

# General Education

📄 Program-216

## Identification Data

Please complete the entire data form. This form allows for assessment results from any or all program outcomes. In AEFIS, you can obtain assessment results if artifacts are linked to program outcomes. Please refer to your Program Assessment Plan to see which outcomes are to be included for this year's report. Your plan will also give you the courses, assessment protocols, and expected results for the selected outcomes. In this data form, you will be able to upload data tables and findings. Contact the OIAA office for additional support: [assessment@georgian.edu](mailto:assessment@georgian.edu). Data form is due June 30.

1

Program Name

BRIDGE General Education

2

Level of Program

- Undergraduate Major
- Graduate-Master's
- Graduate-Certificate Only
- Undergraduate-University Wide
- Other (Specify below)

Comments

3

Assessment Liaison Name (Last, First)

Wedlock, Kristen Park

4

Assessment Liaison Email

[kwedlock@georgian.edu](mailto:kwedlock@georgian.edu)

5

School or Department

- HMM School of Nursing and Wellness
- School of Arts and Sciences
- School of Business and Digital Media
- School of Education
- University-wide program (Gen Ed, Library Services, etc.)
- Other (Specify below)

Comments

6

Dean/Supervisor Name (Last, First)

Chinery, Mary

7

Dean/Supervisor Email

mchinery@georgian.edu

8

Date of Submittal. (MM/DD/YYYY)

07/31/2023

9

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

- Year 1
- Year 2
- Year 3
- Year 4
- Year 5

Comments

## Assessment Report Information

These questions follow the outline of the Assessment Report, found at the end of your Assessment Plan. You may find it helpful to complete the report as a Word document, save it for yourself, and upload it here.

1

Assessment Data for Program



No data found for the program.

2

### 2 BGE02A - Bridge Gen Ed Outcome 2A

2a. Critical and creative thinking, grounded in inquiry, analysis, and synthesis of information

## Assessment Report Information

1

Which program courses or information were used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome?

For direct assessment of 2A. critical and creative thinking, grounded in inquiry, analysis, and synthesis of information, we used courses across the disciplines to assess student learning: ENG 111 / 221, Philosophy Courses, Visual & Performing Arts (Performance), GEN 199, GEN 400

2

Describe the assessment protocol used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome.

To complete the direct assessment of formative courses, we used the signature assignments evaluated by rubrics which included the criteria for 2A:

EN111/221 Research Paper Assignment; PL245 (Philosophy) Unit Papers & Exams; AR229 (Performance) Final Paper; and GEN199 Final Reflection Paper. To complete the direct assessment of summative courses, we evaluated the signature assignment (a personal synthesis paper) in GEN400 using a rubric which included criteria for 2A.

3

What was used for **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome? Describe the protocol used.

Indirect assessment of the formative courses included FY NSSE responses to Reflective and Integrative Learning, whereas summative used SR NSSE responses to Reflective and Integrative Learning. The NSSE prompts read: a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments [RIntegrate]; b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues [RSocietal]; c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments [RDiverse]; d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue [Rlownview]; e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective [Rlperspect]; f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept [RInewview]; and g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge [Rlconnect]

## Assessment Data and Findings

- 1 Describe your results from the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome. State results for both formative and summative data if applicable. You will be able to upload data in the next question.

Our performance goal of 80% was exceeded in the spring (92% success) but not in the fall (78.9% success). Of the 380 artifacts assessed in the Fall 2022 semester, 21% did not meet expectations, 4% met expectations, and 75% exceeded expectations using the following criteria: **FORMATIVE:** 80% of students will meet the Developing or Milestone (2) level in rubric criteria related to the outcomes; **SUMMATIVE:** 80% of students will meet the Accomplished or Capstone (4) level in rubric criteria related to the outcome. Overall, for Fall 2022, our performance goal of 80% was not met. Data showed a 78.9% success rate. Of the 292 artifacts assessed in the Spring 2023 semester, 18% did not meet expectations (less than fall), 20% met expectations (up from fall), and 74% exceeded expectations (about the same as fall). Overall, for Spring 2023, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed a 92% success rate.

