

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: ASSESSMENT RPT ACADEMIC (Web Link)
Started: Wednesday, June 27, 2018 12:40:32 PM
Last Modified: Wednesday, June 27, 2018 1:00:35 PM
Time Spent: 00:20:03
IP Address: 192.231.202.250

Page 1: Program Assessment Report

Q1 Program Name

Bridge General Education

Q2 Level of Program

Undergraduate - University Wide

Q3 Assessment Liaison - Last Name (Person completing this report)

Cappucci

Q4 Assessment Liaison - First Name

Paul

Q5 School or Department

University-wide program (Gen Ed, Library Services, etc.)

Q6 Date of Submittal

Date / Time

06/27/2018

Q7 What is the year of the assessment cycle for this report? (Refer to Assessment Plan.)

Year 2

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 Goal 2 Intellectual and Practical Skills.

Learning Outcomes: Students will demonstrate competence in

- a. Critical and Creative Thinking, grounded in inquiry, analysis, and synthesis of information
 - b. Written and Oral Communication
 - c. Quantitative Literacy
 - d. Information Literacy
 - e. Teamwork and problem solving
-

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.

Select courses from GE categories assigned to assess these different learning outcomes:

(2a) Critical Thinking:

Formative Assessment—PL245 (2 sec.) / GEN199 (1 sec.)

Summative Assessment—GEN400 (3 sections)—Signature Assignment

(2a) Creative Thinking:

Formative Assessment—AR214 (1 section) / AR422 (2 sections)—Signature Assignment

Summative Assessment—GEN400 (3 sections)—Signature Assignment

(2b) Written Communication:

Formative Assessment—EN111 (2 sec) / EN221 (1 sec)—signature assignment

Summative Assessment—GEN400 (3 sections)—Signature Assignment

(2b) Oral Communication:

Formative Assessment—EN111 (2 sec) / EN221 (1 sec)—final project presentation

Summative Assessment—GEN400 (3 sections)—final project presentation

(2c) Quantitative Literacy:

Formative Assessment—BI203 (1 sec.) / MA103 (2 sec.) / MA106 (1 sec.)

(2d) Information Literacy:

Formative Assessment—GEN199 (across sections) Information Literacy Quiz

Summative Assessment—GEN400 (3 sections)—Signature Assignment

(2e) Teamwork:

Formative Assessment: GEN101 (1 section)—Group Project

Summative Assessment: GEN400 (2 sections)—Service Learning Project

(2e) Problem Solving:

Formative Assessment: GEN101 (1 section)—Group Project

Summative Assessment: GEN400 (2 sections)—Service Learning Project

Q10 Assessment Data and Findings. Describe your results using the data obtained from your assessment protocol. State results from formative and summative data. (Note: A full report of data is required at the end of this survey or by email. This should be an abbreviated summary and description.)

(2a) Critical Thinking

Formative: Expected Achievement of 90% at the Developing / Evident Level

GEN199 (1 sec.): Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 2 (92%); Criteria 3 (92%); Criteria 4 (92%); Criteria 5 (92%)

PL245 (2 sec.): Criteria 1 (91.6%); Criteria 2 (89.5%); Criteria 3 (89.5%); Criteria 4 (91/6%); Criteria 5 (91.6%)

GCU Office of Assessment - Academic Program Assessment Report AY 2017-2018

Summative : Expected Achievement of 90% at the Evident / Exemplary Level

GEN400 (2 sec.): Criteria 1 (95%); Criteria 4 (95%)

GEN400 (1 sec): Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 4 (92%)

(2a) Creative Thinking:

Formative: Expected Achievement of 90% at the Developing / Evident Level

AR214: Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 2 (100%); Criteria 3 (100%); Criteria 4 (NR); Criteria 5 (100%); Criteria 6 (100%)

AR222: Criteria 1 (90%); Criteria 2 (90%); Criteria 3 (90%); Criteria 4 (NR); Criteria 5 (90%); Criteria 6 (90%)

Summative : Expected Achievement of 90% at the Evident / Exemplary Level

GEN400 (2 sec.): Criteria 2 (100%) Criteria 5 (100 %)

GEN400 (1 sec.): Criteria 2 (92%) Criteria 5 (100 %)

(2b) Written Communication:

Formative Assessment— Expected Achievement of 90% at the Developing / Evident Level

EN111 (2 sec.) / EN221 (1 sec.): Criteria 1 (95%); Criteria 2 (90.5%); Criteria 3 (90.5%); Criteria 4 (95%)

