aid faculty; we specifically ask AAC to help faculty to connect their courses to their associated GELO's so that we can more completely assess GELO's. These steps will provide a clear method for improving our assessment efforts from CLOs to ILOs. This support will include continued training on assessment features in Blackboard and training on Excel to manage data and statistics.

B. Technical support is needed in creating a mapping system for learning outcomes.
C. We continue to respect the subject-level experts in their assessment. Continuing education and other support is needed for faculty that use writing as an assessment. Because writing is a way to measure analysis and synthesis, among other skills that will connect to ILOs, and because courses have used writing in some of their assessments, we need to support faculty who do not teach in disciplines that support writing instruction for first-year college students. These supports might include an institutional shift to writing across the curriculum or writing in the discipline (WAC and WID); interdepartmental writing workshops for students; interdepartmental collaboration on inclusion of composition pedagogy; and/or continued professional development sessions on writing assessment. These supports should not be unidirectional.
D. Support in finding new ways to assess the General Education program. We may need to add indirect methods such as retention rates or a way to get direct data for the General Education program. We would like to know more about "National standards, collaboration with sister programs and/or research data" to ensure the program's high standards (item B4). We have discussed use of a portfolio in which students accrue artifacts of their learning; this practice is supported by research and it is part of three General Education courses. In order to accomplish this methodology, we will need the support and knowledge of faculty, plus support from institutional information technologies.
E. As noted in the AY 2019-2020 report, the General Education program relies heavily on physical space at all UA-PTC campuses as well as general office equipment and supplies. Specifics include but are not limited to the following: paper, printers, computers; faculty; computer labs; classroom technology; computer software, hardware, maintenance; classroom calculators; library supports; wi-fi supports in buildings; additional laptops for students to check out.

9. Please write any additional information here that you think is pertinent to the assessment process for your program that assists stakeholders (i.e., administrators and standing committees) in understanding your report.

A. Prompts and measurement of Course Level Reports continue to affect measurement in this program level report.
   - Some course level reports list their thresholds as student-centered (for example, "students should earn a 70% or higher score on an exam") rather than course-centered. An example of a course-centered threshold statement is: "at least 70% of students who take the assessment should meet [the goal of X] on the assessment." Without common terms, we cannot make comparisons or calculations.
   - The calculation we used, as described in item B3 above, is not ideal, but it is the best way we could compare terms. We would like to have feedback on this metric.

- Some course level reports define their assessments as "direct" when they are indirect. Some describe moving toward a writing assessment or describe having moved toward an assessment that involves a writing component yet they do not include results for this writing component.
- Individual course level reports include description of the use of standardized rubrics, though only a few include language that indicates the rubrics are normed or if efforts are made concerning interrater reliability or testing. If that data is needed for course or program level reports, then requesting the data at the CLO reporting level should be an action point.
- Individual course level reports do not currently ask for "the distribution of scores, relevant and detailed interpretation, student strengths and weaknesses," so if that information is required for program level reporting, then it should be added to the course level reports template.
- Individual course level reports include considerable variation in terms regarding threshold and benchmarks. We would like to see more standardization of terms and hope that the course level reports can prompt consistency. As a result, we modified the language in this report, by combining the terms threshold and target to meet the Assessment Glossary definition for Benchmark: A specific standard against which an outcome or product is measured. A benchmark determines the acceptable level of achievement for stated outcome(s) or learning objective(s).

B. Because we do not test or norm our own program level report, we could not completely respond to item B2. Because we did not prepare to collect artifacts at the course level, we do not have artifacts to show assignments or examples of exemplary to passing work; therefore, we cannot completely respond to item B3. Because the courses did not always provide data about the distribution of scores, relevant and detailed interpretation, student strengths and weaknesses," we could not completely respond to item B5.

C. AAC dedicated time during Fall of 2020 and Spring of 2021 to change the course level report language and to encourage consistent and useful reporting of data. These efforts, supported by GECA, made clear improvements on the reports, though reinforcement may still be necessary.

