



INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT LEARNING GOALS (ISLG) & GENERAL EDUCATION: ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Academic Year 2015-2016

Provost Office: Office of Assessment

Introduction

Georgian Court's General Education Program supports its Institutional Learning Goals (ISLG). As such, its assessment is closely linked to these goals. For the 2015-2016 academic year, the report on assessment of the ISLG and General Education are intertwined. The data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), first year and senior year student results, is used to validate student achievement of the ISLGs on the undergraduate level. For the General Education Program, the assessment data is expanded to include direct assessment from coursework and from student life (co-curricular) activities, as well as indirect assessment data from senior year responses to NSSE 2014 & 2015. Beginning in 2016-2017, a revised general education program and curriculum will be introduced. Assessment for General Education will be directed toward the revised program (BRIDGE). Assessment of the ISLGs will be a separate assessment using data from the full undergraduate program.

GCU Institutional Student Learning Goals (ISLG)

Georgian Court University offers curricular and co-curricular learning experiences designed to help students achieve the university's Institutional Student Learning Goals:

1. Communicate effectively in written and spoken English
2. Apply critical thinking, problem-solving and research skills
- 3A. Demonstrate academic excellence in the major field
- 3B. (for general education courses): Gain a broad foundation in knowledge and understanding of modes of inquiry in the arts, humanities, behavioral and social sciences, natural sciences, and mathematics.
4. Demonstrate understanding of the Mercy core values
5. Demonstrate awareness of women's issues
6. Explore spirituality and personal growth
7. Demonstrate awareness of the value of engagement in local, national, and global issues
8. Demonstrate analytical skills to appreciate the aesthetic
9. Demonstrate leadership skills
10. Demonstrate awareness of diversity issues

ISLG and Related NSSE Survey Questions (2014, 2015 survey results)

GCU Institutional Student Learning Goal	NSSE Questions related to GCU ISLG.	Percentage of Seniors responding <i>very much</i> or <i>quite a bit.</i> NSSE 2014 N=106	Percentage of Seniors responding <i>very much</i> or <i>quite a bit.</i> NSSE 2015 N=49	Responses 2014- First Year (FY) N= 71 Seniors (SR) N=106 2015 First Year (FY) N= 32 Seniors (SR) N=49
1. Communicate effectively in written and spoken English	Writing clearly and effectively Speaking clearly and effectively	79% 76%	86% 83%	
2. Apply critical thinking, problem-solving and research skills	Thinking critically and analytically Solving complex real-world problems	83% 65%	88% 63%	
3. A. Demonstrate academic excellence in the major field	Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge or skills	81%	71%	
3. B. (for general education courses): Gain a broad foundation in knowledge and understanding of modes of inquiry in the arts, humanities, behavioral and social sciences, natural sciences, and mathematics.	Analyzing numerical and statistical information	57%	52%	
4. Demonstrate understanding of the Mercy core values	About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day			2014 SR: 4.3 hours FY: 2.9 hours 2015

GCU Institutional Student Learning Goal	NSSE Questions related to GCU ISLG.	Percentage of Seniors responding <i>very much</i> or <i>quite a bit</i>. NSSE 2014 N=106	Percentage of Seniors responding <i>very much</i> or <i>quite a bit</i>. NSSE 2015 N=49	Responses 2014- First Year (FY) N= 71 Seniors (SR) N=106 2015 First Year (FY) N= 32 Seniors (SR) N=49
	week doing the following? Doing community service or volunteer work			SR: 8.0 hours FY: 2.7 hours
6. Explore spirituality and personal growth	Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	76%	73%	
7. Demonstrate awareness of the value of engagement in local, national, and global issues	Being an informed and active citizen	60%	67%	
8. Demonstrate analytical skills to appreciate the aesthetic	Attended at least one art exhibit, play or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.)			2014 SR: 57% FY: 61% 2015 SR: 57% FY: 54%
9. Demonstrate leadership skills	Working effectively with others.	73%	79%	
5. Demonstrate awareness of women's issues 10. Demonstrate awareness of diversity issues	Understanding people of other backgrounds (econ., racial/ethnic, polit., relig., nation, etc.	75%	75%	

Engagement Indicators (NSSE 2014)

Engagement Indicators: Overview

- ▲ Your students' average was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
- △ Your students' average was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- No significant difference.
- ▽ Your students' average was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- ▼ Your students' average was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

First-Year Students		Your first-year students compared with Catholic C&U	Your first-year students compared with Carnegie Class	Your first-year students compared with NSSE 2013 & 2014
Theme	Engagement Indicator			
	Higher-Order Learning	--	--	--
Academic Challenge	Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	--	--
	Learning Strategies	▲	▲	▲
	Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	--	--	--
	Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	▲	▲	▲
	Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	--
Campus Environment	Quality of Interactions	--	--	--
	Supportive Environment	▲	▲	▲

Seniors		Your seniors compared with Catholic C&U	Your seniors compared with Carnegie Class	Your seniors compared with NSSE 2013 & 2014
Theme	Engagement Indicator			
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	--	▲	▲
	Reflective & Integrative Learning	▲	▲	▲
	Learning Strategies	--	▲	▲
	Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	--	--	--
	Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	▲	▲	▲
	Effective Teaching Practices	▲	▲	▲
Campus Environment	Quality of Interactions	--	▲	▲
	Supportive Environment	--	▲	▲



NSSE 2015 Engagement Indicators

Overview

Georgian Court University

Engagement Indicators: Overview

Engagement Indicators are summary measures based on sets of NSSE questions examining key dimensions of student engagement. The ten indicators are organized within four broad themes: Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty, and Campus Environment. The tables below compare average scores for your students with those in your comparison groups.

