

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** ARPT 2017 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Thursday, June 29, 2017 10:16:04 AM  
**Last Modified:** Thursday, June 29, 2017 10:31:55 AM  
**Time Spent:** 00:15:50  
**IP Address:** 192.231.202.250

Page 1: Program Assessment Report

Q1	Bridge General Education Program
<b>Program Name</b>	
Q2	Undergraduate - University Wide
<b>Level of Program</b>	
Q3	Cappucci
<b>Assessment Liaison - Last Name (Person completing this report)</b>	
Q4	Paul
<b>Assessment Liaison - First Name</b>	
Q5	University-wide program (Gen Ed, Library Services, etc.)
<b>School or Department</b>	
Q6	
<b>Date of Submittal</b>	
Date / Time	06/29/2017
Q7	Year 1
<b>What is the year of the assessment cycle for this report? (Refer to Assessment Plan.)</b>	

Page 2: Assessment Report Information

Q8

**State the Learning Outcome assessed. Be sure to use the same wording as in your Assessment Plan.**

Bridge General Education Outcome 1a: Students will demonstrate the ability to apply foundational knowledge in the arts, humanities, languages, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences.

Q9

**Describe the Assessment Protocol used. For example, item analysis of selected exam questions, signature assignment assessed with a rubric, results of standardized exam aligned with program content areas.**

A standard assessment rubric for Goal / Learning Outcome 1a. was distributed to faculty volunteers willing to assess an assignment that reflected student ability to apply foundational knowledge. The assignment included the following four criteria.

1. Student understands and correctly uses the discipline's basic concepts and knowledge underlying the assignment.
2. Student applies foundational knowledge in a new or related situation.
3. Student explains or gives evidence for choice(s) or actions.
4. Student follows all assignment directions.

For each criteria, there were four performance categories: Exemplary, Evident, Developing, Not Evident. Faculty volunteers were asked to tally the number of students achieving at these four performance levels.

With the assistance of the Director of Assessment, a message was sent requesting faculty volunteers teaching in six categories to assess Goal / Learning Outcome 1a. English (Humanities), World Languages, Art History, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Mathematics. Here is a brief breakdown of the courses and assignments that were submitted to the GE Curriculum Committee:

Humanities (English): EN176 / EN114—Signature Research Paper Assignment assessed with a rubric

Arts: AR118 (2 sections)—Museum Paper Assignment assessed with rubric; MU109 (1 section)—Music Video Project

Languages: IT101, SP105 (4 sections)—Oral interview assessed with common rubric

Natural Sciences: BI121 (3 sections)—lab practical; PH121 (2 sections)—final exam

Social Sciences: AN112 (2 sections)—exam question assessed with rubric; GO281—Large scale topographic map assessed with rubric

Mathematics: MA103 (3 sections)—Statistical Data Analysis Project assessed with rubric; MA115 (2 sec.)—Word Problem

The GECC reviewed all submissions up to its May 9th meeting date. With guidance from the Director of Assessment, committee members engaged in a discussion of the results for the following rubrics: EN114 / EN176, AR118, IT101, SP105, BI121, AN112. The other assessment rubrics were submitted after the conclusion of the semester and reviewed by the Director of General Education.

**Humanities:** The data collected from the two literature courses reflects that students are meeting the GE expectations for this category. Students are able to situate literary works in appropriate contexts that they were produced. The English department had four faculty members divide into two groups to review 10 papers from each course section. Each group performed an initial paper norming before reading the remaining set of papers. Although there were slight differences in scoring (i.e. one professor rating a student paper at developing and another rating it at evident), these discrepancies never surpassed more than one level. The lowest means in the four criteria were student understanding (EN176-2.25) and application of foundational knowledge (EN114-2.3), which suggests students could use greater support in understanding of this content area.

**Arts:** The data from the two sections of Art History reflect a clear assignment that meets GE expectations for this category. The evening section that included a larger number of juniors / seniors performed higher in each assessment category, which is to be expected. The lack of a submission for the Music History course is problematic and reflects the challenge of relying on adjunct faculty to submit important assessment information.

**Natural Sciences:** Students appear to be meeting the expectations in both courses; however, for the Biology course, the faculty have an expectation of 90% of students reaching the developing / evident level whereas the Physics course has an expectation of student performance at 75% at this level. The differences here suggest a need to better align GE student expectations in the natural sciences; this alignment might just involve a clarification of the uses of an assessment rubric rather than a grading rubric. In regard to the use of the assessment rubric, criteria descriptions need to be clarified for each performance category, particularly when referencing a series of test questions. More specific information about student performance on these questions would add greater specificity to the assessment results.

**Social Sciences:** The results from the two submissions differ. It appears that students in GO281 are performing at the expected level for a GE course. The students in the two sections of AN112, however, appear to fall short of that 90% threshold in some key areas. It could be that these results were submitted earlier in the assessment collection process as faculty were still learning what the GECC needed from them. Such a possibility demonstrates the need to work with faculty in advance of the assignment to ensure that its design and assessment are aligned with the GE learning outcome.

**Languages:** Again, it appears that students seem to be achieving at the expected level in all four courses submitted for this area. However, the GECC was unsure whether or not several of these results were based upon a grading rubric rather than an assessment rubric. As you will note below, IT101 and some sections of SP105 had a large number of students performing at the exemplary level, which is surprising for an introductory course. Such a high performance result may speak to the placement of students in beginning level language courses, or it may indicate confusion over the alignment of the grading rubric with the assessment rubric.