- We now understand more about how some courses collect their information, and can see that it is easy for them to say "X students completed the assessment" but it is often difficult for them to say something like "Y students met the benchmark."
- Although the course level reports ask for annual numbers, most course level reports continue to report in semesterly numbers. This meant we had to add the terms. Though this is not onerous, it means that we risked misrepresenting data through error. It also means that the annual thresholds are often met for that course level outcome, though the semesterly thresholds might not have been. For instance, Comp I students in the fall often show more skills than do the students in the spring; when these skills are looked at annually, benchmarks are met. This

continued error is likely the result of course leads extracting reports from what is included in Nuventive, which may be set up for semesterly reports.

- Many courses offer visual data, as requested in the AY 2019-2020 report, but many times, the graph or table was not labeled in some way. Graphs and tables are excellent, but the succinct information about numbers of students is necessary.

D. It continues to be difficult to see how some measured CLOs connect to the aligned GELO we wish to measure. It is additionally difficult to see how each assessment tool measures a CLO and/or its corresponding GELO. We continue to accept reports in good faith, believing that the course leads are the subject matter experts and that their measurements are valid for the assessed CLO(s). Additional work is needed to link CLOs and GELOs. Although revised measurement methodology may make the links clearer, some of that work might best include rewriting/revising CLOs.

E. We continue to view our report process with awareness that mapping and alignment to ILO's is in the future. We also know that we should be able to report on these GELOs differentiated by mode (traditional, online, hybrid, and concurrent credit) With that in mind, we see these things:

- GELO 3, "Analyzing Works," encompasses a lot and the outcome language is intentionally broad. Some of the courses clearly have course learning outcomes that connect to the ILO "Cultural Awareness," yet we are not currently analyzing that specifically.
- We included GELOs differentiated by mode (traditional, online, hybrid, and concurrent credit) when it was reported by the course level reports.

Appendix A – UA-PTC's Institutional Learning Outcomes

1. Analyze information from credible sources. (Information Literacy)

This may include the ability to:

- Locate relevant information
- Evaluate the quality and usefulness of the information
- Synthesize the information.
- Communicate the information in an ethical manner consistent with the standards of the field or program of study.

2. Appropriately apply a variety of technology tools within one's discipline. (Technology Literacy)

This may include the ability to:

- Acquire information,
- Solve real-world problems,
- Communicate, and/or
- Perform tasks and processes.

3. Communicate effectively with diverse audiences in multiple contexts. (Communication)

This may include the ability to:

- Develop, organize, and present orally well-supported and ideas formally and informally with consideration of community and context.
- Develop, organize, and present in written format well-supported ideas formally and informally with consideration of community and context.
- Clearly express ideas, information, and concepts in various modes and media, including the proper use of appropriate technology.
- Select and utilize means of communication appropriate for a variety of professional, civic, and social circumstances, environments, and communities.
- Consider diverse communities in multiple contexts.

4. Apply critical thinking skills to achieve a desired goal. (Critical Thinking)

This may include the ability to:

- Apply appropriate methods to solve problems or address issues.
- Use evidence to justify conclusions.

5. Use quantitative methods to solve problems. (Quantitative Reasoning)

This may include the ability to:

- Analyze and interpret quantitative information.
- Apply quantitative concepts and skills to solve real world problems.

6. Demonstrate awareness of cultural differences. (Cultural Awareness)

This may include the ability to:

- Explain how similar actions can be understood differently depending on cultural context.
- Evaluate the impact of culture on individuals and groups.

7. Demonstrate career readiness skills. (Professionalism)

This may include the ability to:

- Demonstrate personal accountability.
- Meet commitments.
- Demonstrate ethical behavior.
- Demonstrate teamwork.

Appendix B – Data from the Course Level Reports

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	ENGL 1311 English Composition I	Total Number of Students Assessed: 835 Benchmark: We wish to see 75% of assessed students illustrating "developing" or "mastered" levels in the portfolio. For AY 2021-22, we will change to an 80% benchmark. Distribution of Scores: CLO 1: 739, 89% CLO 2: 727, 87% CLO 3: 669, 80% CLO 6: 722, 86% Mean for all 6 CLO's: ~713, 85% of total students assessed CLO 1: Traditional students, n=487: 87% (424) Online students, n=207: 90% (186) Concurrent credit students, n=113: 95% (107) Hybrid webinar students, n=28: 79% (22) CLO 2: Traditional students, n=487: 86% (417) Online students, n=207: 86% (177) Concurrent credit students, n=113: 90% (102) Hybrid webinar students, n=28: 82% (23) CLO 3: Traditional students, n=487: 76% (372) Online students, n=207: 89% (184) Concurrent credit students, n=113: 91% (103) Hybrid webinar students, n=28: 57% (16) CLO 6: Traditional students, n=487: 85% (415) Online students, n=207: 89% (184) Concurrent credit students, n=113: 90% (102) Hybrid webinar students, n=28: 75% (21) Interpretation: The assessment goal is met for all the course learning outcomes, and for all the CLO's (1, 2, 3, and 6) relating to GELO 1, the results show an overall improvement over AY 2019-20. However, there is variation in success among identified populations. Student Strengths: Overall, students are particularly strong with critical thinking (CLO 2). Overall, online who were retained met the benchmark more than students overall, and concurrent credit students scored higher than other identified populations. Student Weaknesses:

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		Overall, students are less strong with academic integrity (CLO 3), which is a key skill in communicating effectively. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	ENGL 1312 English Composition II	Total Number of Students Assessed: 612 Benchmark: We wish to see 80% of assessed students illustrating "developing" or "mastered" levels in the portfolio. Distribution of Scores: CLO 2: Out of 209 traditional students assessed for Writing and Reading, 178 (85%) scored "mastered" or "developing." Out of 405 online students, 349 (86%) scored "mastered" or "developing." In total, out of 614 total students assessed for Writing and Reading, 527 (86%) met the benchmark. CLO 3: Out of 207 traditional students assessed for Academic Integrity, 164 (79%) scored "mastered" or "developing." Out of 405 online students, 342 (84%) scored "mastered" or "developing." In total, out of 612 total students assessed for Academic Integrity, 506 (83%) met the benchmark. Mean for both CLO's: ~517, 84% of total students assessed (612) Interpretation: The assessment goal is met for the course learning outcomes. However, there is variation in success among identified populations. Student Strengths: Spring students in traditional classes continue to perform higher than Fall semester students. Student Weaknesses: Overall, students are less strong with academic integrity (CLO 3), which is a key skill in communicating effectively. Unusually, online students scored lower in the Spring semester than in the fall on this outcome, when only 81% met the benchmark, compared to 89% of Fall online students. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	SPCH 1300 Speech Communication	Total Number of Students Assessed: 936 Benchmark: We wish to see 70% of assessed students to meet or exceed average proficiency of the CLO. Distribution of Scores: Fall Out of 528 total students assessed for effective verbal and nonverbal presentation skills, 366 (69%) met the benchmark. Traditional students: 64% Online students: 72%