Summative Assessment— Expected Achievement of 90% at the Evident / Exemplary Level

GEN400 (2 sections)—Criteria 1 (95%); Criteria 3 (83%);

GEN400 (1 section)—Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 3 (83%)

(2b) Oral Communication:

Formative Assessment—Expected Achievement of 90% at the Developing / Evident Level

EN111 (2 sections)—Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 2 (100%); Criteria 3 (100%); Criteria 4 (100%)

EN221 (1 section)—Criteria 1 (97%); Criteria 2 (97%); Criteria 3 (82%); Criteria 4 (97%)

Summative Assessment—Expected Achievement of 90% at the Evident / Exemplary Level

GEN400 (2 sections)--Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 2 (100%); Criteria 3 (93%); Criteria 4 (100)

GEN400 (1 section)—Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 2 (100%); Criteria 3 (100%); Criteria 4 (100%)

(2c) Quantitative Literacy:

Formative Assessment— Expected Achievement of 90% at the Developing / Evident Level

BI203(1 sec): Criteria 1(100%); Criteria 2(100%); Criteria 3(100%); Criteria 4(100); Criteria 5(100%); Crit. 6 (100%)

MA103 (2 sec.): Criteria 1 (94%); Criteria 2 (87%); Criteria 3 (90%); Criteria 4 (87%); Criteria 5 (93%); Crit. 6 (87%)

MA106 (1 sec): Criteria 1 (86.7%); Criteria 2 (93.3%); Crit. 3 (73.3%); Crit. 4 (66.7); Crit. 5 (86.7%); Crit. 6 (80%)

(2d) Information Literacy:

Formative Assessment: GEN199 SearchPath Quizzes—Spring '18. Instructors determined students should earn an 80% or higher on each of these quizzes.

Quiz 1—Smart Start (research strategies, choosing topic, etc.): 149 scores above 80% /169 unique emails—88% scored an 80% or higher

Quiz2—Library Hunt: 183 scores above 80% / 139 unique emails—100% scored an 80% or higher

Quiz 3—Hunting Beyond the Library: 128 scores above 80% / 120 unique emails—100% scored an 80% or higher

Quiz 4—Citing Sources: 150 scores above 80% /134 unique emails—100% scored an 80% or higher

Summative Assessment:

GEN400 (sec. 2): Criteria 4 (95%)

GEN400 (sec. 1): Criteria 4 (100%)

(2e) Teamwork:

(2c) Reading

Formative Assessment: Expected Achievement of 90% at the Developing / Evident Level

GEN101 (1 sec)—Criteria 1 (75%); Criteria 2 (75%); Criteria 3 (75%); Criteria 4 (75%); Criteria 5 (75%)

Summative Assessment: Expected Achievement of 90% at the Evident / Exemplary Level

GEN400 (1 sec)—Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 2 (100%); Criteria 3 (100%); Criteria 4 (100%); Criteria 5 (100%)

GEN400 (1 sec.)—Criteria 1 (82%); Criteria 2 (82%); Criteria 3 (64%); Criteria 4 (82%); Criteria 5 (100%)

(2e) Problem Solving:

Formative Assessment: Expected Achievement of 90% at the Developing / Evident Level

GEN101—Criteria 1 (15%); Criteria 2 (100%); Criteria 3 (92.5%); Criteria 4 (0); Criteria 5 (0); Criteria 6 (0%)

Summative Assessment: Expected Achievement of 90% at the Evident / Exemplary Level

GEN400 (2 sec)—Criteria 1 (95%); Criteria 3 (95%)

GEN400 (1 sec)—Criteria 1 (100%); Criteria 3 (92%)

SIR II Assessing Courses and Instructors: Indirect Assessment of Course Outcomes

GEN199:

My Learning Increased—3.16 (3: About the Same as Other Courses)

I made progress achieving course objectives—3.38 (3: About the Same as Other Courses)

My interest in the subject area increased—2.93 (2: Less than most Courses)

Courses helped me to think independently about subject matter—3.35 (3: About the Same as Other Courses)

This course actively involved me in what I was learning—3.41 (3: About the Same as Other Courses)

Means derived from 11 different sections of

GEN199 Fall / Spring (122 Respondents of 217 Possible Students).

