7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

After 3 years of data and continuous improvement, the History ARGs summarize the results:

- As the number of artifacts has increased over the years, the overall results have declined.
- There are still a number of signature assignments that are problematic. More importantly, they suspect there is a more general failure to focus on primary source analysis in many sections. ARGs will present this to the Department.
- In the Spring 2016, all of the honors sections utilized the same primary source analysis as the signature assignment. Over 90% of these students met the benchmark. This was an improvement of 20% over the same honors students from the fall.
- The ARGs are requiring to mandate a common assignment for History General Education sections.
- They propose to dedicate more class time to primary source analysis.
- ARGs are continuing broader conversations about the role of adjunct instructors in History General Education.

% Students attaining History competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLO1: Students demonstrate knowledge of history and awareness of historic experience.
SLO2: Students situate primary historical records in their context and use sources to construct historical arguments.
**Humanities**

**Assessment Report Summary**

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

- Humanities are improving over the course of the three years.
- We actually look at three different things:
  - How well students are thinking (analysis of ideas): are they engaging with the ideas of the questions?
  - Use of primary sources
  - Writing

- Results show that at least 80% of our students can do at least one of those well.
- When you look at all 3 of those, then we get about 67% of our students can do all three.
- There is feasible improvement, and there are a couple of things that account for the improvement:
  1. The committee (ARGs) has worked very hard with departments to improve prompts. For example, worked with our ARGs to develop one common signature assignment that works for all their courses. After that, we have seen dramatic improvement our ability to assess the documents according to the learning outcomes. We are hoping to use this model to communicate to a couple of other departments where their prompts are still not working very well.
  2. We found this year that the programs that are more difficult for us in many ways are the interdisciplinary programs: international studies, women and gender studies, African American studies, etc. And the problem with those is, because they are interdisciplinary, primary sources mean very different things for the different disciplines. For example, for Arts, the work of Art is the primary source. For History, it could be an newspaper to archival documents to memoirs. And when you deal with interdisciplinary program very difficult to say what the nature of the primary source is? Or at least, we often don’t see where source is and how students are engaging with it.

- Part of our Action Plan is to contact specific departments that prompts are still problematic and address the problems with them. Communicate to departments what assignments are good for assessment purposes.
- Continuing problems for us are basically how to define the primary source and how well students evaluate that. But that is something we continue to work with individual departments and programs. A recommendation to faculty is to include an answer key with the prompt, what is it that we are looking for? If the student is writing a research paper and the prompt asks for the use of primary and secondary sources, faculty should provide the ARGs with a key that indicates what that means in the context of the department. What is a primary source in the context of international studies or in philosophy or history, etc? Also, in some cases, the primary source is not clearly identified, mostly in interdisciplinary area.
- One of the things that makes our job really difficult is that we have so many different disciplines in the humanities. For example, norming takes a long period of time because we have to make sure us, who represent different disciplines in the room, agree on the standards that we apply on the test. Some of us are new; some have been at the committee (ARG) for a long period of time. But we feel we are making progress.
- We would like to consider, particularly for humanities, because the GenEd requirement is four classes, a study of improvement over time. How are students improving over the course of those years, of those four classes that they take? We have brought up a couple of times before, the possibility of doing a longitudinal study. One temporary solution that we thought about, until we have the technical ability to properly sample students according to class. For example, to sample in the 100 levels, only freshmen; in the 200 level classes, we sample sophomores, in the 300 juniors and in the 400 seniors. And hopefully see changes over time. But that is something we will continue to talk about with the GenEd coordinator.
% Students attaining Humanities competencies

SLO1: Students analyze how ideas are represented, interpreted, or valued in various expressions of human culture.

SLO2: Students examine relevant primary source materials as understood by the human area under study and interpret the material in writing assignments.

Humanities Average
Languages

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Three or five years ago, when we started this, GenEd Assessment was an expression of terror in our people rolled their eyes, and complained. After three years, the greatest result that our group talked about is the fact that GenEd assessment is now part of the culture of our department, which is one of our very original goals. GenEd assessment is just another word for accountability, and accountability is just so important.

We started to look at the GenEd foreign languages results, having 13 languages taught at CofC. We ARGs for French and Spanish, because we are the two largest departments. Today, we will break down the results into French and Spanish and use our plans to help the other smaller language departments.

French:

All results are pretty consistent among the years, except for the following:

- In 2014/2015 the reading section for French was low (56.9%)
- In 2015/2016 the cultural analysis section for French was low (57.1%)

The French faculty has worked really hard on their instrument, and that have resulted in a lot of disparate results have really helped in figuring out what is it that we want our students to walk out of the classroom and being able to say.