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		Concurrent credit students 100% Spring Out of 408 total students assessed for effective verbal and nonverbal presentation skills, 287 (70%) met the benchmark. Traditional students: 62% Online students: 72% Concurrent credit students 100% Mean for the year: 653, 70% of 936 total students assessed met the benchmark. Interpretation: The assessment goal is met for the course learning outcome. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively	MATH 1302 College Algebra	Total Number of Students Assessed: 894 Benchmark: We wish to see a 70% success of each CLO assessed. Distribution of Scores: Total: 894 students Traditional: 485 students took the assessment with 84.4% success on assessment test that includes all 4 course learning outcomes. Online: 351 took the assessment with 83.17% mean score on assessment test that includes all 4 course learning outcomes. Concurrent: 58 took the assessment that includes all 4 course learning outcomes. Success for each CLO: CLO 1: 88.73% of students met the benchmark. CLO 2: 86.58% of students met the benchmark. CLO 3: 89.42% of students met the benchmark. CLO 4: 80.69% of students met the benchmark. Average success for all CLO's: 85.56% n=~765 students out of 894 who completed the assessment. Interpretation: These results could be attributed to several things. When the pandemic hit in March 2020 all classes moved off campus. We came back to campus in August 2020 but in a very different way than pre-pandemic days. All exams went from being given in a proctored, on campus setting to online through MyMathLab. Also, as a department we have analyzed our results each semester and worked to improve our assessment results by adding assignments to lessons that had lower scores. Weaknesses: Like other general education courses, they note that the total students on the rosters (n=1178) is substantially greater than the numbers who completed the assessment (n=894). Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 2: Reason	MATH 1300 Mathematical Reasoning	Total Number of Students Assessed: 296 Benchmark: We wish to see a 70% success of each CLO assessed.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
Quantitatively		Distribution of Scores: Success for Each CLO : CLO 1: 90.34% of students met the benchmark. CLO 2: 76.31% of students met the benchmark. CLO 3: 84.76% of students met the benchmark. Average success for all CLO's: 83.33% n=~247 students out of 296 who completed the assessment. Interpretation: We are pleased to see improvement over the results of the previous academic year. For Fall 2019, findings for CLO's 1, 2, and 3, were 68.95%, 74.95%, and 77.78%, so there was improvement in every learning outcome. Those improvements were 18.91%, 0.73%, and 6.58%, respectively. We found in the Spring 2021 results, compared to Spring 2020, all CLO's showed improvements, with an increase of 14.28%, 6.3%, and 13.3% for CLO's 1, 2, and 3, respectively. (Spring 2020 CLO 1, 2, and 3 results were 78.75%, 70.71% and 71.90%.) Some of this increase is most likely due to the pivot to remote which occurred during Spring 2020. We recognize that Spring 2020 was one of the most unusual situations higher education has ever faced. The pandemic caused disruptions to nearly every facet of life, and it would be expected that by Spring 2021 faculty and students alike were learning to teach and learn in the new normal. Students and instructors were more prepared and better equipped to work in a blended, on campus and remote environment. There were more on campus classes by Spring 2021, and the atmosphere on campus seemed almost back to pre-pandemic days. Instructors added extra practice on areas which were lower and continued to provide a midterm practice assignment to help reinforce skills from the beginning of the semester. Attendance was required for on-campus Assessment Report or webinar classes, and instructors provided recordings of classes for students who were unable to attend. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	ARTS 2300 Introduction to Visual Art	Total Number of Students Assessed: 391 Benchmark: 70% average for each student on the assessment paper. Distribution of Scores: For the entire 2020-2021 school year, 329 of 391 students assessed, or 84%, reached the benchmark. Fall 2020: Twelve sections of ARTS 2300 were included in data collection. 234 students were measured and 77% reached the benchmark. Ten of those sections measured were online, while two were hybrid/flex. Some sections are not included in this report due to participation in data reporting. Spring 2021: Eight sections of ARTS 2300 were included in data collection due to participation in reporting. 157 students were measured and 94% reached the benchmark. Six of those sections measured were online and two were traditional in-person courses. Some sections are not included in this report due to participation in data reporting. Interpretation: Each instructor offered their own personal interpretation of the data. Retention strategy was a common theme. Student Strengths: For those that submitted papers the quality was higher than in the past.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		Student Weaknesses: 6 students could not identify the techniques used to imply depth (tenebrism); not turning in final papers. Benchmark met? Yes. 84% of students achieved a 70% average which suggests that the benchmark was met. The benchmark in this class is a different calculation than what is used in many other Gen. Ed. Classes. Here there is not a designated percentage of assessed students that would indicate success.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	ENGL 2337 World Literature from the Beginning to 1650	Total Number of Students Assessed: 188 Benchmark: 70% of students should score adequate or above on the literary analysis essay. There are two categories, "Critical Thinking" and "Knowledge of Literary Context." Distribution of scores: The composite number of successful students is 154. This number was derived from an average of the number of successful students in the two assessed categories. The corresponding percentage of successful students is 82%. Interpretation: Students in both online and traditional classes met or exceeded the stated goals in both categories of assessment. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	ENGL 2338 World Literature from 1650 to Present	Total Number of Students Assessed: 197. Benchmark: 70% of students should score adequate or above on the on the literary analysis essay. There are two categories, "Critical Thinking" and "Knowledge of Literary Context". Distribution of Scores: The composite number of successful students is 165. This number was derived from an average of the number of successful students in the two assessed categories. The corresponding percentage of successful students is 84%. Interpretation: Students in both online and traditional classes met or exceeded the stated goals in both categories of assessment. Face-to-face and online classes varied in terms of achieving better results in each category. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	MUSC 2300 Introduction to Music	Total Number of Students Assessed: 154 students were assessed in the combined Fall and Spring semesters. Benchmark: The goal is for 70% of students to achieve the level of Competent or Excellent in the 'Objective Observations' aspect of their culminating paper. Distribution of Scores: Over the 2020-21 Academic year 130 students reached the desired level of success. This was 84% of students. Fall 20 – 56 students scored at an 'excellent' level, and 15 students scored at a 'competent' level. A total of 73 of 83 students reached the desired outcome.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		Spring 21 – 46 students scored at an 'excellent' level, and 11 students scored at a 'competent' level. A total of 57 of 71 students reached the desired outcome. Interpretation: Positive data reveals successful instruction and student achievement. Student Strengths: Many students successfully incorporate knowledge related to all CLOs into their culminating paper. Student Weaknesses: There are always some students who struggle with this course, those who have poor preparation for college reading and writing, or who have insufficient time due to family or work commitments. Benchmark met? Yes. 84% of students assessed were successful.
GELO 3: Analyze Works	PHIL 1310 Introduction to Philosophy	Total Number of Students Assessed: 59 Benchmark: 80% of students will earn an average grade of 75% or higher on assessment essays. Distribution of Scores: 54 of 59 students who submitted essays were successful. That is a success rate of 92%. Interpretation: A very high percentage of students who attended regularly, and who turned in required coursework, met assessment goals – the major problem seems to be retention and students not submitting assessment essays. Student Weaknesses: Retention. Benchmark met? Yes
GELO 3: Analyze Works	THEA 2300 Introduction to Theater	No data is available for this course.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	ANTH 2310 Cultural Anthropology	Total Number of Students Assessed: 87 Benchmark: 75% of students should attain a score of 70% or higher on a discussion question assessing CLO 3 and CLO 5. Course lead notes that the 2021-22 benchmark will be 80%. Distribution of Scores: 70 students (80% of participants) mastered the topic, 5 students (6% of participants) were proficient, and 12 students (14% of participants) failed, e.g., scoring below 60%. Interpretation: Students generally understand the issue of ethnocentrism and can relate it to the process of fieldwork. Student Strengths: Students demonstrate the ability to think critically and analytically and synthesize cultural anthropological concepts. Student Weaknesses: Students who did not meet expectations struggled with understanding definitions of and differences between the concepts of "ethnography" and "ethnocentrism."