- 2 Upload any data documents related to the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

[BGL02A Spring 2023.pdf](#)

[Fall22.GENED.LO2.080823.pdf](#)

- 3 Describe your results from the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

While we did not have the peer benchmarks for comparison, we do see our summative students (SR) reporting higher perceptions of reflection and integration which demonstrate the criteria for LO2A, particularly the ability to synthesize information.

In response to the FY and SR NSSE prompts how often did you do the following during the past school year, we captured the following student responses:

FORMATIVE (FY)

- a. "Sometimes" [2.58]: Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments [RIntegrate];
- b. "Sometimes" [2.48]: Connected your learning to societal problems or issues [RSocietal];
- c. "Sometimes" [2.84]: Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments [RIdiverse];
- d. "Sometimes" [2.52]: Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue [Rlownview];
- e. "Sometimes" [2.62]: Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from

their perspective [Rlperspect]

f. "Sometimes" [2.82]: Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept [Rlnewview]; and

g. "Sometimes" [2.98]: Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge [Rlconnect]

SUMMATIVE SR:

a. "Sometimes" [2.97]: Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments [Rlintegrate];

b. "Sometimes" [2.81]: Connected your learning to societal problems or issues [Rlsocietal];

c. "Sometimes" [2.70]: Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments [Rldiverse];

d. "Sometimes" [2.86]: Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue [Rlownview];

e. "Sometimes" [2.95]: Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective [Rlperspect]

f. "Sometimes" [2.94]: Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept [Rlnewview]; and

g. "Often" [3.15]: Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge [Rlconnect]

Shift in FY and SR Perception of Reflection & Integration

a. +.39 points (closer to "often" than "sometimes"): Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments [Rlintegrate];

b. +.34 points (closer to "often" than "sometimes"): Connected your learning to societal problems or issues [Rlsocietal];

c. -.14 points (closer to "often" than "sometimes" BUT lower in the SR pop rather than in the FY pop): Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments [Rldiverse];

d. +.34 points (closer to "often" than "sometimes"):: Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue [Rlownview];

e. +.33 points (closer to "often" than "sometimes"): Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective [Rlperspect]

f. +.12 points (closer to "often" than "sometimes"): Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept [Rlnewview]; and

g. +.16 points (closer to "often" than "sometimes"): Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge [Rlconnect]

4

Upload any data files related to the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

## Analysis of data

- 1 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.

Examining the direct assessment data (Rubric Scores) which looked at student performance as opposed to the indirect assessment data (NSSE) which revealed student attitudes and perceptions of learning, students are engaging in critical and creative thinking whether they recognize it or not. While students selected on average "sometimes" as the predominant attitude for metrics of reflection and integration, all courses aligned with the BRIDGE LO2A, submitted rubric graded signature assignments. The greatest difference in perceptions of learning [+0.39] between FY and SR courses was focused on an ability to integrate information: *Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments [RIintegrate]*. This is supported by the gap in performance between the Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 semesters. The courses predominantly scheduled in the Spring are GEN199 and GEN400 which both emphasize integration and synthesis whereas the courses scheduled in the fall [EN111 and GEN101] are introducing new students to academic reading, writing, and thinking: summary vs analysis and analysis vs synthesis. The fall courses scaffold the spring skills at both the formative and summative levels. In the context of performance, in the Fall 2022 semester we had a 78.9% success, whereas the Spring 2023 semester boasted a 92% success in LO2A critical and creative thinking. The high[est] NSSE scores in both FY [2.98] and SR [3.14] populations for connection correlate with the formative GEN199 and summative GEN400 signature assignments: *Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge [RIconnect]*.

- 2 Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)

- Exceeded expectations/benchmarks
- Met all expectations/benchmarks
- Met most expectations/benchmarks
- Did not meet expectations/benchmarks
- No data available to judge

- 3 Describe why or why not in the comment box below.

In the context of performance, in the Fall 2022 semester we had a 78.9% success, missing our 80% goal by 1.1%, whereas the Spring 2023 semester boasted a 92% success, exceeding our goal by 12% in LO2A critical and creative thinking. Does this have to do with the scaffolding of courses? The preparedness of students entering college? The expectations of faculty?

## Actions

**1 What actions will be taken based on these results?**

We will conduct a comparative study across time (Fall 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 versus Spring 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023) to see if this pattern was previously evident, as well as across units. Do students who use more of our resources [writing center, tutoring center, TRIO, etc.] between Fall and Spring semesters] demonstrate improvement in critical and creative thinking? It would also be interesting to compare trends with the Writing Program, particularly the Writing Intensive Program.