#### **Quantitative Analysis:**

MA103 indicates that students are achieving at the expected level. Looking at the percentages, students are performing between developing and exemplary in two of the four categories. Criteria 2, application of foundational knowledge in a new or related situation, is the one area where students fell short of the 90% goal at the developing level (89%). It suggests that students are becoming familiar with these concepts but may need more support in clearly applying them. The three sections included a large number of Freshmen / Sophomore level students (about 70% of the students). The data from MA115 did not exactly align with the four stated criteria of the assessment criteria (criteria 4 was not reported). Although the percentage of students did not reach the 90% expectation, they came close in two of three areas. According to the instructor, "If they do not know how to convert this word problem to a pure math problem and set up a function representing the variable to be maximized, they are not be able to go further. It may imply that some students need more explanation and practice."

Q12

**Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Why or why not? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)**

These results are satisfactory given the initiation of a new GE assessment process. Faculty have designed appropriate assignments to measure student learning of this learning outcome. For the most part, across these six categories students appear to be meeting “application” expectations.

Q13

**What actions will be taken based on these results? When will the action be implemented, where or how, and who will be responsible?**

The Director of General Education will discuss this report with the General Education Curriculum Committee at its first meeting in the Fall 2017 meeting. The director will then follow-up on the results with representatives from each of the departments.

In regard to the Natural Sciences, there needs to be further discussion about setting a consistent percentage for the expected performance in the Sciences. Also, it would help to request greater specificity about responses to questions used in the BI121 lab practical.

PH121 needs to offer greater clarity in the performance-level descriptions used for the assessment criteria.

In World Languages, there needs to be further discussion about the use of an assessment rubric in place of a grading rubric as it relates to indicating student learning levels for a 100 level course. It also needs to be determined whether the Oral Interview assignment is standardized in some way across different languages.

In Art / Music History, there needs to be discussion about the ways to ensure assessment reporting if relying on adjunct faculty.

In Humanities (English), there needs to be discussion about the ways to best support student understanding and application of foundational knowledge in their final research papers.

In Social Sciences, particularly AN112, there needs to be continued discussion about ways to enhance the assignment and its assessment to achieve the 90% expected achievement at the developing or higher level.

In Math, there needs to be further discussion about the process for reporting assessment results, particularly in regard to the alignment of the assessment rubric with grading rubric.

Q14

**What is the time frame for the above actions? Designate actions for year 1 and year 2. The outcome will be reassessed in year 3, following a 3 year cycle.**

During the Fall 2017 semester, the Director of General Education will discuss results with the GECC and meet with departmental representatives to discuss the assessment results. This outcome will be reassessed in line with the GE assessment plan cycle.

Q15

Respondent skipped this question

**State the Learning Outcome assessed. Be sure to use the same wording as in your Assessment Plan. (Outcome # 2 if needed)**

Q24

**Write a short executive summary of the assessment results and planned action based on your program assessment for the current year.**

99 courses (276 sections) were offered in the Bridge General Education Program over the 2016-2017 academic year. This included Online, Hybrid, Lakewood, and Off-site offerings. A total of 2,513 students enrolled in Bridge courses in the fall, and 2,314 students were enrolled in Bridge courses in the spring. These offerings included two new Bridge GE requirements, GEN199 (12 sections) and GEN400 (2 sections).

The General Education Program conducted its formative direct assessment of GE Learning Outcome 1a for year one by evaluating student work obtained from 100 and 200 level courses that reflect application of learning in the following categories: English (Humanities), Art History / Music History (Art), Mathematics, World Languages, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. A request for two volunteers from each of these categories was sent to faculty. Volunteers were asked to assess one GE course in either the Fall or Spring semesters and to submit an outline of the assignment and its alignment with criteria for Bridge Learning Outcome 1a. This form was reviewed by the Director of General Education and the Director of Assessment. If necessary, feedback was provided to volunteers about the assignment or rubric alignment. These submission forms were posted on the General Education Curriculum Committee Blackboard Organization for review by committee members. At the conclusion of the semester, faculty were asked to complete the assessment rubric indicating student performance at either the exemplary, evident, developing, or not evident levels. Completed rubrics were reviewed by the GECC during a May 9, 2017 meeting.

A total of 11 different courses (22 sections) were assessed. Two different courses were assessed in 5 of the 6 categories (with (MU109--Music History not submitting in Arts). Our findings demonstrate that students generally meet the formative expectation with achievement at the expected level.

The one noticeable criteria where students did not consistently achieve the expectation was criteria 2 (student applies foundational knowledge in a new or related situation). 6 of 22 sections reported student performance below the 90% expected level with only one section below 80%. While several of these courses were close to the 90% expectation, it suggests that work is still needed to clarify the expectations that we have for students applying their foundational knowledge in these different disciplines. It also reflects a continued need for faculty discussions about these expectations, their assignments, and reporting assessment results. Such discussions will be critical as we continue with the continued

When made available, NSSE results will be used for summative assessment results.

---

Q25

**Is there anything else you would like to add to this report?**

I will be sending GE assessment reports as email attachments.

---