Use the following key:

- ▲ **Your students' average** was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
- ▲ **Your students' average** was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- No significant difference.
- ▼ **Your students' average** was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- ▼ **Your students' average** was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

First-Year Students

Theme	Engagement Indicator	Your first-year students compared with Mid East Private	Your first-year students compared with Carnegie Class	Your first-year students compared with NSSE 2014 & 2015
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	--	--	--
	Learning	--	--	--

		Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	--	--
		Learning Strategies	--	--	▲
		Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--
	<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	--	--	--
		Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--
		Student-Faculty Interaction	--	▲	▲
	<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	--
		Quality of Interactions	--	--	--
	<i>Campus Environment</i>	Supportive Environment	--	▲	▲
Seniors					
			Your seniors compared with	Your seniors compared with	Your seniors compared with
			Mid East Private	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2014 & 2015
<i>Theme</i>	<i>Engagement Indicator</i>				
		Higher-Order Learning	--	--	--
	<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	--	--
		Learning Strategies	--	--	--
		Quantitative Reasoning	▼	▼	▼
	<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	▼	--	--
		Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--
		Student-Faculty Interaction	--	▲	▲
	<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	--

<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	▲	▲	▲
	Supportive Environment	▲	▲	▲

GCU’s criteria for demonstrating achievement of the learning goals is for GCU students to achieve at or significantly above the mean of the comparison institutions on the questions most relevant to each learning goal.

NSSE 2014: Except for Appreciation of the Aesthetic (ISLG VIII), the data show that GCU students achieve all other student learning goals (significantly higher means than comparison institutions on 26 questions, the same as comparison institutions on 23 questions), and performed exceptionally well on information literacy items (Apply Critical Thinking, Problem-Solving and Research Skills [ISLG II]). Very high achievement is noted for Demonstrating Understanding of the Mercy Core Values (ISLG IV).

NSSE 2015: The data show that GCU students achieve student learning goals comparable to comparison group (Mid East Private). Very high achievement is noted for oral communication, social involvement, and service learning. Quantitative analysis is shown as a weakness for both Senior and First Year students. While quality of interaction with others was a weakness for FY students, it is a strength for Senior Year students. Collaborative learning is a slight weakness for Senior year students.

GCU General Education Assessment 2015-2016

Direct Assessment of General Education

Direct Assessment of GCU General Education involves data from the courses aligned with the General Education Assessment Plan developed in 2011-2012 and from Student Life reports for the current academic year (2015-2016). The goals of the current General Education program are aligned with the ISLG, so this assessment report of General Education will also serve as the assessment of the ISLG. It is to be noted that a revised General Education program (BRIDGE) will be introduced in Fall 2016, and will be introduced with a revised assessment plan. Also noted is that some areas of assessment in the 2011-2012 General Education Assessment Plan are outdated or are no longer valid. The Institutional Student Learning Goal Assessment Plan will be revised for AY 2016-2017.

Institutional Student Learning Goal or “Essential Characteristic” of General Education	Direct Assessment Method(s)/Course														
Written, Oral and Communication skills and Research skills	Final Research Papers/EN111-112 Academic Writing and Research I and II In-class debates/ AN112: Cultural Anthropology Oral Interviews/SP106: Everyday Spanish II Interviews with individuals of different cultures/PS300: Multicultural Psychology														
<p>Writing: See Writing Assessment Report under Arts and Sciences. Rubric Scores: (Mean Scores out of 10)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="203 1430 948 1896"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="203 1430 948 1528">AVERAGE SCORES: includes all scores (Reader A, Reader B and Instructor) for each Rubric</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1528 862 1591">4B. Audience/Voice/Rhetorical Situation</td> <td data-bbox="862 1528 948 1591">7.89</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1591 862 1654">2A. Structure</td> <td data-bbox="862 1591 948 1654">7.77</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1654 862 1717">2B. Coherence</td> <td data-bbox="862 1654 948 1717">7.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1717 862 1780">1A. Argument</td> <td data-bbox="862 1717 948 1780">7.74</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1780 862 1843">4A. Conventions</td> <td data-bbox="862 1780 948 1843">7.73</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="203 1843 862 1896">1B. Support</td> <td data-bbox="862 1843 948 1896">7.48</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		AVERAGE SCORES: includes all scores (Reader A, Reader B and Instructor) for each Rubric		4B. Audience/Voice/Rhetorical Situation	7.89	2A. Structure	7.77	2B. Coherence	7.75	1A. Argument	7.74	4A. Conventions	7.73	1B. Support	7.48
AVERAGE SCORES: includes all scores (Reader A, Reader B and Instructor) for each Rubric															
4B. Audience/Voice/Rhetorical Situation	7.89														
2A. Structure	7.77														
2B. Coherence	7.75														
1A. Argument	7.74														
4A. Conventions	7.73														
1B. Support	7.48														

3B. Source Integration, Citing, and MLA	7.26
3A. Research Skills	7.22

The three strongest scores:

1. 4B. Audience/Voice/Rhetorical Situation
2. 2A. Structure
3. 2B. Coherence

The three weakest scores:

1. 3A. Research
2. 3B. Source Integration, Citing, and MLA
3. 1B. Support

Results and Analysis: Based on May 2016 results, in the 2016-17 EN111 and EN112 classes, focus will remain for another year on the two competencies in the rubric category of Information Literacy. This will address specifically the courses' learning objectives that focus on selecting and integrating source information into the argumentation/ research papers as well as the competency of choosing relevant supporting evidence and integrating it effectively into the paper, which is part of the Argument, Analysis, and Critical Thinking rubric category. In the argument-based papers, which are the signature assignments in EN105 and EN106, focus will be on preparing students to succeed in EN111 as always, with emphasis this coming year on choosing and integrating strong supporting evidence and introducing the concept of MLA documentation style.

Based on the relatively low scores in the Support and Coherence rubric competencies, we will continue as we did last year: The writing faculty expressed the need for students to learn to read closely to "enter the conversation" of their selected writing topics, to choose credible sources, and to cite effectively, so we will review syllabi for EN105, EN106, EN111 and EN112 and share strategies (via email and Blackboard GCU Writing Faculty organization) for strengthening the those competencies, in light of the current level of student ability that we are seeing in our freshmen classes

AN 112: Assignment not included in course.

SP 106:

Oral Presentations

At the end of the semester, students made a presentation (2-4 minutes) to the class in Spanish. They were required to speak spontaneously, and use the new vocabulary and concepts that they had acquired. They were required to use a power point presentation (at least 6 slides) to enhance their ideas. Their power point presentation could not contain full sentences, only spell-checked bullet points in Spanish, and they were not allowed to read any of the content of their presentation (neither from notes nor from the screen). Comprised 5% of final grade.

Oral Interview

The oral interview took place at the end of the semester. Students were able to select the day and time of their interview. On their particular day and time, students came to class for about 10 minutes. Their interview was graded based on the following criteria: Content, vocabulary, preparation pronunciation, grammar, fluency, comprehension, and interaction. There were many opportunities to speak Spanish throughout the semester to build their skills for the oral interview. There were no make-ups. Comprised 5% of final grade.

Results:

Course goal 1 was measured by participation, homework, exams, the presentation, oral interview, and the quizzes.

- 10 out 19 students (53%) did achieve the successful rate of a C- (70%) or above.
- 9 out of 19 Students (47%) did not reach the successful rate of a C- (70%) or above when all assignments for this component were calculated and aggregated.

PS 300: Assignment not included in course.

Critical thinking, Problem-solving and Research skills and a foundation in knowledge and understanding of modes of inquiry in the arts, humanities, behavioral and social sciences, natural sciences, and mathematics

Pre-Post exam on knowledge of geography and application/GO281:
Introduction to Geography
Document Analysis: HI132:
US History II
Final Research Paper:
EN114: American Lit II

History HI132: In Spring 2016, creation of an assessment rubric for General Education history courses was a priority. A new assessment instrument has been adopted for History courses in the new General Education program (to be implemented Fall 2016). Pilot Rubric in Spring 2016, and, if necessary, revise before Fall 2016.

ACTION TAKEN: Partially completed in Spring 2016. Faculty members teaching the Gen Ed history survey courses did pilot the new assessment instrument. However, we did not construct a common rubric to use with the new assessment assignment, which will be formally required beginning in Fall 2016.

1. **100 Level History Courses**

a. **Books / Readings**

i. Instructors will assign 2 books.

1. One book will be the common textbook adopted by the Department.
2. The other common book will be chosen by the instructor—and the Department encourages instructors to select a book that is engaging. The Department prefers that the second book be a book-length primary source (e.g., memoir, novel) or a collection of primary documents, but an interpretive secondary work is acceptable. For an excellent list of short, effective books with an introductory essay

followed by documents, see the Bedford Series on History and Culture.

3. In lieu of the second book (non-textbook), instructors may assign online (or hard copy) readings / documents; however, such online reading should total 200-350 pp.—and each reading should be listed on the Syllabus, and for OL readings both title and URL provided.

b. **Assignments**

- i. Instructors will use primary documents / texts in their teaching.
- ii. Instructors will use and teach the mandated General Education Assessment Assignment (DBQ).

GO 281							
Program Goal	Program Objective	Course Goal	Course Objective	Method of Measurement	ISLG	Assessment Results	Assessment Follow-Up
1. To think critically	1. The course will include reading texts and at least one other source.	To recognize the natural and human forces which modify the Earth's surface.	Students will recognize that modification of the Earth's is deliberate & accidental.	Quests (Q) (Quiz + Tests) ---- Journal Report (JR)	2, 3B	The students successfully passed the first and/or second Quests. ---- Use of a Graded Assignment Rubric ensured student success with the Journal Report.	No follow up is necessary. ---- No follow up is necessary.

EN114: American Literature II
Final Essay

Directions: Compare and contrast the development of a theme in assigned texts by two different writers we have studied. At least one of the writers must be someone you have not written about in a previous essay. In addition, the entire essay must be new work; you may not reuse any of the writing you did for your previous essays. Use Safe-Assign in BB Learn. You should choose two works that explore a common subject but that either arrive at different

themes or that develop a similar theme in different ways. Your essay must have a clear thesis you come up with yourself that states what larger point your paper will make by comparing and contrasting your chosen texts. This thesis need not be a single sentence, given the complexity of the ideas you will be dealing with.