**2 When, where, and how will the actions be implemented?**

Director of Gen Ed, Kristen Park Wedlock, will work with the Office of Assessment to collect data and compare results to other academic and support unit assessments (direct) as well as contextualize with Provost's report and Associate Vice President for University Assessment, Dr. Janet Thiel's report (indirect). After the information is gathered, an action plan will be established to address the findings.

**3 Who will be responsible?**

Kristen Park Wedlock, Director of General Education, will request assistance from Dr. Janet Thiel, Associate Vice President for University Assessment.

**4 What is the time frame for the above actions? Designate actions for each year of your assessment cycle.**

Fall 2023 Conduct Comparative Study; Spring 2024 Develop Action Plan

**3 BGE02B - Bridge Gen Ed Outcome 2B**

2b. Written and oral communication

## Assessment Report Information

**1 Which program courses or information were used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome?**

To assess Bridge Gen Ed Outcome 2B written and oral communication, we evaluated courses in our writing intensive program, particularly research and academic writing as well as core gen ed classes, as well as world language courses in the gen ed program: Written: Academic Writing Courses (ENG 111/221), WI-Gen Ed Courses, GEN 199; Oral: Presentation Skills taught in EN111 and GEN 199, Oral Language skills in target language taught in World Languages courses.

**2 Describe the assessment protocol used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome.**

To complete the direct assessment of formative coursework, we used a rubric designed to evaluate written communication on the signature assignments for EN111/221 [Research Paper] and GEN199 [Synthesis Paper]. Assessment of oral communication emphasized the development in EN111, reinforcement in GEN199, and

common oral exam in target World Language. To complete the direct assessment of summative coursework, rubrics for written and oral communication were used in the GEN 400 signature assignment (Personal Synthesis Paper and Presentation/ Team Takeover).

- 3 What was used for **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome? Describe the protocol used.  
NA

## Assessment Data and Findings

- 1 Describe your results from the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome. State results for both formative and summative data if applicable. You will be able to upload data in the next question.

We exceeded our performance goal of 80% in both the Fall 2022 [87% success] and Spring 2023 [91.2% success]. Of the 193 artifacts assessed in the Fall 2022 semester, 7.72% did not meet expectations, 6% met expectations, and 80% exceeded expectations. Overall, for Fall 2022, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed an 87% success rate. Of the 231 artifacts assessed in the Spring 2023 semester, 17.7% did not meet expectations (more than fall), 6.6% met expectations (same as fall), and 79.2% exceeded expectations (about the same as fall). Overall, for Spring 2023, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed a 91.2% success rate.

- 2 Upload any data documents related to the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

[BGL02A Spring 2023.pdf](#)

[Fall22.GENED.LO2.080823.pdf](#)

- 3 Describe your results from the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

NA

- 4 Upload any data files related to the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.



Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

## Analysis of data

- 1 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.

According to the data, written and oral communication performance goals were met: Fall 2022 [87% success] and Spring 2023 [91.2%]. With only direct assessment results to evaluate the outcome, this assessment relies on the quality of the rubrics and those assessing the signature assignments to determine whether or not written communication was "developing" [formative] or "evident" [summative]. Likewise, the data does not distinguish between oral results and written results.

- 2 Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)

- Exceeded expectations/benchmarks
- Met all expectations/benchmarks
- Met most expectations/benchmarks
- Did not meet expectations/benchmarks
- No data available to judge

- 3 Describe why or why not in the comment box below.

Exceeded performance goal of 80% by 7% in the fall and 11.2% in the spring.

## Actions

- 1 What actions will be taken based on these results?

No action planned.

- 2 When, where, and how will the actions be implemented?

No action planned.

- 3 Who will be responsible?

No action planned.

- 4 What is the time frame for the above actions? Designate actions for each year of your assessment cycle.

No action planned.

4 **BGEO2C - Bridge Gen Ed Outcome 2C**

2c. Quantitative literacy

## Assessment Report Information

- 1 Which program courses or information were used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome?

