UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
PULASKI TECH

Assessment Report:
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 a 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 Program*

2. Name of individual compiling report: *Mark Perry and Jennifer Atkins-Gordeeva*

3. Date of submission: *October 2022*

4. Academic year: *2021-2022*

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 1300 Biology for Non-Majors					X
BIOL 1100 Biology for Non-Majors Lab					X
BIOL 1302 Biological Science					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. At this time, we are not sure what part of our outcomes or our assessment pertains to this ILO.

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. The capstone project for ENGL 1312 connects through the reading and writing and academic integrity course level outcomes to GELO 1. Students in ENGL 1312 all sections completed a common portfolio and self reflection. The design of the portfolio is to address all Course Learning Outcomes as a capstone project. Course Learning Outcomes 2 and 3 correspond to GELO 1. 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. All Speech Communication students completed a portfolio which allowed for all four learning outcomes to be assessed at the same time. However, learning outcomes 2 and 3 were the primary focus. Within the portfolio, students are asked to provide evidence showing that they have mastered the learning outcome of the course followed by a written reflection detailing the process they went through to complete the assignment, changes that may have been made to improve the assignment, and feedback from the instructor and or peers. 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. Questions were linked to specific Course Learning Outcomes. Item analysis was completed to determine proficiency. 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. To assess this learning outcome, students across all sections completed a common comprehensive final exam. Questions selected for the exam and those to be mapped to this CLO were identified by course instructors. Item analysis was performed to determine proficiency. Data were examined in total, as well as by modality of instruction. 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.

Program Learning Outcomes	Course	Assessment Method and/or Data Source
		CLO 3: Critiquing public consumer and political information for better understanding, completeness, and accuracy. CLO 1 is the outcome that maps to GELO 2.

2. Please check or highlight any of the 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.

   Our program assessment is not determined by a single assessment or capstone assignment. We compile the course level reports of aligned courses and each of them describe uses of common rubrics and/or standardized tests that are piloted and refined.

   ☐ 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.

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

   We continue to invite other methods of assessment, including indirect methods. We currently have the following data from Institutional Research.

Year	Term Code	Course Code	A	B	C	Student Count	DFW Rate
2021	FA	ENGL 1311	322	189	123	1026	38%
2021	FA	ENGL 1312	123	90	49	458	43%
2021	FA	MATH 1300	92	58	51	306	34%
2021	FA	MATH 1302	214	142	60	568	27%
2021	FA	SPCH 1300	237	78	57	597	38%
2021	SP	ENGL 1311	91	70	44	441	54%
2021	SP	ENGL 1312	281	131	76	739	34%
2021	SP	MATH 1300	54	30	17	167	40%
2021	SP	MATH 1302	149	114	52	454	31%
2021	SP	SPCH 1300	188	61	47	506	42%
Fall 2021 to Spring 2022, courses related to GELOs 1 or 2			3290 total students earned A, B, or C			5262 students were enrolled.	

It illustrates that among 5262 students enrolled in the five named courses from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022, 3290 students earned an A, B, or C. 3767 students took courses to support development of GELO 1; of those, 2257 made an A, B, or C, a rate of only 60%. 1495 students

took courses to support development of GELO 2; of those, 1033 made an A, B, or C, a rate of only 69%.

4. Describe the process of analyzing the assessment data, including specifically 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 an assessment report in September. The report is compiled by the data provided by all faculty teaching the course during that academic year; in this report, it was 2020-2021. 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 of the reports on the UA-PTC website.

The General Education Committee then takes the twenty-eight reports and uses those to complete the Program Report. For the 2021-2022 year, a workgroup was established to manage the project. The workgroup included the General Education Committee chair and two committee members.

Following 2021's collection of course level reports, we asked faculty leads of courses to provide more information, when needed, to complete the Gen Ed Report. These requests were assisted by the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC). The AAC used our questions and requests from the General Education Curriculum and Alliances (GECA) Committee to revise the template course level report and add to faculty education. In August 2022, GECA partnered with AAC for a professional development session on how course level reporting affects programmatic assessment, in a "Town Hall" setting. Subsequently, Fall 2022 reporting of Course Level Reports seems improved. With the considerable labor from AAC and from faculty course leads around the college, we are going to be able to progress with mapping the General Education program. In our next iteration of mapping, we will shift from only considering whole courses as linked to GELO's to consider GELO's as linked to courses, individual courses' methods, and/or course learning objectives.