In addition to providing quotes from the primary texts in support of your thesis, your paper must include citations from at least **two** works of peer-reviewed literary criticism. Acceptable examples include critical books that you find in the library or scholarly journal articles (minimum of ten pages long) listed in the **MLA International Bibliography**, which you can access from the library’s “Databases” webpage. Unacceptable sources include – but are not limited to – Wikipedia, cribs such as Spark Notes, dictionaries and other reference books, and websites run by non-scholars.

Finally, your essay must follow MLA citation format, and it should include a Works Cited page. If you are unfamiliar with the latest updates to MLA style or would like a refresher, make an appointment with the Writing Center and/or consult the following website for examples: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/>

Results

- Section 1: Class Average was 2.67, a B- or approximately 81% (based on rubric grades, not counting grade reductions for lateness). There were 20 final papers handed in, out of 22 students enrolled. Two students received zero credit for failing to hand in the assignment and were not counted in the calculation of the class average. The distribution of grades was as follows:
 - A: 2, A-: 2, B+: 3, B: 2, B-: 3, C+: 0, C: 4, C-: 2, D+: 1, D: 1, F(0): 2
- Section 2: average grade for the final research paper was 82%.

Analysis of Results

Students can easily verbalize their ideas on the Discussion Board forums and organize their thoughts into paragraphs. They are able to discuss common themes and how the thematic elements relate to the time period within which the texts were written. Students have a lot of difficulty integrating sources smoothly and transitioning between their ideas. They also have a hard time citing properly. They constantly struggle with going beyond basic plot summary and moving toward analysis.

Understanding of the Mercy core values

Student Leadership and Engagement Activities.
Service Learning Courses and Activities.
Mission Office Activities.

All student leaders were required to participate in Leadership Day on January 15, 2016. Each of the leadership programs divided into small groups and participated in service projects outside the GCU community. An estimated one hundred student leaders participated in service projects. Below is the list of service projects completed.

- ✓ Student Government Association – *Ocean County Hunger Relief*

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Women in Leadership Development – <i>Destiny CDC Thrift Store and Food Pantry</i> ✓ Emerging Leaders – <i>Laurelton Care Village Center</i> ✓ Orientation Leaders, Mercy Collegiate Society, and Resident Assistants – <i>The Red Cross</i> 	
<p>During the second day of New Student Orientation, the Assistant Director of Student Leadership and Engagement coordinated and implemented the first group of service projects for all freshmen and transfer students to participate in with their First year Seminar/Transfer Seminar courses. Instructors and Orientation Leaders participated as well. More than 200 faculty and students participated; completing an estimated 600 hours of community service in the afternoon. Below is the list of projects that the classes engaged in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ocean County Hunger Relief ✓ The Red Cross ✓ Monmouth County Park System (Holmdel Park) ✓ Popcorn Park Zoo ✓ Mercy Garden – Georgian Court University ✓ Laurelton Village Care Center ✓ Lake Carasaljo Clean-up – Georgian Court University ✓ Jersey Shore Animal Center 	
<p>During the 2015 – 2016 AY, the WILD program accepted forty-seven new members into its newest cohort, cohort thirteen. WILD members completed more than four hundred hours of community service, individually and collaboratively. In May, an estimated twenty seniors graduated from the program.</p> <p>During the 2015 – 2016 AY, the Emerging Leaders program accepted fifty new members into its newest cohort, cohort three. Members of the program completed more than five hundred hours of community service, individually and collaboratively. Twenty-three male students actively participated in the program.</p>	
<p>Athletics: Service to the Community Hours of volunteer/community service during AY 2015-2016: 11,098 hours 10,000 hour service challenge: http://gculions.com/news/2016/5/25/mens-basketball-we-did-it-georgian-court-student-athletes-eclipse-established-goal-of-10-000-community-service-hours.aspx</p>	
<p><i>Awareness of women’s issues, and awareness of diversity issues and exploration of spirituality and personal growth</i></p>	<p>Assessment based on common learning assignments in WS311: Shaping Lives: Women and Gender: Exam questions and review of common book. Student Leadership and Engagement Activities.</p>

				Global Education Activities. Student Life – Resident Student Activities and Workshops		
WS 311 Course Assessment AY 2015-2016						
Each of these three major areas listed on the chart are measured using two or three different exam questions that try to get at the information in a variety of ways, using matching, multiple choice, and T/F questions.						
WS311 AY 15-16 N= 60	Can Explain and Apply the Concept of Intersectionality.	Can Distinguish the Three Historic "Waves" of Feminism in the U.S.	Can Describe the Wage Gap	Can Explain and Apply the Concept of Intersectionality.	Can Distinguish the Three Historic "Waves" of Feminism in the U.S.	Can Describe the Wage Gap
Exemplary	27	38	28	45%	63%	47%
Achieved	7	15	11	12%	25%	18%
Partially Achieved	20	2	15	33%	3%	25%
Not Achieved	2	1	2	3%	2%	3%
N/A	4	4	4	7%	7%	7%
Total	60	60	60			
Mean - All	2.85	3.37	2.95			
Mean - Completed Assignment	3.05	3.61	3.16			

Learning goals measured via the final book review assignment.						
WS 311 AY 2015-16 N = 45	Students will critically evaluate the claims of select primary and secondary texts in gender theory.	Students will evaluate a book in the field of gender studies in writing.	Students will evaluate a book in the field of gender studies in discussion and presentation form	Students will critically evaluate the claims of select primary and secondary texts in gender theory.	Students will evaluate a book in the field of gender studies in writing.	Students will evaluate a book in the field of gender studies in discussion and presentation form
Exemplary	11	11	10	24.4%	24.4%	22.2%
Achieved	21	22	20	46.7%	48.9%	44.4%
Partially Achieved	9	8	5	20.0%	17.8%	11.1%
Not Achieved	3	3	9	6.7%	6.7%	20.0%
N/A	1	1	1	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%
Total	45	45	45			
Mean - All	2.84	2.87	2.64			
Mean - Completed Assignment	2.91	2.93	2.70			
<p>In collaboration with the AAUW and in celebration of Women’s Month, the WILD (Women in Leadership Development) program hosted a screening of feminist director Jennifer Lee’s film, <i>Feminist Stories from the Women’s Liberation</i>, which portrayed the women’s liberation movement from 1963 to 1970. On March 21, 2016, over 150 attendees joined the film screening; including WILD members, AAUW members, and members of the GCU community. The film received the coveted “Best of the Fest” award for the documentary category at the Los Angeles Women’s International Festival. WILD women and AAUW members enjoyed a private lunch with Jennifer Lee to further discuss the modern day depiction of feminism.</p>						
GCU Global Education Program						
Participation SU 2013 - SU 2016						

AY	Total participants per semester	Participants per program	Study Abroad Destinations	Type of Study Abroad Program	Faculty Program Leaders
SU 2013- SU 2014	50 students		19 different countries		2 faculty leaders
AY	Total participants per semester	Participants per program	Study Abroad Destinations	Type of Study Abroad Program	
FA 2014 – SU 2015	46 students	1	11 countries		7 faculty leaders
FALL 2015	1	1	Thailand (1 country)	Gap Medics/Nursing	
SPRING 2016	40	1	England	Academic Study/Semester Abroad/CIEE (London)	
		2	Colombia	Academic Study/Semester Abroad/ISA (Barranquilla)	
		3	Spain	Academic Study/Semester Abroad/API (Salamanca, Seville, Madrid)	
		1	Italy		
		1	Italy		

		10	Italy	Academic Study/Semester Abroad/API (Florence)	2
		14	Spain	Academic Study/Semester Abroad/John Cabot University (Rome) FLSA/Academic Credit Required/Multicultural Psychology Honors	2
		8	Guyana (6 countries)	FLSA/Academic Credit Optional/World Languages/Art Service Abroad/Cultural Immersion Program – Netvue Grant	2
SUMMER 2016	40	13	China	FLSA/Academic Credit Optional/Holistic Health	3
		9	Italy	FLSA/Academic Credit Optional/Digital Communication	1
		6	Austria	FLSA/Academic Credit Optional/Dance	2
		12	Ireland (4 countries)	Mercy Student Pilgrimage	2
AY 2015-2016	81 students		10 different countries		14 faculty leaders

Summary of Programming in Residence Life AY 2015-2016

- The Office of Residence Life welcomed 393 into the residence halls, including 105 first time freshmen in August 2015.
- The Sophomore Year Experience, a series of workshops targeted specifically at sophomore students, was implemented Maria Hall as part of the Residence Life Community Development and Programming Model at the start of the Fall 2015 Semester to address common issues and concerns of second year students. Topics included career development, studying abroad, leadership opportunities, stress management, and wellness
- Overall residence student retention rate from Fall 2015 to Spring 2016 was 88%; Overall First Year student retention rate was 93%.
- Student satisfaction with weekend programming provided by the Office of Residence Life has increased to 40%, up from 35% for Spring 2015 Semester.
- Maintenance issues with Maria Hall were addressed with deep cleaning during winter break and bathroom renovations in summer 2016.
- 2015-2016 Residence Life End of Year Satisfaction Survey
 - From April 2016-May 2016 the resident student population was asked to complete an online survey about their residential experience via Campus Labs
 - The survey was revised from previous years resulting in the number of questions being reduced from 41 to 28
 - 161 students responded to the survey, which represents approximately 44% of the Spring 2015 residential population (362)
 - *Overall Satisfaction*
 - 76% of students indicated that they were Moderately- Very Satisfied with their residence hall experience
 - When responses from Maria Hall are factored out 87% of residents are moderately to very satisfied with their residence life experience

Residence Life Programming and attendance AY 2015-2016

Fall 2015

Program Theme\Type	Number of Programs	Total Number of Students Attending All Programs
Diversity	4	106
Civility	5	73
Personal Responsibility	5	52
Community Builders	56	173
Community Service	1	8

Faculty/Campus Collaborator	4	77
11 pm- 1 am Saturday Night Programs	10	146
Totals	85	635
<i>Spring 2016</i>		
Program Theme\ Type	Number of Programs	Total Number of Students Attending All Programs
Diversity	6	81
Civility	6	34
Personal Responsibility	12	161
Community Builders	78	426
Community Service	1	16
Faculty/Campus Collaborator	2	24
11 pm- 1 am Saturday Night Programs	11	118
Totals	116	860
<i>Awareness of the value of engagement in local, national and global issues</i>		<i>Student Leadership and Engagement Activities.</i>
<p>On March 11, 2016 members of WILD (Women in Leadership Development) and ELP (Emerging Leaders Program) attended the 3rd African Women Extraordinaire one-day symposium at the Princeton Theological Seminary. Four students and the graduate assistant working with WILD engaged in lectures with speakers such as Dr. Musimbi Kanyoro, a Christian scholar, human rights activist, president and CEO of the Global Fund for Women, and previous leader of the World Council of Churches. Also in attendance were speakers Mrs. Antoinette Muleka Tshisuaka (RN) and Mrs. Denise Ngome-Sakisa (MDiv), leaders of Woman Cradle of Abundance; an organization founded to empower women and girls in the Democratic Republic of Congo that is based in Kinshasa. Student leaders had the opportunity to converse with women leaders of the church and Sub-Saharan Africa in break-out sessions to discuss challenges faced by women in our society. This was a unique opportunity to become immersed in the lives of women leaders from across the globe and celebrate their strength and tenacity.</p>		

In support of Sexual Assault Awareness Month, the Office for Student Leadership and Engagement coordinated an event known as ‘Lions Get Consent’ on April 12th in the Gavan Student Lounge. Lists of facts and statistics on sexual assault were displayed on the table and anyone who participated received a teal ribbon. All students, faculty, staff, and administration were asked to sign the *White Ribbon Pledge*: “I (name) pledge never to commit, condone or remain silent about violence.” Over 120 members of the GCU community signed the pledge. The community also signed a large poster that stated “Lions Get Consent”; vowing to receive consent before engaging in any and all sexual activity.

In collaboration with the office of Student Activities and the office of Residence Life, the first Annual Student Affairs Leadership and Service Awards Ceremony took place on April 28, 2016 to celebrate the accomplishments of student leaders who served as members of the Emerging Leaders program, Resident Assistants, and the Student Government Association. Fifteen students received awards for their dedication and commitment to the Emerging Leaders program.

Demonstration of analytical skills to appreciate the aesthetic

Project with presentation/DA201: History of Dance
Modern music report created through photographs/music using jazz, the American musical, music in film, rock and music in nonwestern cultures/MU109: Survey of Music History

MU109

Program Goal	Program Objective	Course Goal	Course Objective	Method of Measurement	ISLG	Assessment Results	Assessment Follow-Up
Program Goal 1: Students will understand the aesthetic properties of style and how they shape artistic and cultural forces.	Program Objective 1: Students will write competently about pieces of music as they are performed, integrating information pertaining to elements of music with the aesthetic, artistic and emotional components of music of the	Course Goal 1: Students will demonstrate appreciation for the aesthetic value of music through knowledge of the historical development of music from the Middle Ages through the present era	Course Objective 1: Students will demonstrate the ability to write intelligently about pieces of music as they are performed, integrating information pertaining to elements of music with the aesthetic, artistic, and emotional components of	1. Performance reports; modern music reports; essays; course tests	1, 2, 3A, 3B, 8	Students did well throughout the semester understanding general aesthetic principles of music, and appreciating the scope and change of western classical music from the middle ages to the modern age. The biggest issue remains student’s ability to write coherently and	Focus on helping students to write differently than they would in a casual e-mail or text message. Show them the difference between that and serious college writing.

	various time periods		music of the various time periods.			clearly about music. This requires a deeper level of critical thinking.	
	Program Objective 2: Students will identify and describe the stylistic characteristics of music of the various historical eras.	Course Goal 2: Students will demonstrate familiarity with various forms and styles within music	Course Objective 4: Students will demonstrate familiarity with styles of music, concentrating on classical (art) music, yet also including aspects of jazz and world music.	4. Tests; course projects	1, 2, 3A, 3B, 8, 9	4. Project preparation quality was significantly lower this semester. Students didn't seem to take the projects as seriously, thinking that they wouldn't affect their grades very much.	

DA 201: No project in course.

Leadership skills

[Assessment from Student Activities: Leadership Programs](#)

Student Government Association. In February of 2016, after much research and discussion, the Student Government Association (SGA) began *exploring* the possibility of changing the current SGA governing structure from a class level assembly to a legislative governing body. According to the *American Student Government Association*, a legislative model is the preferred SGA configuration for colleges and universities across the country. The new proposed structure is designed to be financially more advantageous as well as provide more structure and support for clubs and organizations.

The major change to the SGA structure is the removal of class level cabinets. Given the current climate of higher education, many students no longer identify themselves with the expected graduation year they were assigned entering the university. In order to properly represent the GCU student population, the SGA will replace the class level cabinet officers with at-large members. All SGA members (with the exception of the executive board) will be considered at-large representatives.

At-large representatives shall represent no specific constituency, but shall serve all undergraduate students collectively. In addition to the SGA at-large representatives, the SGA legislator will include academic school delegates. A delegate will serve as a voting member of the SGA and will represent a specific academic school (School of Education, School of Arts and Sciences, School of Business and Digital Media). In order to represent a school of the university the individual must be an undergraduate of the school they wish to represent, be in good academic and disciplinary standing in accordance with both the university and the academic school, and must be endorsed by the Dean of the respective department.

Along with the changes that made to the SGA, clubs and organizations would undergo a restructuring phase to work synchronously with the SGA. All clubs and organizations would be required to submit a GCU Clubs/Organizations Chartering application, undergo an evaluation process, and attend trainings on the new organizational structure. The new processes and procedures are intended to strengthen our clubs and organizations, create a vibrant and enriching campus life, reward those organizations that continuously contribute to the GCU community and provide better programs and events for all GCU students.

Athletics and Recreation:

End of year student questionnaire. Question related to leadership.

18. Being a member of a GCU athletic team has . . . - Led to the positive development of my leadership skills

Responses: N=73	Seniors N= 12	Seniors Percent	All athletes N=61	All athletes Percent
Strongly agree	7	58.3 %	38	62.3 %
Moderately agree	4	33.3 %	17	27.9 %
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0	5	8.2 %
Moderately disagree	0	0	0	
Strongly disagree	1	8.3 %	1	1.6 %

*Technology skills:
Information Literacy*

*Information Literacy
Modules/FY101: First Year Seminar & FY201: Transfer Seminar*

Writing Program Assessment: As part of the focus on the two competencies in the Information Literacy rubric category, faculty will review online resources for pre-post assessment of Information Literacy skills, with a goal of creating an assessment tool for all writing courses by the beginning of Spring 2017 semester.

Indirect Assessment of General Education

Indirect Assessment of GCU General Education through NSSE2015 and NSSE2014 Senior Responses (relevant items from NSSE 2014 Catholic Consortium, NSSE 2014 information literacy module, NSSE 2015 general survey, NSSE 2015 senior transitions module, NSSE 2015 global perspectives module) follows. The current General Education Program was designed to support the Institutional Student Learning Goals (ISLG) as listed below. This data also contributes to the assessment of the General Education Program.

Institutional Student Learning Goals	Indirect Assessment Method(s)	Results
1. Communicate effectively in written and spoken English	<p>NSSE 2015 Transitions GCU vs. 134 other institutions on how much confidence senior students have in ability to complete tasks requiring skill (4 point scale, 1=very little, 4=very much)</p> <p>NSSE 2015: speaking and writing items (1= never, 4 = very often)</p>	<p>NSSE 2015: No significant difference 1) clear writing (3.5 GCU vs. 3.3 others) and 2) persuasive speaking (3.2 GCU vs. 3.1 others)</p> <p>NSSE2015: No significant difference 1) given a course presentation (2.9 GCU vs. 3.0 Mideast private and 2.8 Carnegie class), 2) how often instructor provided feedback on draft or work in progress (3.0 GCU vs. 2.9 Mideast private and 2.8 Carnegie class), 3) estimated number of pages of assigned pages of student writing (87.4 GCU vs. 85.6 Mideast private vs. 80.1 Carnegie class)</p>
2. Apply critical thinking, problem-solving and research skills	<p>NSSE 2014 Info Lit: GCU vs. 81 other institutions on how much senior students report, on 14 different questions related to information literacy (frequently doing information literacy tasks, frequency of instructors emphasizing information literacy practices, and how much institution contributed to knowledge, skills and development in using information effectively.)</p>	<p>NSSE 2014: GCU significantly higher than other institutions on 13 of the 14 information literacy items and not significantly different on the 14th item.</p>

	<p>NSSE 2015 Transitions GCU vs. 134 other institutions on how much confidence senior students have in ability to complete tasks requiring skill (4 point scale, 1=very little, 4=very much)</p> <p>Library: Searchpath Tutorial: Six modules required to be taken by all transfer seminar students and optionally used in other courses across all disciplines. In transfer seminar, students are required to receive a grade of 80% or higher on each of the six assessments in order to complete the tutorial. Tutorial is designed to increase information literacy skills and to assess how well students critically evaluate information sources.</p>	<p>NSSE 2015: Significantly higher 1) research skills (3.5 GCU vs. 3.3 others). No significant difference 1) creative thinking and problem solving 3.5 GCU vs. 3.5 others), 2) critical thinking and analysis of arguments and information (3.4 GCU vs. 3.5 others), 3) technological skills (3.2 GCU vs. 3.1 others).</p> <p>Library: Searchpath Results: 2015 Fall Semester Student Completion of Assessments: Module 1 Start Smart: 401 Module 2 Choosing A Topic: 397 Module 3 Using the Catalog: 353 Module 4 Finding Articles: 355 Module 5 Using the Web: 334 Module 6 Citing Sources: 328</p>
<p>3. Demonstrate academic excellence in the major field and, for GenEd courses, gain a broad foundation in knowledge and understanding of modes of inquiry in arts,</p>	<p>NSSE 2015 items (% of students who did or have in progress)</p>	<p>NSSE 2015: Significantly higher or no difference: 1) participate in internship, field experience, student teaching, clinical placement (65% GCU vs. 66% Mideast private vs. 49% Carnegie class, 2) work with faculty member on research project (30% GCU vs. 32% Mideast private vs. 21% Carnegie class), 3) complete culminating senior experience (capstone course, project/thesis, comp exam, portfolio)</p>

humanities, sciences, and mathematics.		(GCU 52% vs. 59% Mideast private vs. 45% Carnegie class).
4. Demonstrate understanding of the Mercy core values	NSSE 2014 Catholic GCU vs. 71 institutions (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) and NSSE 2015 values item	NSSE 2014 Catholic: Significantly higher difference 1) mission understood by students (4.2 GCU vs. 3.8 others), 2) heritage of founders of institution is evident (4.4 GCU, 4.2 others). No significant difference 1) as result of my experience here, I am more aware of social justice issues (4.1 GCU vs. 4.0 others). NSSE 2015: Significantly higher difference 1) developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics (3.2 GCU vs. 2.9 others)
5. Demonstrate awareness of women's issues	NSSE 2014 Catholic GCU vs. 71 institutions (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)	NSSE 2014 Catholic: No significant difference 1) as result of my experience here, I am more aware of social justice issues (4.1 GCU vs. 4.0 others).
6. Explore spirituality and personal growth	NSSE 2014 Catholic GCU vs. 71 institutions (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)	NSSE 2014 Catholic: Significantly higher difference 1) students feel free to express their spirituality (4.3 GCU vs. 4.1 others), 2) social and personal development of students is important part of mission (4.4 GCU vs. 4.2 others). No significant difference 1) Opportunities at this institution for students to strengthen their religious commitment (4.4 GCU vs. 4.2 others), 2) I am more aware of my personal values because of my experience here (4.3 GCU vs. 4.2 others), 3) ethical and spiritual development of students is important part of mission (4.3 GCU vs. 4.2 others)
7. Demonstrate awareness of the value of engagement in local, national and global issues	NSSE 2014 Catholic GCU vs. 71 institutions (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) NSSE 2015 (1=very little, 4=very much)	NSSE 2014 Catholic: No significant difference 1) as result of my experience here, I am more aware of social justice issues (4.1 GCU vs. 4.0 others). NSSE 2015: Significantly higher difference 1) how much campus emphasizes attending events that address important social, economic or

	NSSE 2015 Global Persp (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)	political issues (3.0 GCU vs. 2.6 mideast private and 2.4 Carnegie class). No significant difference 1) how much experience at institution contributed to your being informed active citizen (3.0 GCU vs. 2.7 mideast private and 2.7 Carnegie class) NSSE2015 Global Persp: No significant difference 1) I am informed of current issues that impact international relations
8. Demonstrate analytical skills to appreciate the aesthetic	NSSE 2015 (1=never, 4=very often)	NSSE 2015: Significantly lower difference 1) how often attended arts performance (GCU 1.8 vs. 2.0 others)
9. Demonstrate leadership skills	NSSE2014 Catholic: GCU vs. 71 institutions. Leadership skills question. (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree). NSSE 2015 Transitions GCU vs. 134 other institutions on how much confidence senior students have in ability to complete tasks requiring skill (4 point scale, 1=very little, 4=very much) NSSE 2015 held leadership question	NSSE 2014 Catholic: Significantly higher difference 1) institutions offers opportunities for developing leadership skills (4.5 GCU vs. 4.2 others). NSSE 2015 Transitions : No significant difference 1) leadership skills (3.3 GCU vs. 3.2 others) NSSE 2015: Significantly higher or no significant difference 1) % hold or have held leadership role in student group (47% GCU vs. 47% other Mideast private vs. 33% other Carnegie class)
10. Demonstrate awareness of diversity issues	NSSE 2014 Catholic: GCU vs. 71 institutions. (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) NSSE 2015 diversity items	NSSE 2014 Catholic: Significantly higher difference 1) environment here encourages students to develop appreciation of diversity (4.4 GCU vs. 4.1 others). NSSE 2015: Significantly higher difference 1) understanding people of other backgrounds (3.2 GCU vs. 2.8 others). No significant difference GCU vs all other comparison groups:

		frequency of discussions with people of different 1) race/ethnicity 2) economic background 3) religious beliefs, 4) political views, and in frequency of including diverse perspectives in course discussions or assignments.
--	--	---

Recommendations and Action Steps

1. Engage in a discussion about the Institutional Learning Goals and whether there should be any modifications. Since the new general education program does not align itself specifically with the goals, this is a good time to revisit the goals. Curricular opportunities for students to achieve some of the goals, such as the one related to aesthetics, is limited. Is this related to strategic planning and the institution's identity statement? But, meanwhile, students in GEN199 and 400 can be encouraged to use aesthetic resources in their projects and assignments. Instructors can make students aware of campus-based opportunities for aesthetic experiences (art gallery, dance and music performances).
2. To improve upon NSSE-documented weakness in analyzing numerical and statistical information, ask instructors to consider increasing the use of materials that involve numbers and statistics. (Although this was done once during a fall faculty welcome back meeting, it may bear repeating). Speak with instructors of GEN199 and 400 about making use of numerical/statistical materials a requirement in some assignments.
3. Assess new SGA structure – number of student participants in elections in 16-17 vs in other years, satisfaction survey at end of the year, etc.
4. Does student life do surveys related to its programming, not just how many people attended but how much they were affected by the programs they attended (in relation to the ISLGs)?
5. Consider incorporating a short survey into GEN101/199 and GEN400 related to the ISLGs to get a sense as to how much students feel they have achieved the ISLGs during their time at GCU.
6. Consider asking students to put into their portfolio one artifact they believe best demonstrates their achievement of the ISLGs (from curriculum or co-curriculum). Then have the assessment committee randomly select some to evaluate using a simple rubric.
7. Consider suggesting to faculty the Neumann practice of including at least one core value in each of their classes as a focus of the class and develop an appropriate assessment.