GEN400:

My Learning Increased—3.69 (3: About the Same as Other Courses)

I made progress achieving course objectives—4.03 (More than most courses)

My interest in the subject area increased—3.85 (3: About the Same as Other Courses)

Courses helped me to think independently about subject matter—4.33 (More than most courses)

This course actively involved me in what I was learning—4.26 (More than most courses)

Means derived from 3 different sections of GEN400 Fall / Spring (25 Respondents of 30 Possible Students).

Q11 Analysis of data. What did the data tell you about the student achievement of the outcome? Do you consider the data valid? Was the data sufficient to address the program outcome? Distinguish between formative and summative data, direct and indirect results.

The GECC reviewed all assessment forms during its April 19 and June 14th meetings. With guidance from the Director of Assessment, committee members engaged in a discussion of the results for the learning outcomes designated for review during the 2nd year of the Bridge GE program (2 a., b., c., d., and e). Faculty teaching the following courses volunteered to provide formative assessment data aligned with a specific learning outcome: AR214, AR222, GEN101, GEN199, EN111, EN221, MA103, MA106, BI203, and PL245. With the assessment of GEN400, the committee also had access to summative data; however, it should be noted that students taking the course during this year are transfers and did not complete many of the other Bridge GE requirements. The assessment information was submitted on a form that included an assessment rubric for each learning outcome. Based upon the GECC's 2016-2017 assessment review, the forms also included a separate section so that faculty reports included data analysis, a satisfaction response, and a recommendation.

GCU Office of Assessment - Academic Program Assessment Report AY 2017-2018

(2a) Critical Thinking: The data collected from the two courses (GEN199 / PL245) at the formative level reflects that students are achieving the learning outcome at the developing/evident level. Students assessed in GEN400 are also meeting the learning outcomes at the evident / exemplary level for explanation of an issue (97.5%) and the student's position—perspective, thesis, and/or hypothesis (93.5%).

(2a) Creative Thinking: The data collected from the two courses (AR214 /AR222) at the formative level reflects that students are achieving the learning outcome at the developing/evident level. Students assessed in GEN400 are also meeting the learning outcomes at the evident / exemplary level aligned with the criteria for taking risks (96%) and innovative thinking (100%).

(2b) Written Communication: The data collected from the two courses (EN111 / EN221) at the formative level reflects that students are achieving the learning outcome at the developing/evident level. Students assessed in GEN400 did not meet the 90% expectation at the summative level for control of syntax / mechanics (83%); however, students did exceed the expectation for the use of content and source materials (100%). Instructors pointed out the challenges faced by ESL/ TLC students in a writing intensive class and the need for greater utilization of the Writing Center.

(2b) Oral Communication: The data collected from the two courses (EN111 / EN221) at the formative level reflects that students are achieving the learning outcome at the developing/evident level. GEN400 student presentations assessed also met the expectation for the learning outcome at the evident / exemplary level. Instructors noted the use of multiple presentations (and the final presentation focused on student project) as contributing to achieving this expectation.

(2c) Quantitative Literacy: The data collected from the three courses (MA103 / MA106 / BI203) at the formative level reflects that students are achieving the learning outcome at the developing/evident level. There are three criteria where students did not reach the 90% expectation (Calculation 87.8%; Application / Analysis 84.6%; Communication 89%). This resulted in a discussion about whether 80% may be a more realistic expectation for this particular learning outcome; the topic will be discussed when the committee reconvenes next academic year. Since GEN400 does not assess quantitative literacy in its current course design, there is no data for summative assessment.

(2d) Information Literacy: The formative assessment for this learning outcome took the form of four Search Path quizzes that students were asked to complete in GEN199. During GEN199 planning meetings in the Fall semester, faculty agreed that completion of the tutorial quizzes should be factored into the student grade. It also was agreed that students must score an 80% or above to earn credit for quiz completion. (Students are allowed to repeat the quizzes as many times as needed to reach the 80% expectation.) The results for the quizzes, though, suggest that not all of the GEN199 students completed the quizzes. At the start of the semester 238 students were enrolled in the course. According to information provided by the GCU library, here are the number of unique emails to complete each of the quizzes: Quiz #1 169; Quiz 2 139; Quiz 3 120; Quiz 4: 134. In 3 of 4 quizzes the number of scores higher than 80% exceed the number of unique emails. In reviewing this data, it was suggested by library staff that "1) sometimes the same student used a different email (one data field) other than GCU when submitting the same quiz more than once; 2) sometimes the student used a slightly different name (another data field) when submitting the same quiz more than once AND used a different email. Some names that should be, perhaps, listed under GEN199 but do not list GEN199 under the course field."