In AY 2021-22, we submitted the 2020-21 program level report and sent a copy of it to course leads, asking them to read how our General Education program performed overall, and how their aligned GELO was measured. We invited them to participate in the upcoming faculty development sessions, as described above. We believed we were

cultivating a collaborative tone that would further invite faculty to taking ownership of the General Education program as a distinct program.

GECA created a taskforce to look at sister institutions in the state. Taskforce members chose seven different institutions, including at least two of each of the following categories: four-year, two-year, institutions in the UA system, and institutions outside the UA system. They looked at assessment and programmatic information available on websites and spoke with faculty and administrators at the institutions and compared our institution to theirs. The taskforce members investigated how the institutions organize their general education program and how they assess their program, if that information is available.

✠ Comparative data used when interpreting results and deciding on changes for improvements.

☐ 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.

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: 1768 1587 student assessments show that students have met benchmark in courses associated with GELO 1. This is approximately 90% of students assessed for this outcome. These courses clearly connect their CLOs with this GELO: ENGL 1311, ENGL 1312, and SPCH 1300. Strengths: Assessment results support the premise that students who complete the course can communicate effectively. Among the students who were assessed, the success rate of 90% is quite higher than the rate of 79% last year. Some current weaknesses are noted: 3767 students took courses to support development of GELO 1; of those, 2257 made an A, B, or C, a rate of only 60%. The target was 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	Total assessments: 1082 969 students met the benchmark in courses associated with GELO 2. This number is approximately 90% of students assessed for this outcome.

to construct or analyze quantitative data to draw conclusions about the reasonableness of the results.	These courses clearly connect CLOs with GELO 2: MATH 1300, MATH 1302. Strengths: Assessment results support the contention that students completing the courses can reason quantitatively. The assessment success rate of 90% is higher than the assessment success rate of 85% last year. Some current weaknesses are noted: The number of students succeeding in the course (completing the courses with a grade of A, B or C) remains too low at approximately 65% (as reported by faculty; Office of IR notes an A, B, C rate of 69%). The target is met for this outcome.

For more detailed information on these GELO's please look at Appendix B.

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.

   We are comparing data on GELO 1 and GELO 2 between two years. In AY 2020-21, 79% of students met the benchmark for GELO 1, far lower than this year's success found in 90% of students. In AY 2020-21 and AY 2021-22, 85% of students met the benchmark for GELO 2.

   This year, we are also using some indirect data. We are comparing numbers of students assessed with numbers of students who earned a letter grade of A, B, or C. 3290 students made A, B, or C in the five named courses in Fall 2021 and Spring 2022, yet only 2850 assessments were collected, meaning only 86.6% of students who passed with A, B, or C were assessed.

   During this time period (Fall 2021 and Spring 2022), the student count for the five courses was 5262. Because the assessments occur at the ends of semesters, it is unlikely that students who are not passing are participating in assessments; this means that they are not being measured.

7. What specific changes were implemented this year based on last year's results?
   The Academic Assessment Committee and the General Education Curriculum and Alliances committee added faculty education over the year. See descriptions of it above, at 4.

8. What specific budgetary resources are needed for your program based on your assessment results?
   Nonbudgetary changes in education about upcoming GELOs include additional efforts toward mapping past aligning GELOs by course. We must look at assessment methods and current CLOs to identify diverse ways students attain general education learning objectives. For more about this, see number 9, "Mapping."

   We continue to ask for multiple and diverse methods of assessment. This year we asked The Office of Institutional Research for data about student retention, an indirect

assessment method. We continue to seek other indirect methods that will complement and/or the direct assessment of the General Education program.

We need a way for students to develop and store artifacts in a repository. That repository might be a sort of evaluative portfolio, including polished and process artifacts of learning and skill; the repository must be digital and stored in-house, and it must be portable for the student. We could use it for assessing the general education program and it could also possible help assess institutional objectives. Courses currently support students in meeting general education learning objectives, but students do not have a way to illustrate that they meet all the objectives over the course of their attendance.

We need more attention on writing across the curriculum. 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 ILO's, 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.

We note the relationship between retention and general education courses. This year's indirect assessment reveals part of the challenges. We wish to become part of the solution. In the coming year, we want discuss retention—particularly retention within a semester. We would like to suggest participation in a taskforce of cross-committee collaboration that focuses on student retention. These efforts are being discussed in the Office of Institutional Research, the Advising Office, the AAC and in the Recruitment and Retention committee, and possibly others.

As noted in the AY 2019-2020 and AY 2020-2021 reports, the General Education program relies heavily on physical space at all UA-PTC campuses as well as general office equipment and supplies. This includes but is not limited to the following: paper, printers, computers; faculty; computer labs; classroom technology; computer software, hardware, maintenance; classroom calculators; library supports; wifi supports in buildings; additional laptops for students to check out. Specifically, Composition I and Composition II courses take place in computer labs; there are not enough computer labs for the busiest times of day.

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.

Assessment Cycle

Last year, each GELO was assessed and reported upon. We are currently in a cycle of assessment as shown below. In this way, each GELO is assessed twice over five years.

Academic Year	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026
GELO's Assessed	1 and 2	3 and 4	5 and 1	2 and 3	4 and 5

This year, in Spring 2023, we will assess the GELO's themselves, starting with GELO 2. If we choose to make changes in the GELO's, then we will make the changes prior to the academic year for which they will be assessed.

Mapping

At the time of writing, GELO's are correlated with courses. For example, GELO 2 is only currently mapped to two courses (MATH 1302 and MATH 1300) through many courses teach how one can reason quantitatively (GELO 2). It is our hope that our mapping will evolve to see how individual courses' objectives and/or methods help define students' learning—and with that, how diverse courses aid student learning. We would like to represent student learning accurately. One example of a more robust mapping could be found in the example of ECON 2323, Principles of Macroeconomics; ECON 2323 is currently connected with GELO 4, Synthesize Works. It is possible that their writing assessment might help to define how students use written communication (GELO 1); their assessment might also help define how students reason quantitatively (GELO 2). These connections might become important because students often complete ECON 2323 in different semesters than those in which they take courses currently aligned to GELO 1 and GELO 2.

Course Level Reporting

Changes in the Course Level Report have been noticed, and the changes resulted in easier reporting at the programmatic level—for the reports we used this time.

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 GELO's differentiated by mode (traditional, online, hybrid, and concurrent credit). 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 could be added to the course level reports template. This is part of Nuventive reporting and it could be included in course level reports for courses aligned with the General Education program.

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 Collection for GELO's 1 and 2, AY 2021-22

Program Learning Outcome	Course	Assessment Results/Conclusion
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	ENGL 1311 Composition I	Total Number of Students Assessed: *551* Benchmark: 80% of students meet the benchmark of "mastered" or "developing"on the CLO assessment assignment or measure. Success for each CLO: CLO 1: 551 students assessed with 497 or 90% successful CLO 2: 551 students assessed with 475 or 86% successful CLO 3: 551 students assessed with 448 or 81% successful CLO 6: 551 students assessed with 482 or 87% successful Indirect Course Data: Number of students enrolled in ENGL 1311: 1467 Number of students who earned an A, B, or C in ENGL 1311: 839 Number of students assessed: 551 Interpretation: Our goals were met and exceeded the benchmark. Weaknesses: 839 students passed ENGL 1311 with an A, B, or C, yet only 551 students were assessed. "Data collection remains a problem. Though we had 1467 students enrolled in ENGL 1311 and 839 students passed the course with an A, B, or C. Due to the nature of our assessment, portfolios tend to be turned in for students who pass, and instructors do not submit data for portfolios that are not graded, indicating only 551 (~66%) of students who pass are represented in this assessment. This low percentage likely indicates gaps in our reporting. We need to figure out causes and solutions so that all student successes can be represented." "Our main areas of concern are CLO 2, Academic Integrity… so our action plan primarily focuses on ways to improve in these areas while addressing the remaining CLOs. Academic integrity success rates have trended downward from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022. Students barely met the benchmark in the Fall, and then dropped below the benchmark in the Spring." Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	ENGL 1312 Composition II	Total Number of Students Assessed: *606/605* Benchmark: 80% of students meet the benchmark of "mastered" or "developing"on the CLO assessment assignment or measure. Success for each CLO: CLO 2: 606 students assessed with 546 or 90% successful CLO 3: 605 students assessed with 507 or 84% successful

		Interpretation: Our goals were met, and far exceeded the benchmark for Reading and Writing. The 90% success rate gives reason to assume that the work of assessment of should be directed elsewhere. Steps taken to improve the success rate seem to have been successful. While not as successful as the Reading and Writing, the Academic Integrity benchmark was over 80% for the year and each semester, giving evidence for the aberration of the previous year to be aimed toward the pandemic. Consistency among the responses is likely a reason for the rise in scores as well. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 1: Communicate Effectively	SPCH 1300 Speech Communication	Total Number of Students Assessed: *611* Benchmark: 80% of students meet the benchmark of "mastered" or "developing"on the CLO assessment assignment or measure. Success for each CLO: CLO 2: 611 students assessed with 597 or 98% successful CLO 3: 611 students assessed with 572 or 94% successful Interpretation: During the 21-22 school year, the speech department piloted the portfolio to assess all four learning outcomes. From the data provided our success rates are extremely high. CLO 2: Because more online speech communication courses are being offered more students are exceeding the learning outcome. A total of 327 online students met or exceeded this learning outcome. Of traditional students or campus students, 122 met or exceed the learning outcome. Concurrent courses are only available in the spring. Of concurrent students, 15 of 16 students exceeded the learning outcome. CLO3: Off the 611 students that were enrolled in speech, 309 online students met or exceeded the learning outcome. A total of 184 students in a traditional setting met or exceeded the learning outcome. Of the concurrent students, 15 students met or exceeded the learning outcome. Weaknesses: "This data is potentially skewed because the date shows extremely high almost perfect rates when in reality that is not the case. A total of 611 students submitted the portfolio, which only allowed for these students' scores to be considered. However, the data does not paint an accurate picture. A total of 921 students were still enrolled in speech communication at the time this assignment was due, which is the end of the semester. A total of 310 students did not submit a portfolio (FA21 – 148 & SP22 – 162). With 34% of students not submitting a portfolio, the data may have proven differently if more students submitted the portfolio." Benchmark met? Yes.

GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively	MATH 1302 College Algebra	Total Number of Students Assessed: *749* Benchmark: 70% of students in the course achieve success on the CLO assessment assignment or measure. *Note: this benchmark refers to scores not # of students who score.* Success for each CLO: CLO 1: 749 students assessed with 671 or 90% successful CLO 2: 749 students assessed with 654 or 87% successful CLO 3: 749 students assessed with 664 or 89% successful CLO 4: 749 students assessed with 614 or 82% successful Interpretation: "When looking at the picture as a whole for MATH 1302 College Algebra the success on the Final Exam (Assessment) is well above the success threshold of 70% that we have set for this course. Also, our retention level this past academic school year was high. (90% for fall and 92% for Spring) However, it is concerning that our Pass Rate (A, B, or C) is much lower than these numbers. The pass rates for this last academic year were 60% in fall and 72% in spring. This is telling us that many students are not completing the semester/ taking the final exam as well as not dropping the course. They are opting to make an F in the course instead of a W. This result is having a negative effect on several student grade point averages and instructor success rates." Weaknesses: Success rates for assessment are high for those students who complete the course and take the final exam assessment. The pass rates for Fall (60%) and Spring (72%) suggest that a sizeable number of students are not completing the course successfully. Benchmark met? Yes.
GELO 2: Reason Quantitatively	MATH 1300 Mathematical Reasoning	Total Number of Students Assessed: *333* Benchmark: 70% of students in the course achieve success on the CLO assessment. *Note: this benchmark refers to scores not # of students who score.* Success for CLO 1: 333 students assessed with 318 or 95% successful Interpretation: For CLO 1, identifying problem-solving strategies and applying them to contemporary everyday problems, both in work and in personal lives, our goals were met for this learning objective. Because the kinds of problems students encounter in this course are very relevant to their work and personal lives, they seem to master the problem-solving techniques very well. These

		might include problems such as price comparisons or currency conversions. Students who attend regularly and complete the assignments for the class tend to show a high level of proficiency on this learning outcome. When compared to the previous academic year, there was an improvement for this CLO from 90% success to 95.3%. Weaknesses: It should be noted, although the students met the benchmarks for all course learning outcomes, except for CLO 3 for online only students in the spring semester, there is a concern with the success rates. Of the 473 students enrolled in MATH 1300 in 2021-22, 63.80% of students passed the course with a C or higher. Our goal is for 70% of enrolled students to pass with a C or higher. It is clear that students who remain engaged in the course until the final exam are mastering the expected outcomes and earning their General Education mathematics credit. There are far too many students who stop attending class and stop completing assignments. Often the reason this occurs is unknown because students do not respond to our attempts to contact them. We will continue to work with Student Services to find ways to retain our students, not simply on the rosters, but actively completing the course. Benchmark met? Yes.