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		Benchmark met? Yes. 86% of students scored 70% or higher on the assessment discussion question.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	ECON 2323 Principles of Macroeconomics	Total Number of Students Assessed: 125 Benchmark: 80% of students score 80% or higher on the final exam that includes multiple choice and essay items assessing the following three CLO's: National Income Accounting, Business Cycles, and Money and Banking Distribution of Scores: 125 students were assessed. Of the 125 students assessed, 105 or 84% scored at or above 80% on the final exam assessment. Interpretation: Change in format of assessment instrument from paper to final exam was cited as possible factor affecting scores. The pandemic also affected results. Online sections outperformed face-to-face sections for the first time. Student Strengths: Students are understanding and applying the three CLO's: National Income Accounting, Business Cycles, and Money and Banking. Student Weaknesses: Students who could not attend face-to-face classes consistently because of the pandemic struggled to meet expectations. Benchmark met? Yes. 84% of students scored 80% or higher on the final exam assessment.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 1311 History of Civilization I	Total Number of Students Assessed: 230 Benchmark: Using a common grading rubric, 75% of students will score a 3 (Proficient) or above on faculty-deployed essay questions assessing the three CLOs. Distribution of Scores: 94 students, or 41%, achieved proficient or above which is below the benchmark of 75%. 50% of Students in face-to-face classes met or exceeded expectation, and 40% of online students scored a 3 or above. Total students by assessment category: Advanced – 53 Proficient – 41 Needs Improvement – 46 Failing – 47 Failed – 42 Interpretation: Many students did not submit required assessment assignments, 18% overall (15% on campus and 18% of online students). On campus students only made up 21% of the overall students. Such a small sample makes suspect conclusions concerning student progress for this group. Some instructors did not submit data for one or more classes. This fact creates inconsistencies in the data used. Benchmark met? No. 41% scored proficient or above on the essay questions assessing the three CLOs.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 1312 History of	Total Number of Students Assessed: 45 Benchmark: Using a common grading rubric, 75% of students will score a 3 (Proficient) or above on faculty-deployed essay questions assessing the three CLOs.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
	Civilization II	Distribution of Scores: 26 students, or 58%, achieved proficient or above which is below the benchmark of 75%. All data are from online classes. Total Students by assessment category: Advanced – 7 Proficient – 19 Needs Improvement – 11 Failing – 5 Failed - 4 Interpretation: There were no data for on campus classes, which allows analysis of online students only. These students have traditionally scored lower on assessments than on campus students. Some instructors did not submit data for one or more classes. This fact creates inconsistencies in the data used. Benchmark met? No. 58% scored proficient or above on the essay questions assessing the three CLOs.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 2311 U.S. History to 1877	Total Number of Students Assessed: 155 Traditional Course – 21 Online Courses – 111 Concurrent Courses – 23 Benchmark: Using a common grading rubric, 75% of students will score a 3 (Proficient) or above on faculty-deployed essay questions assessing the three CLOs. Distribution of Scores: 121 students, or 78%, achieved proficient or above on the essay questions assessment. Students scoring proficient or above by course type: Traditional Course – 13 of 21 (62%) Online Courses – 89 of 111 (80%) Concurrent Courses – 19 of 23 (83%) Interpretation: Overall enrollment remained abysmally low; Retention was low for students enrolled in live courses (likely due to pandemic policies), retention was higher than usual for online courses, and full participation by faculty to collect their data and share with the course-level assessment lead remains problematic. Student Weaknesses: Students failing to complete assignments remain high (22%) Benchmark met? Yes. 78% of students assessed scored proficient or above on the essay questions assessing the three CLOs.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	HIST 2312 U.S. History since 1877	Total Number of Students Assessed: 259 Traditional Sections – 89 Online Sections – 151 Concurrent Sections – 19 Benchmark: Using a common grading rubric, 75% of students will score a 3 (Proficient) or above on faculty-deployed essay questions assessing the three CLOs.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		Distribution of Scores: 184 students, or 71%, achieved proficient or above on the essay questions assessment. Students scoring proficient or above by course type: Traditional Course – 57 of 89 (64%) Online Courses – 111 of 151 (74%) Concurrent Courses – 16 of 19 (84%) Interpretation: Overall enrollment remained abysmally low; Retention was low for students enrolled in live course (likely due to pandemic policies), retention was higher than usual for online courses, and full participation by faculty to collect their data and share with the course-level assessment lead remains problematic. Student Weaknesses: Students failing to complete assignments remain high (20%) Benchmark met? Yes. 71% of students assessed scored proficient or above on the essay questions assessing the three CLOs.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	POLS 1310 American National Government	Total Number of Students Assessed: 173 Benchmark: 75% of students earn a "C" grade on the essay assignment assessing CLOs 1, 2 and 3. Distribution of Scores: Of the 173 students assessed, 142, or 82% of students met or exceeded the expectation of a "C" grade on the essay assessment. Interpretation: Assessment data indicated that students, post-pandemic, have easier access to the internet, which has helped them complete assignments on time. Benchmark met? Yes. 82% of students met or exceeded the expectation of a "C" grade on the essay assessment.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	PSYC 2300 Psychology and the Human Experience	Total Number of Students Assessed: 1230 Benchmark: 75% of students score 75% or higher on the final exam that assesses the five CLOs. Distribution of Scores: Of the 1230 students assessed, 1,021 or 83% averaged 75% or higher on the seven sections of the final exam assessment. Students averaging above 75% by course location: Main Campus - 339 of 420 (81%) South Campus - 86 of 95 (91%) Online - 610 of 715 (85%) Students scoring above 75% by final exam section: History – 1025 of 1230 (83%) Research – 948 of 1230 (77%) Sensory/Perception - 1032 of 1230 (84%) Theory - 1050 of 1230 (85%)