Based on these results, it does not appear that every student enrolled in GEN199 completed the four quizzes. After reviewing all GEN199 syllabi, the 80% expectation for quiz completion was inconsistently communicated to students. It's also unclear whether or not students properly identified the appropriate course field. It should be noted, though, that 100% of unique student emails completing quizzes 2, 3, and 4 scored an 80% or above. For Quiz # 1, 88% of unique student emails scored an 80% or above.

The summative assessment of GEN400 reflects achievement at the 90% evident / exemplary level for criteria #4 (Content / Source Materials). Students enrolled in these sections demonstrated the ability to locate quality source materials for the assignment and cite with "some errors" from the APA / MLA style. As Juniors / Seniors many of these students have information literacy experience. The annotated bibliography assignment also ensured instructors could have a conversation with students about source materials / citations before the submission of the final essay.

(2e) Teamwork and Problem Solving: Teamwork and problem solving have been the most problematic learning outcome to assess in this assessment cycle. GEN400 offered inconsistent artifacts for review that did not consistently address the criteria of Teamwork and

GCU Office of Assessment - Academic Program Assessment Report AY 2017-2018

this assessment cycle. GEN101 offered inconsistent artifacts for review that did not consistently address the criteria of teamwork and problem solving. As a result, the GECC has asked for this to be collected and reported again next year with the revision of the signature assignment and its inclusion in each GEN101 section. Through the use of a service learning project, GEN400 was able to provide helpful data as it relates to the achievement of Teamwork on the summative level. One of the criteria was below the 90% expectation (Individual Contributions outside Team Meetings—82%). With the revision of the teamwork assessment rubric, all criteria should be reviewed in relation to the assignment. The final signature assignment in GEN400 reflects that students are meeting the expectation of problem solving.

GEN199 SIR Scores: Indirect Assessment of Course Outcomes

SIR results indicate that from a student perspective progress was made towards course objectives, independent thinking, and active learning on a level comparable with other courses. Students reported less interest in the subject matter as compared with other courses. The faculty attending the semester wrap-up meeting for GEN101 discussed these results and ways to improve them, especially clarifying for freshman-level students the tie between learning outcomes and assignments. There also was concern expressed that the completion rate of electronic SIRs (56%) was much lower than instructor's requesting paper SIRs (75%).

GEN400 SIR Scores: Indirect Assessment of Course Outcomes

Although these results are for only 3 sections of GEN400, it indicates that from a student perspective progress was made towards course objectives, independent thinking, and active learning on a level more than most courses.

Q12 Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Why or why not? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)

For the most part, the results reviewed by the GECC are satisfactory for the assessment of the learning outcomes associated with the Bridge General Education Goal of Intellectual and Practical Skills. Faculty volunteers identified appropriate assignments and exam questions in their different courses to measure student learning of these outcomes. As noted in this report, students achieved at or near the performance expectation for formative assessment (developing / evident) and summative assessment (evident / exemplary). The assessment of Teamwork and Problem Solving did not provide satisfactory assessment data at the formative level. The GEN101 signature assignment needs to be revised to better align with the assessment rubric and instructors need to distribute the assignment more consistently across the different course sections.

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 during its first meeting in the Fall 2018 meeting. The director will then follow-up on the results with representatives from each of the departments.

All assessment rubric templates need to be standardized to include a separate row for "Number/Percent of students who met the criteria at the above level." This will help clarify to faculty submitters that the GECC would like to see the performance expectation reported in percentages. All rubrics also need to include Beginning / Not evident columns.

In regard to Critical and Creative Thinking, assessment reports should continue to be reported in percentage of student performance. For art courses, clarify the performance difference between art and non-art majors. In regard to AR422, review suggestions to clarify assignment in relation to the creative thinking rubric. For critical thinking, there should be a similar assignment / exam question moving forward with assessment that can be integrated into all PL245 exams. As suggested during the GECC meeting, the assignment and rubric for GEN199 need to be reviewed, revised, and realigned to ensure that the assignment measures the critical thinking outcome. Courses for this learning outcome will be reviewed again in the 2020-2021 academic year.

In Oral and Written Communication, the assessment of oral communication needs to move beyond instructor based assessment. It would be worthwhile to develop a strategy that includes an outside evaluator (solely for assessment, not grading purposes). This external evaluation may even take the form of anonymous student evaluations (as long as students are properly informed about the assessment rubric and its purposes). In regard to writing, the Director of the Writing program held a meeting in May '18 for the writing instructors focused on the "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" category. The group discussed results and shared ideas how to better help students achieve the performance expectation for this learning outcome. Such focused assessment meetings should continue each academic year. Courses for this learning outcome will be reviewed again in the 2020-2021 academic year.