To assess quantitative literacy (Bridge Gen Ed 2C), we evaluated approved Quantitative Analysis and Natural Science Laboratory courses: BI111, BI121, BI219, CS123, MA103, MA109, MA110, MA210, PH334, PH122, PH116, and PH112.

- 2 Describe the assessment protocol used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome.

To complete the direct assessment of Bridge Gen Ed LO2C quantitative literacy, we evaluated the signature assignment in Quantitative Analysis Courses using an AAC&U Value rubric Quantitative Analysis courses and used a rubric to evaluate Common Laboratory Skills and Reporting for the Natural Science courses.

- 3 What was used for **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome? Describe the protocol used.

Results of NSSE FY Survey were used with an emphasis on the Academic Challenge and Quantitative Reasoning prompts: a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.) [QRconclude]; b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.) [QRproblem]; c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information [QRevaluate].

## Assessment Data and Findings

- 1 Describe your results from the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome. State results for both formative and summative data if applicable. You will be able to upload data in the next question.

We did not meet our performance goal of 80% at the developing or milestone level in the Fall 2022 [78.6% success], however we did meet it in the Spring 2023 [82.5% success]. Of the 290 artifacts assessed in the Fall 2022 semester, 21% did not meet expectations, 28% met expectations, and 50% exceeded expectations. Overall, for Fall 2022, our performance goal of 80% was not met. Data showed an 78.6% success rate. Of the 63 artifacts assessed in the Spring 2023 semester, 5.7% did not meet expectations (less than fall), 3.5% met

expectations (less than fall), and 50% exceeded expectations (about the same as fall). Overall, for Spring 2023, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed a 82.5% success rate.

**2** Upload any data documents related to the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

**3** Describe your results from the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

While we did not have the peer benchmarks for comparison, we do see our formative learners aligning their perception of learning with Quantitative Reasoning in the context of drawing conclusions mores so than solving problems or evaluating numerical information.

In response to the FY NSSE prompts "how often did you do the following during the past school year," we captured the following student responses:

- a. "Sometimes" [2.51]: Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.) [QRconclude];
- b. "Sometimes" [2.18]: Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.) [QRproblem];
- c. "Sometimes" [2.20]: Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information [QRevaluate].

**4** Upload any data files related to the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

## Analysis of data

- 1 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.

Students neither consistently demonstrated quantitative literacy, nor assessed their perception of quantitative reasoning with confidence, citing that they "sometimes" draw conclusions, solve problems, or evaluate positions using numerical information. We did not meet our performance goal of 80% at the developing or milestone level in the Fall 2022 [78.6% success], however we did meet it in the Spring 2023 [82.5% success]. There were fewer artifacts for direct assessment collected in the spring and more in the fall, so it would be valuable to investigate this discrepancy.

- 2 Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)

- Exceeded expectations/benchmarks
- Met all expectations/benchmarks
- Met most expectations/benchmarks
- Did not meet expectations/benchmarks
- No data available to judge

- 3 Describe why or why not in the comment box below.

Performance goal of 80% developing or milestone was not met in the fall, however it was achieved in the spring.

## Actions

- 1 What actions will be taken based on these results?

We will conduct a comparative study across time (Fall 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 versus Spring 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023) to see if this pattern was previously evident, as well as across units. Do students who use more of our resources [math lounge, tutoring center, TRIO, etc.] between Fall and Spring semesters] demonstrate improvement in quantitative literacy? What are the DWF reports for the courses listed and do the reflect differences between fall and spring?

- 2 When, where, and how will the actions be implemented?

Director of Gen Ed, Kristen Park Wedlock, will work with the Office of Assessment to collect data and compare results to other academic and support unit assessments (direct) as well as contextualize with Provost's report and Associate Vice President for University Assessment, Dr. Janet Thiel's report (indirect). After the information is gathered, an action plan will be established to address the findings.

- 3 Who will be responsible?

Kristen Park Wedlock, Director of General Education, will request assistance from Dr. Janet Thiel, Associate Vice President for University Assessment.

- 4 **What is the time frame for the above actions? Designate actions for each year of your assessment cycle.**

Fall 2023 Conduct Study; Spring 2024 Develop Action Plan.