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		Biological - 1097 of 1230 (89%) Sociocultural - 995 of 1230 (81%) People - 1032 of 1230 (84%) Interpretation: Considering all students assessed, the benchmark was met. 83% of students averaged above 75% on the sections of the final exam assessment. Also, all locations exceeded the benchmark. The benchmark was exceeded overall and at all locations for each of the seven sections of the final exam assessment with the single exception of the Research section for students on the main campus. 74% of students at this location scored above a 75% on the Research section. Student Strengths: Students scored highest on sections of the assessment related to psychological theories and biological foundations of psychology. Student Weaknesses: Students scored lowest on the section of the assessment related to research methods. Benchmark met? Yes. 83% of students averaged 75% or higher on the final exam that assesses the five CLOs.
GELO 4: Synthesize Concepts	SOCI 2300 Introduction to Sociology	Total Number of Students Assessed: 384 Benchmark: 75% of students score above 70% on the Social Stratification Project assessing CLO 4. Distribution of Scores: 384 (86.2%) completed the assessment project. Of the 384 students who completed the project, 311 (81%) scored above 70% on the assessment project. Student scoring above 70% by semester: Fall 2020 – 184 of 226 (81%) Spring 2021 – 127 of 158(80%) Interpretation: The coronavirus pandemic continued disruptions in regular academic processes throughout the 2020-2021 academic year. Despite required adjustments, including reduced seat time for face-to-face classes, across all sections for the academic year 2020-2021, 81% of students completing the assessment scored advanced or proficient. This percentage surpasses the stated assessment goal of 75%. The 81% proficient and advanced also is an increase of 2.2 percentage points over the 78.8% proficient and advanced for all completers in the previous academic year. During the 2020-2021 academic year, a 23-percentage point difference existed between the results for the instructor with the lowest percentage of advanced and proficient and the instructor with the highest percentage. That difference represents an increase in range from the 2019-2020 academic year. This difference was mostly due to a relatively large number of students failing the assessment in one instructor's spring online classes. This result is atypical when all previous semesters using this assessment process and instrument were reviewed and is considered an outlier. For the academic year, all but one instructor met the 75% goal for proficient and advanced completers. Finally, the completion rate of the assessment project improved compared to previous academic years. For the 2019-2020 academic year, the completion rate was 81.2% in the