For Quantitative Literacy, there should be a discussion about the expected level of performance for students taking a GE math. This determination should be Courses for this learning outcome will be reviewed again in the 2020-2021 academic year.

For Information Literacy, the process needs to be refined as it relates to student completion of the SearchPath quizzes. GEN199 instructors need to communicate to students a consistent expectation of 80% for the completion of the quizzes on the course syllabus. This expectation should be clear across all sections. Also, as we continue the collection process, it will help to formulate ways to better identify GEN199 students completing each quiz. GEN400 should continue the annotated bibliography assignment to support information literacy outcome for the program. Courses for this learning outcome will be reviewed again in the 2020-2021 academic year.

For Teamwork and Problem Solving, there needs to be a revision of the GEN101 signature assignment for the Fall '18 semester and realignment with the teamwork / problem solving rubric. Data should be collected on student performance for the 2018-2019 semester and reported to the GECC. GEN400 instructors met in June '18 to discuss the challenges related to assessing the learning outcome for teamwork. This assignment and the assessment rubric will continue to be reviewed by a group of instructors to ensure its alignment and effectiveness for measuring this learning outcome. For GEN400, this learning outcome will be reviewed again in the 2020-2021 academic year.

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 2018 semester, the Director of General Education will discuss results with the GECC and communicate with departmental representatives about the assessment results. GEN101 needs to provide assessment data for the teamwork and problem solving outcome during the 2018-2019 academic year. Other courses should initiate recommendations and work towards the review of this learning outcome during the 2020-2021 academic year.

Q15 State the Learning Outcome assessed. Be sure to use the same wording as in your Assessment Plan. (Outcome # 2 if needed)

Respondent skipped this question

Q16 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.

Respondent skipped this question

Q17 Assessment Data and Findings. Describe your results using the data obtained from your assessment protocol. State results from formative and summative data.

Respondent skipped this question

Q18 Analysis of data. What did the data tell you about the student achievement of the outcome? Do you consider the data valid? Was the data sufficient to address the program outcome? Distinguish between formative and summative data, direct and indirect results.

Respondent skipped this question

Q19 Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Why or why not? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)

Respondent skipped this question

Q20 What actions will be taken based on these results? When will the action be implemented, where or how, and who will be responsible?

Respondent skipped this question

Q21 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.

Respondent skipped this question

Page 3: Assessment Data

Q22 Copy and paste your full data report for Outcome 1. Or send it separately to jthiel@georgian.edu. Use the latter option if there are a number of charts and graphs.

I will send any supporting material via email.

Q23 Copy and paste your full data report for Outcome 2. Or send it separately to jthiel@georgian.edu. Use the latter option if there are a number of charts and graphs.

Respondent skipped this question

Q24 Write a short executive summary of the assessment results and planned action based on your program assessment for the current year. Be sure to include your program name. Note that this information will be used for an

overall report that will be read by both internal and external audiences. Do not use data from individual students that can be identified. Write the report in the third person or first person plural. Sample: (170 words)The Biology Program conducted its assessment for year one by evaluating student work obtained from 100 level lab courses and senior seminar research papers and oral presentations. Overall the lab reports of 15 students were assessed for formative assessment related to the outcome of preparation for the profession, and the research and presentations of eight (8) students for summative assessment of this same outcome. Our findings were that the formative assessment met expectations with achievement at the expected level, while the summative assessment was above expectations in both research and presentations. We found that the eight students in the capstone course worked closely with faculty mentors. We will continue this practice in the future. Those students who did not meet expectations in the formative assessment were non-science majors. The department will address this as a motivation issue in the next semester using selected pairing of lab partners. The indirect assessment of student surveys showed that students are generally satisfied with program offerings, but requested more flexibility with open lab times.

105 courses (313 sections) were offered in the Bridge General Education Program over the 2017-2018 academic year. This total included Online (55), Hybrid (24), Day (158) / Evening (47), and Offsite (36) offerings. A total of 2,442 students enrolled in Bridge courses in the fall, and 2,499 students were enrolled in Bridge courses in the spring. These offerings included two new Bridge GE requirements, GEN199 (15 sections—2 of these sections were online) and GEN400 (8 sections—1 section online and 1 section as hybrid).