The French department, based on this process, has hired Kathy Kaufmann as their GenEd assessment language coordinator. The Hispanic Studies department has me, Devon Hanahan, as the language coordinator. Kathy is working on a new curriculum plan and we are both coordinating with each other and sharing well. As part of the changes, they determined they would change the cultural question. The new curriculum plan for French 101-202 courses includes a new textbook, more coordinated tests, and a more cohesive plan that we have had in the past.

Spanish:

The Spanish results are shown below:
We also are appreciative of having more student artifacts to make the results more accurate.

Now, we are very pleased on the listening section. No matter how difficult we make the listening section, they excel. And we are proud of that because our department is strongly committed to only using Spanish in the classroom and we assign a ton of lab work outside of class. With our communicative approach, we are opposite of what others have done, where you just conjugate verbs, you don’t speak it, you don’t listen to it.

Before this 3 year period, we had a downward trend in writing, so we altered the entire basic language curriculum, which is 6 courses, 2 tracks, to include a lot more writing, which is not a popular move among all the instructors. But everybody understands that it makes a big difference and the deep we had has come back up.

We noticed the dip of results last year (2014/2015). We adapted a more stringent textbook and we up the difficulty of our instrument, based on that. And there was a little period of time where they had to adjust and hadn’t really caught up to our new textbook yet.

We continue to refine our language program scope and sequence, just like the French department, following a lot of research in language and pedagogy, as well as our own experiences. The trend in language teaching is that less is more. That instead of cram in every single verb tense out there, we will stick with less material and really focus on task based assessment and have our students come out and walk out of the classroom able to use the language.

And again, this GenEd assessment process really has forced us to focus on our strengths, our weaknesses, and to be accountable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies measured by SLOs</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
<th>2014/2015</th>
<th>2015/2016</th>
<th>all SLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPANISH ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO1: Students read languages other than English.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO2: Students write languages other than English.</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO3: Students understand languages other than English</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO4: Students use their knowledge of languages other than English to analyze the perspectives of historical and/or modern cultures that can be obtained only through reading and/or listening to that language</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2013/14 (n1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.5% (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2014/15 (n2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.1% (182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2015/16 (n3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.9% (161)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Students attaining Foreign Language competencies

![Foreign Language Competencies Chart]
SLO1: Students read languages other than English.
SLO2: Students write languages other than English.
SLO3: Students understand languages other than English.
SLO4: Students use their knowledge of languages other than English to analyze the perspectives of historical and/or modern cultures that can be obtained only through reading and/or listening to that language.

Foreign Languages Average
Math/Logic

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

The benchmark for success changed after the first year, so it’s difficult to compare the first year’s overall rate to the second two years’. However, we can recompute the first year’s results using the new benchmark to see that the overall results are fairly consistent across all three years.

In AY 2013-2014, we were supplied a smaller subset of the collected student artifacts (n=233). After the first semester (Fall 2013), we were given all of the collected student artifacts. Because of the additional data, we were able to extract more useful information both broadly and specifically for the individual courses. We were able to stratify data across individual courses, which allowed us to draw different conclusions, including about individual courses. In the early semesters, some signature assignments from particular courses did not align well with the rubric or the SLOs. More recently, there has been an improvement with the alignment of the assignments to the learning outcomes, although more refinement in certain courses is still advisable.

Additionally, the percentage of non-assessable artifacts declined from 2.6% to 0.2%. This decline came from two sources: First, over time, the signature assignments have become more aligned with the SLOs and the rubrics; second, we have been able to consult hard copies of the student artifacts when the digital versions are too difficult to read.

Overall, we are pleased with the consistency of the data over time, with a small trend of improvement. The Math Department finds this data useful because it provides insight into the entirety of certain courses.

What changes were made based on the results from previous years (i.e. revisions to course content, course offerings, revision of admission standards, revision of program offerings, implementation of training or workshops, creation of committees, modification of services or processes)

- Discussion of creation of an Adjunct Development Workshop designed to uniformize the core content of specific courses
- Implementation of graduate student training program to help the graduate students working as teaching assistants
- Creation of the Math Assistance Program, a service program to offer additional instruction and tutoring for undergraduates enrolled in certain General Education mathematics courses
- Removal of Math 220 from the General Education program since its scope and content was above the appropriate level
- Changing the Math/Logic General Education requirement from “6 hours of approved coursework” to “MATH 120 or 6 hours of approved coursework”
SLO1: Students model phenomena in mathematical terms.
SLO2: Students solve problems using these models.
SLO3: Students demonstrate an understanding of the supporting theory behind the models apart from any particular application.
Natural Science

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Rubric and signature assignments for the 1st year (2013-2014) were inappropriate, resulting in none of the student artifacts being completely assessable and a very low percentage (19.5%) of satisfactory results. Improvements in both rubric and signature assignments are reflected in both a useful number of assessable student artifacts (160 in 2014/15 and 154 in 2015/16) and a higher percentage (45.7% and 47.7%) of satisfactory results. Note that the benchmark for satisfactory results has been changed but the percentages reported reflect the same benchmark applied to data from all years.

