

Discipline Assessment Analysis Form

Directions: For each course SLO undergoing assessment, collect the Transfer/Basic Skills Assessment forms for Individual Course Sections.

Convene a department meeting (and/or communicate with department members) to summarize and discuss the SLO assessment results/analyses for all sections.

DEPARTMENT	General Education (GE)
Meeting Date (if applicable) And/or Alternative Means of Communication	E-mails used primarily, with a meeting on 1/12/12 for all faculty in sample
Number of Faculty/Staff Participating (# fulltime, # adjunct, and total)	18 faculty (1 associate faculty, 17 faculty)
Number of Faculty Sharing Assessment Results Number of Course Sections Assessed	21 courses, 30 sections, all faculty have access to results
Course SLO or Degree SLO Measured --Identify Course(s) and Degree--	Critical Thinking GE outcome
ASSESSMENT TOOLS Describe assessment tool/ assignments faculty/staff used to measure the SLO.	By the end of the semester, faculty recorded a score for each student's ability to utilize critical thinking skills in their classes based upon a three-point rubric (1=student does not meet expectations/does not display an ability to think critically; 2=meets expectations/ moderate ability to think critically; 3=exceeds expectations/ excellent critical thinking skills; NA=student's ability was not measured due to absence/ non-participation in activity). Rather than record an overall, potentially more subjective score based upon an impression of the student at the end of the semester, faculty were asked to record the score as part of a rubric for grading a specific assignment. Survey Monkey was used to enter the data, describe the artifacts used, and provide feedback on the process.

<p>ASSESSMENT RESULTS (Summarize the overall results of your department, including performance data if applicable.)</p>	<p>See data table at end of this form for data</p>
<p>In what areas was student performance outstanding?</p>	<p>This first assessment of GE focused as much on the process as student performance. Suggestions to improve student learning that were shared at the 1/12/12 meeting will be documented on a “closing the loop” form. Most students did display an ability to think critically to some degree, but faculty would like a means to measure whether or not this ability was gained in the course itself. Some participants suggested that faculty might ask students how long they have been in school and how many units in order to correlate prior GE experience with current sample, put students into categories (level 1, 2, 3 of GE experience prior to the class).</p>
<p>In what areas should student performance be improved?</p>	<p>Other specific suggestions for the process included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *on the entry form (Survey Monkey), clarify question on frequency with which faculty address critical thinking, clarify "always" or use a rubric for percents *find out with a multiple choice question response how sample was gathered (test/ quiz, lab, presentation, etc.) *include GE bullet subpoints as choices (which bullets are covered in class) so that we can see if all bullets in a given GE outcome area are being addressed
<p>Describe unaddressed student needs or issues that the assessment revealed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *clarify NA vs. didn't complete or didn't meet expectations *for faculty with concerns about how to coordinate all assessment work - you can be flexible with 5-year plans as needed, updating them to better coordinate GE, course, and degree/certificate-level assessment *for GE revisions, we should consider which points are working/not working

	<p>For the current GE bullets under “critical thinking,” faculty recommended: Bullet #3 - add "or" after resources to make more open/clear Bullets #2/3 - redundant Bullet #4 - perhaps include "appropriately" in addition to, or instead of, "effectively" Bulle t#7 - change to "defend and analyze value judgments and ethical decisions using course materials"</p> <p>Pedagogical suggestions included:</p> <p>*types of assignments to use critical thinking - experiment with types of assignments used and use varied instructional modes to teach critical thinking</p> <p>*be more specific with essay questions, ask specifically for critical thinking when it is required, faculty may want to use a multi-part question to separate and emphasize the critical thinking part</p> <p>*some faculty had good results with an in-class exam with prior resources and research provided</p> <p>*faculty should work on emphasizing outcomes to students so they know expectations</p> <p>*tiered multiple choice questions to show ability to make decisions (nursing uses)</p> <p>*we will provide names of those in current sample to next sample group of faculty so that they may ask colleagues about the assessment and reporting process</p> <p>*as we start assessing these outcomes, we may want to consider revisions to GE outcomes, as well as course-level outcomes</p>
<p>NEXT STEP(S) TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING</p> <p>How will your department address the needs and issues that were revealed by your assessment?</p> <p>What are your collective plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Seek out or design faculty development activities on teaching and assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Consult teaching and learning experts about teaching and assessment methods <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage faculty to share activities that foster improved student learning <input type="checkbox"/> Write collaborative grants to fund departmental projects to improve teaching <input type="checkbox"/> Purchase articles/books on teaching/assessment.

<p>and strategies for improving student learning?</p> <p>Check all that apply.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Create bibliography of resource material <input type="checkbox"/> Visit classrooms to provide feedback (mentoring) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Share rubrics and assessment results among all discipline faculty <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analyze/revise course curriculum and/or SLOs <input type="checkbox"/> Analyze department curriculum to strengthen the coherence of the program or the progression of skills from course to course <input type="checkbox"/> Nothing; assessments indicate no improvements necessary <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): refine process of GE assessment reporting and data management using software being developed in-house <p>Additional Explanation:</p>
<p>Priorities to Improve Student Learning</p> <p>List the TOP 3 TO 6 actions/changes faculty judge will <u>most</u> improve student learning.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Making students aware of outcomes and expectations 2) Using explicit rubrics 3) Using varied instructional modes and experiences emphasizing critical thinking
<p>IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>Describe the departmental plans to implement these priorities.</p>	<p>This form, composed of feedback from a meeting of faculty in the fall 2011 GE assessment sample, will be shared with all those in the sample for feedback and comments. It will then be shared with the Curriculum Committee, who might consider revising the phrasing of some of the bullet points for the outcome, as well as those in the next GE sample. It will also be posted on MyCR on the Assessment Committee's site.</p>
<p>TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>Provide a timeline for implementation of your top priorities.</p>	<p>Faculty should continue to emphasize critical thinking in their GE courses, integrating suggestions from colleagues as appropriate. The findings will be made public by February, 2012 so that others teaching GE courses may also review these findings. Faculty in the fall 2011 sample also volunteered to serve as contacts to provide advice for colleagues in future GE samples.</p>
<p>REASSESSMENT</p> <p>When do you plan to reassess this SLO?</p>	<p>Spring 2013</p>

	Extent to which students met expectations:				
GE Area	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet	Extent developed Always / frequently	# courses evaluated
Overall	38.21%	42.69%	19.10%	8 / 13	21
A: Nat Sci	44.73%	43.46%	11.81%	1 / 4	5 (12 sections)*
B: Soc Sci	30.59%	41.67%	27.65%	4 / 3	7 (8 sections)*
C: Human	36.67%	52.22%	11.11%	2 / 3	5
D: Lang & Rat	36.90%	32.14%	30.95%	1 / 3	4