The second year of the new Bridge General Education Program requires direct assessment of Intellectual and Practical Skills. This program goal expects student competence in each of the following learning outcomes: 2a—Critical and Creative Thinking, 2b—Written and Oral Communication, 2c—Quantitative Literacy, 2d—Information Literacy, and 2e—Teamwork and Problem Solving. Based upon the three-year assessment cycle approved by the GECC, the Director of GE requested two volunteers from each of the areas designated to assess Bridge Learning Outcomes 2a, b, c, d, and e. It should be noted that several of the learning outcomes—2a, 2b, and 2e—were reported separately to offer greater specificity / clarity of the assessment results (i.e. two volunteers were requested for Critical Thinking; two volunteers were requested for Creative Thinking.) Volunteers were asked to assess one GE course in either the Fall or Spring semester and to submit an outline of the assignment and its alignment with the designated learning outcome. 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 assessment forms were posted on the General Education Curriculum Committee Blackboard Organization for review by committee members. At the conclusion of each semester, faculty volunteers were asked to complete the assessment rubric indicating student performance at either the exemplary, evident, developing, or not evident levels. For courses at the formative level, 90% of students were expected to achieve at the developing / evident level. For courses at the summative level (GEN400), 90% of students were expected to achieve at the evident / exemplary level. The assessment forms were reviewed by the Director of General Education / Director of Assessment before posting on the GECC Blackboard Organization. The completed rubrics were then reviewed by the GECC during meetings held on April 19th and June 14th.

A total of 11 different courses (19 sections) were assessed with at least two different courses assessed for each of the learning outcomes. Formative assessment data was collected for courses at the 100 and 200 level. Summative assessment data was obtained through GEN400 for all but the Quantitative Literacy outcome. Our findings demonstrate that students generally met the performance expectation at the formative level (developing / evident) for Critical and Creative Thinking and Written and Oral Communication. While students fell short of the expectation of 90% for three criteria of Quantitative Literacy, the 85-89% achievement reflects a significant number of students were able to reach the developing / evident performance level. It will be worthwhile to discuss 90% or 80% as the performance expectation for this learning outcome. The assessment of Information Literacy suggests a need to fine tune the process. The SearchPath quizzes do offer support for this learning outcome at the formative level. However, the expectation for completion and pass rate of these quizzes needs to be more consistent across the different sections of GEN199. The one learning outcome—Teamwork and Problem Solving—was difficult to assess at the formative level due to the inconsistency of the student artifacts generated in GEN101 for the final assignment. The assignment needs to be reworked to better align with the Teamwork / Problem Solving rubric. With the piloting of this updated assignment, the GECC has asked for information about the project to be reported on this learning outcome for next year.

With the new GEN400 course, the GECC was also able to review summative assessment data for 2 a, b, d, and e. Through a culminating project (paper / presentation) and a service learning assignment, this course has been designed to assess learning outcomes central to this Bridge goal. With the assistance of the Director of Assessment, a streamlined assessment rubric was

GCU Office of Assessment - Academic Program Assessment Report AY 2017-2018

outcomes central to the Bridge goal. With the assistance of the Director of Assessment, a streamlined assessment rubric was generated for the final project. The submission of this assessment rubric from three different course sections reflects students meeting the performance expectations (evident / exemplary) for Critical and Creative Thinking, Oral and Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Problem Solving. However, some questions related to effective assessment of teamwork remain, including whether there might be a better assignment to measure this learning outcome. GEN400 Instructors meeting at the end of the Spring semester also discussed the need for a Service Learning coordinator to better assist faculty and students with the development of “group projects” for their students. With the increasing number of GEN400 courses, this coordinator will play a critical role in cultivating relationships with community partners to support the learning outcomes of this course. GEN101 also discussed the need for a service learning coordinator in their summer planning meetings.

While most of the assessment submissions from the faculty volunteers reflect student learning at the 90% expectation of the formative / summative level for criteria associated with the different outcomes, work is still needed to enhance the assessment of the Bridge GE program. As pointed out in several places of the report, faculty will continue to work on the best methods for collecting assessment data, as well as analyzing / reporting findings to the GECC. There also will be discussions to better align assignments / assessment rubrics in signature courses like GEN101, GEN199, and GEN400. These discussions also will involve clarifying the expectations that we have for students at differing levels of the program. All of this continuing work will enhance the coherence and effectiveness of a program that seeks to improve student learning at GCU.

Q25 Is there anything else you would like to add to this report?

Not at this time