- 5 **BGEO2D - Bridge Gen Ed Outcome 2D**

2d. Information literacy

## Assessment Report Information

- 1 **Which program courses or information were used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome?**

We used courses in both the writing program and core gen program where direct information literacy instruction is provided by the library faculty, reinforced in learning modules, and applied in signature assignments: [Formative] EN111, EN221, GEN 199; Library Instructional Programs related to General Education courses; and [Summative] GEN 400.

- 2 **Describe the assessment protocol used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome.**

To complete direct assessment of information literacy in formative courses, we used a rubric for information literacy to evaluate EN 111/ EN 221 Research Paper and GEN199 . annotated bibliography. The same protocol was followed for direct assessment of the summative course GEN400.

- 3 **What was used for **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome? Describe the protocol used.**

FORMATIVE: Statistics from the University Library on Information Literacy instruction in Gen Ed courses and use of lib guides for these courses. Statistics on incidents of plagiarism within Gen Ed coursework.

SUMMATIVE: none

## Assessment Data and Findings

- 1 **Describe your results from the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome. State results for both formative and summative data if applicable. You will be able to upload data in the next question.**

We exceeded our performance goal of 80% at the development and milestone levels in both the Fall 2022 [86% success] and Spring 2023 [85.7% success]. Of the 292 artifacts assessed in the Fall 2022 semester, 14% did not meet expectations, 8% met expectations, and 78% exceeded expectations. Overall, for Fall 2022, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed an 86% success rate. Of the 230 artifacts assessed in the

Spring 2023 semester, 12% did not meet expectations (less than fall), 16% met expectations (more than fall), and 72% exceeded expectations (less than fall). Overall, for Spring 2023, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed a 85.7% success rate.

- 2 Upload any data documents related to the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

- 3 Describe your results from the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

- 4 Upload any data files related to the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

## Analysis of data

- 1 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 results of the direct assessment reflected the positive correlation of semesters when direct information literacy instruction is programmed (required library faculty class visit during Fall EN111/EN221 Courses) and the successful application of information literacy strategies in producing Research Papers and Annotated Bibliographies. The retention and application of information literacy through the GEN199 Annotated Bibliography assignment and Search Path module series reveals comparable results for the spring, too. Students are learning information literacy skills and sustaining, applying, and reinforcing them across their gen program. I would like to see the Library Report to compare our direct and indirect results. How do students perceive their engagement with and confidence of information literacy?

2 Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)

- Exceeded expectations/benchmarks
- Met all expectations/benchmarks
- Met most expectations/benchmarks
- Did not meet expectations/benchmarks
- No data available to judge

3 Describe why or why not in the comment box below.

Met expectations for Developing, Milestone, and Accomplished, Capstone in both the Fall 2022 (86%) and Spring 2023 (85.7%) semesters.

## Actions

1 What actions will be taken based on these results?

No action at this time.

2 When, where, and how will the actions be implemented?

No action at this time.

3 Who will be responsible?

No action at this time.

4 What is the time frame for the above actions? Designate actions for each year of your assessment cycle.

No action at this time.

6 **BGE02E - Bridge Gen Ed Outcome 2E**

2e. Teamwork and problem solving

## Assessment Report Information

1 Which program courses or information were used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome?

Our cornerstone (GEN101) and capstone (GEN400) courses were used to evaluate Bridge Gen Ed LO2E Teamwork and problem solving. Both of these courses have service learning and teamwork projects embedded in the curriculum.

2 Describe the assessment protocol used for **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome.

To complete the direct assessment of LO2E Team Work and Problem Solving, we evaluated the team-based assignment in GEN101 (formative) and signature assignment in GEN400 (summative) with an AAC&U VALUE rubric on Teamwork.

3 What was used for **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome? Describe the protocol used.

Used the NSSE FY (formative) and SR (summative) Learning with Peers [CL] prompt to complete indirect assessment: "How many times in the last year did you: Work[ed] with other students on course projects or assignments [CLproject]."

## Assessment Data and Findings

1 Describe your results from the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen outcome. State results for both formative and summative data if applicable. You will be able to upload data in the next question.