Below are changes made based on the results from previous years and some proposed changes for this year:

- All departments have standardized their signature assignments, which has resulted in more valid assessment results.
- All departments have increased training/mentoring of laboratory instructors, since signature assignments are all given in laboratory sections.
- Some departments have begun implementing changes to general education course content to better emphasize connections between course content and real world applications.
- Some departments are in the process of reviewing and revising the overall structure of their general education courses.
7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

We believe the data show considerable improvement over the past three years. Notably, this improvement is evident in the aggregate results as well as the individual competency areas.

Roughly 70% of students in both 2013-14 and 2014-15 could identify a social science concept, model, or theory whereas this academic year the percentage increased to 85%. Roughly 60% of students in both 2013-14 and 2014-15 could describe a social science concept, model, or theory whereas this academic year the percentage increased to 85%.
increased to 70%. And roughly 60% of students in both 2013-14 and 2014-15 could apply a social science concept, model, or theory whereas this academic year the percentage increased to 79%.

In the aggregate, 62.4% of students achieved 3s or 4s in all three competency areas in 2015-16 (a 13% improvement from 2014-15 and a 15% improvement from 2013-14).

One thing we noted in assessing the social science exams is the fact that many of the assignments constituted “passing” work, and some were quite good, but may have missed the mark on one of the three competency areas (thus failing according to our standards). Although some schools required students to achieve competency in one area, our standard is more holistic. In particular, the data indicate that 17% of our students were competent in two of the three competency areas yet count as failures according to our standards. In other words, our impression is that more students are competent in the social sciences than our data indicate.

We believe there are three changes worth highlighting. First, one of last year’s suggestions was to improve communication with faculty who are teaching general education classes and create better assessment assignments. Comparing last year’s assignments to this year’s, we believe this recommendation was mostly fulfilled. Second, one of last year’s suggestions was to increase the number of common questions and common assignments within classes. We noticed an increase in the number of common assignments—particularly within specific disciplines. And third, we noticed that, as a result of the above two changes, there was a decline in the number of submitted work that was not appropriate for our assessment purposes.

In the Spring 2016 semester, the Psychology department modified the assessment procedure to determine whether the current practice of performing assessment at the end of the semester (i.e., on the final exam) was contributing to the failure to meet benchmark goals. The content of the Psychology prompt (research methodology) is universally taught in the beginning of the semester. Therefore, all PSYC 103 faculty were instructed to include the GenEd prompt on an exam most proximate to the classroom discussion (and no later than the midterm). Based on the data from the Spring 2016 semester, this change has resulted in a dramatic improvement in satisfaction rate across all learning dimensions such that the benchmark goals have been achieved.
Writing

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Looking at the data over 3 years confirms the problem with using the final research paper for our signature assignment, because different instructors are interpreting that assignment in so many different ways. We saw student work from 12 pages to 3 pages and assignment prompts that ranged from one page to 10 pages.
Some signature assignment prompts did not seem to focus on the research imagined when we created the SLOs. Some assignment prompts were too complex for us to interpret, leading us to wonder if students also struggled with completing them (of course we assume there was time devoted to explaining the assignment, but we could not determine this in our assessment.)

The following are actions proposed by ARGs based on previous year’s results that will help close the loop:

- Department-wide discussion of thesis statements for sig assignments [F 2014]
- Workshops [annotated bib, thesis statements, assignment sheets, alternatives to research paper] instructors teach students to use sources effectively [F 2014 to present]
- Adjuncts paid for prof development/mentoring (F 2013 and 15-16)
- Adjuncts required to submit teaching portfolios for annual evaluation
- Dropbox uploads of departmental guidelines for 110
- Working group plans to pilot alternative to staff syllabus [Summer 2016]
- Appointment of FYW coordinator [F 2015]

---

**% Students attaining Writing competencies**

- **SLO1**: Students articulate clear analytical theses.
- **SLO2**: Students effectively situate their ideas in relation to sources.
- **SLO3**: Students select and correctly document relevant and credible sources.
SLO1: Students articulate clear analytical theses.
SLO2: Students effectively situate their ideas in relation to sources.
SLO3: Students select and correctly document relevant and credible sources.