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		fall and 78.1% in the spring. For the 2020-2021 academic year, 86.2% of students in the PSYC 2300 sections completed the assessment. Work will continue to improve this completion Student Strengths: Students demonstrated proficiency synthesizing concepts related to the discipline of sociology including the relationships between social institutions, socialization, social inequality and global disparities in health, wealth, and human development. Student Weaknesses: Almost 14% of students did not complete the Social Stratification Project. Benchmark met? Yes. 81% of students scored above 70% on the Social Stratification Project assessing CLO 4.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1300 Biology for General Education*, also called Biology for Non-Majors Lecture	Total Number of Students Assessed: 169 Benchmark: 70% of students should earn 70% or better on the assessment for each CLO. Distribution of Scores: CLO 2: 134 out of 169 students (79% of students) assessed in AY 2020-21, in BIOL 1300 earned 70% or better on the essay portion of the assessment. 169 out of 209 students turned in the paper on endangered species, which means that only 81% of students completed the assessment, and only 79% of them met the threshold. CLO 3: 171 out of 209 students took the assessment (exam questions on cell division) with an average of 82.65% success. *Note: we are not including the breakdown of this score in the analysis since it is also represented in the BIOL 1100 results*. Interpretation: We exceeded our target of 70% overall success in both assessments for both semesters, so the evidence shows that students are successfully learning biological concepts in BIOL 1300 for non-majors. Fewer students turned in papers than were expected. Student Weaknesses: The paper still has issues with the students understanding what range is because that average was low. The COVID 19 pandemic began in March 2020, and the campus CLO'sed as all learning pivoted online, with instructors and students working from home. We continue to have reduced face to face classes and mask mandates that we must all live with at school and at work. This has affected the BIOL 1300 classes as we used to be able to do more face-to-face classes with them but most prefer online now which is more difficult for most students. Benchmark met? Yes
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1100 Biology for General Education*,	Total Number of Students Assessed: 213 Benchmark: 70% Distribution of Scores:

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
	also called Biology for Non-Majors Lab	181students out of 213 students (84.9%) assessed in BIOL 1100 got 70% or better on the portion of the assessment that measures knowledge of mitosis and meiosis. 213 out of 253 enrolled students completed the assessment (exam questions on cell division). Interpretation: We exceeded our target of 70% overall success in the assessment for both semesters, so the evidence shows that students are successfully learning biological concepts in BIOL 1100 for non-major's lab. There were a few problem questions in the mitosis/meiosis where students went below the 70% threshold, while the combined 10 question average was well above 70%. These particular questions need to be examined to see if there is a problem with the questions or if we need to emphasize this content more. Note: these same 10 questions over mitosis and meiosis are used in both the 1300 class and the 1100 lab. Most of the students are taking both, not just one or the other. The students get the 10 questions on an exam in the 1300 class earlier in the semester than the students in lab. They are studying the same process at the same time but tested over it at different times, which was thought to perhaps yield different results. However, the individual questions missed during the exam in 1300 were the same as the individual questions missed during the later exam (Final) in lab. As a result, the questions will be assessed. The COVID 19 pandemic began in March 2020, and the campus closed as all learning pivoted online, with instructors and students working from home. We continue to be in a precarious situation as far as campus presence; however, these 1100 labs have always been online. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1302 Biological Science* (Lecture)	Total Number of Students Assessed: varies, see below: 207-282 Benchmark: Successful completion of each CLO is scoring 70% or higher on the assessment. The target is that at least 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the assessment. Distribution of Scores: CLO 1 Number of students assessed: 282 236 (83.7%) students scored higher than 70% for assessment of CLO 1. CLO 2 Number of students assessed: 282 257 (91.1%) of students scored higher than 70% for assessment of CLO 2. CLO 3 Number of students assessed: 261 234 (89.7%) students scored higher than 70% for assessment of CLO 3. Information Literacy Number of students assessed: 206 159 (77.2%) students scored higher than 70% for assessment of that CLO. Student Weaknesses: Information Literacy, measured by the essay, has the lowest number of available assessments, and shows the lowest percentage of students who met the threshold. This assessment measure was piloted this year and will be repeated. The report notes retention challenges relating to the pandemic Benchmark met? Yes.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	BIOL 1102 Biological Science* Lab	Total Number of Students: 233 Benchmark: Successful completion of CLO 1 is scoring 70% or higher on the assessment. The target is that at least 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the assessment. Distribution of Scores: Total number of students for the year = 233 181 students (84.8% of students) assessed in Spring 2020 BIOL 1100 got 70% or better on the portion of the assessment that measures knowledge of mitosis and meiosis. Number and percentage of students scoring 70% or higher = 177, 76% Fall 2020 Total number of students submitting a paper = 109 Number and percentage of students scoring 70% or higher = 97, 89% Spring 2021 Total number of students submitting a paper = 124 Number and percentage of students scoring 70% or higher = 80, 64.52% Interpretation: The Spring semester was less successful than the fall, and it did not meet the threshold. Faculty will continue to make decisions on the data and assessment of microscope use. Faculty are considering a paper assessment. Student Weaknesses: The Spring 2021 results were below the threshold. Benchmark met? Yes, for the year.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1307 Earth Science Lecture	Total Number of Students Assessed for CLO's 2-6: 27 Benchmark: At least 70% of students should score 70% or above for the assessment. Distribution of Scores: 27 students (100%) met or exceeded expectations for CLO's 2-6. Total Number of Students Assessed for CLO 1: 13 Threshold: At least 70% of students should score 70% or above for the assessment. Distribution of Scores: 11 students (84.6%) met or exceeded expectations for CLO 1. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1107 Earth Science Lab	Total Number of Students Assessed: 24 Benchmark: At least 70% of students should score 70% or above for CLO 3. Distribution of Scores: 22 students (91.7%) met or exceeded expectations for CLO 3. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1300 Physical Science*	Total Number of Students Assessed: 75, 84 Benchmark: For CLO 1 and CLO 2 on the Chemistry assessment, 80% of students should earn an 80% or higher on the assessment. For CLO 3 and CLO 4 on the Physics assessment, 70% of students should earn a 70% or higher on the assessment. Distribution of Scores: CLO 1 Number of students assessed: 75

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
		69 (92%) students scored higher than 80% for assessment of CLO 1. CLO 2 Number of students assessed: 75 65 (87%) students who scored higher than 80% for assessment of CLO 2. CLO 3 Number of students assessed: 84 79 (94%) students who scored higher than 70% for assessment of CLO 3. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 5: Make Scientific Inquiries	PHYS 1100 Physical Science (Lab)	Total Number of Students Assessed: 209 Benchmark: 70% of students getting at least 70% of the points on the lab (Meets Expectations). Distribution of Scores: 203 (97.1%) students met or exceeded expectations, scoring at least 70% on the assessment. Benchmark met? Yes.