Our performance goal of 80% was exceeded in the fall (90.8% success) and the spring (87.5% success). Of the 295 artifacts assessed in the Fall 2022 semester, 9% did not meet expectations, 6% met expectations, and 84% exceeded expectations using the following criteria: **FORMATIVE:** 80% of students will meet the Developing or Milestone (2) level in rubric criteria related to the outcomes; **SUMMATIVE:** 80% of students will meet the Accomplished or Capstone (4) level in rubric criteria related to the outcome. Overall, for Fall 2022, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed a 90.8% success rate. Of the 7 artifacts assessed in the Spring 2023 semester, 42% met expectations (up from fall), and 57% exceeded expectations (less than fall). Overall, for Spring 2023, our performance goal of 80% was met. Data showed a 87.5% success rate.

2 Upload any data documents related to the **DIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

3 Describe your results from the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.



While we did not have the peer benchmarks for comparison, we do see our summative students (SR) reporting higher perceptions of peer learning which demonstrates the criteria for LO2E, particularly Teamwork and Problem Solving.

In response to the FY and SR NSSE prompts how often did you do the following during the past school year, we captured the following student responses:

FY: "Sometimes" [2.39] Work[ed] with other students on course projects assignments [CLproject].

SR: "Sometimes" [2.68] Work[ed] with other students on course projects or assignments [CLproject].

Shift in FY and SR perception of peer learning: [+ .29] Closer to "Often" than "Sometimes": Work[ed] with other students on course projects or assignments [CLproject].

#### 4 Upload any data files related to the **INDIRECT** assessment of the chosen learning outcome.

Please select the add a new document link to upload your files. Once uploaded, please select the files within the dropdown menu.

No document was selected.

## Analysis of data

### 1 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 data reflected student success in LO2E Teamwork and Problem Solving through participation in and evaluation of their GEN101 and GEN400 signature assignments. While students reported in the FY NSSE that they "sometimes" [2.39] worked on team projects, the SR results indicated a modest increase [+ .29 to 2.68] in perception of peer learning in project-based coursework. How can we continue to reinforce the value of peer learning through project-based coursework AND demonstrate how and where our BRIDGE program centers this HIP? How can we close the gap between perception of learning and performance indicators in the context of teamwork and problem solving?

### 2 Are the assessment results for this outcome satisfactory? Did they meet your stated expectations? (See Assessment Plan)

- Exceeded expectations/benchmarks
- Met all expectations/benchmarks
- Met most expectations/benchmarks
- Did not meet expectations/benchmarks
- No data available to judge

**3 Describe why or why not in the comment box below.**

Our performance goal of 80% was exceeded in the fall (90.8% success) and the spring (87.5% success) and the NSSE data reflected a +.29 increase in perception of project-based peer learning between FY and SR populations.

## Actions

**1 What actions will be taken based on these results?**

No action at this time.

**2 When, where, and how will the actions be implemented?**

No action at this time.

**3 Who will be responsible?**

No action at this time.

**4 What is the time frame for the above actions? Designate actions for each year of your assessment cycle.**

No action at this time.

## Executive Summary

**1**

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.

Here is a sample: The (program name) assessed its learning outcome(s) (name outcomes) for the academic year (?). Key findings were that students .... The program (exceeded, met, did not meet) its achievement/benchmark goals for this/these outcomes. Future action for continuous improvement will include.....

The BRIDGE General Education Program (216) assessed the learning outcomes in Goal 2 Intellectual and Practical Skills for the 2022 - 2023 school year. The learning outcomes which define the competencies aligned with this goal (2) include critical and creative thinking (2A), written and oral communication (2B), quantitative literacy (2C), information literacy (2D), and teamwork and problem solving (2E). Students who participate in the GEN pathways [GEN101], cornerstone [GEN199], and capstone [GEN400] courses as well as the survey of foundational knowledge classes provided artifacts for evaluation including direct assessment (signature assignments with rubrics aligned to outcomes) and indirect assessment (NSSE FY and SR scores). The BRIDGE program

met its 80% performance goal in LO2B Written and Oral Communication [87% F, 92.1% S], LO2D information literacy [86% F, 85.7% S], and LO2E Teamwork and Problem Solving [90.8% F, 97.5% S]. The results for LO2A Critical and Creative Thinking [78.9% F, 92% S] and LO2C Quantitative Literacy [78.6% F, 82.5% S] reflect inconsistency between the fall and spring semesters. Whereas both competencies were not met in the fall, they were met in the spring. On closer examination of the specific courses that run in the fall vs the spring, we find more pre-requisite and introductory courses in the fall [EN111, GEN101, MA 103, 109] and more scaffolded programming in the spring [GEN199 after EN111 & GEN101 as well as BI 203 & 219 after BI111 & BI121]. It would be valuable to investigate how both academic preparation (the pre-requisites) and student success programming (Writing Center, Writing Intensive, Math Lounge, Tutoring Services, TRIO programs) contribute to student learning. How might our degree maps and advising coupled with evidence-based assessment from current course offerings help departments and the BRIDGE program plan their courses for student retention and success? What might we glean from enrollment data that speaks to the readiness of students pre-college and how do our formative courses provide an equitable and inclusive path for our students? LO2D Information Literacy reveals a positive correlation between direct instruction and student success [86% F, 85.7% S] as all sections of EN111/221 and GEN101 [fall courses] are required to include information literacy classroom visits from library faculty. This competency is then reinforced through Search Path Modules (review) and Annotated Bibliography assignments (application) in GEN199 and GEN400 courses. How can we translate this scaffolded approach of introduce, review, reinforce, apply, and integrate with our courses that align with LO2A critical and creative thinking and LO2C quantitative literacy? The NSSE might reveal places for overlap in the development of the competencies for these two learning outcomes as the prompts for Reflection and Integration mapped to LO2A reveal similar strands as those Quantitative Reasoning mapped to LO2C (\*see below for prompts). Both sets of prompts ask students how often they analyze, evaluate, or connect either other people's viewpoints (2A) or numerical representations of real world problems (2C). A hallmark of the BRIDGE has been to encourage reflection and integration at the level of University values, core competencies, and shared experiences. How can we teach meta-reflection and meta-cognition to challenge students' perception of their learning (indirect assessment) and improve performance (direct assessment)? How can we scaffold from memorization, summary, and report to analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and application – the criteria of both critical and creative thinking (2A) and quantitative literacy (2C). The action plan for continuous improvement includes a comparative study of Academic Units and Student Success Units to identify correlations between resource use and student learning and retention, a deeper dive into NSSE FY and SR data for peer benchmarks to build a values-driven and evidence-based promotion of the BRIDGE program, and an inventory of degree maps to investigate course sequencing and student achievement and retention. The BRIDGE has just completed its 5-year Program Review and will continue to use assessment data to develop its action plan.

\*NSSE prompts a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments [RIintegrate]; b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues [RIsocietal]; c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments [RIdiverse]; d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue [Rlownview]; e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective [Rlperspect]; f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept [RInewview]; and g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge [Rlconnect] a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.) [QRconclude]; b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.) [QRproblem]; c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information [QRevaluate].

2

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

If I can get the indirect assessment data for 2D from the library, I would like to add it to this report.

## Review of Annual Program Assessment Reports

1

Name of reviewer (Last, First)

Thiel, Janet

2

Email of Reviewer

jthiel@georgian.edu

3

Name of person completing the academic program assessment report. (Last, First)

Wedlock, Kristen

4

Do program learning outcomes match what is written in the current catalog?

Yes

No

5

Please explain the difference.

6

Did the assessment methods chosen fit the learning outcomes? Was the data appropriate?

Yes

No

7

Please explain

8

Did the report include discussions of results?

Yes

No

9

Please explain

10

Did the report identify areas for improvement?

Yes

No

11

Please explain

12

Did the report include an action plan for implementation of assessment findings?

Yes

No

13

Please explain

14

Will this assessment report need to be modified?

Yes

No

15

Please explain

16

Please write an executive summary of your findings from this assessment report. Include as much detail as possible, such as the program's name, the outcomes assessed, the evidence of learning used, a summary of results, and the quality of the assessment report.

During AY 2022-2023, The Bridge General Education Program was updated in HelioCampus. Thus, this program only drew data from the spring semester. Gen Ed learning outcomes were also renamed. This made assessment for the program somewhat confusing. This will be remedied going forward with use of the revised program in HelioCampus. In addition, there was a transition in the Bridge Gen Ed leadership. The new director completed this report. In all, the report is very detailed and authentic. The results will be shared with the Gen Ed Committee for implementation.

## Program Supervisor Review/Feedback

1

Comments/Feedback: