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Tasks for Today

• Develop recommendations to improve student learning in UNCG’s General Education Program

• Gather feedback on the General Education Program assessment process
Overview

• UNCG’s General Education Program
  – 5 Learning Goals
  – 8 categories
  – 4 markers

• General Education Program assessment process

• Results from the latest phase

• Discussion
General Education Learning Goals

Learning Goal 1: Foundational Skills
Learning Goal 2: The Physical & Natural World
Learning Goal 3: Knowledge of Human Histories, Cultures, & the Self
Learning Goal 4: Knowledge of Social & Human Behavior
Learning Goal 5: Personal, Civic, & Professional Development
## General Education Program: Categories (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories:</th>
<th>Learning Goal 1</th>
<th>Learning Goal 2</th>
<th>Learning Goal 3</th>
<th>Learning Goal 4</th>
<th>Learning Goal 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts (GFA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Perspectives (GHP)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature (GLT)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (GMT)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (GNS)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical, Religious, &amp; Ethical Principles (GPR)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning &amp; Discourse (GRD)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences (GSB)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# General Education Program: Markers (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markers:</th>
<th>Learning Goal 1</th>
<th>Learning Goal 2</th>
<th>Learning Goal 3</th>
<th>Learning Goal 4</th>
<th>Learning Goal 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives (GL)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives Non-Western (GN)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Intensive (SI)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive (WI)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What do we want students to know and be able to do?

What is Program Assessment?

What evidence do we have that students have learned?

How are we using that evidence to improve student learning?

Do students have the opportunity to know and do the things we value?
Gen Ed Program Assessment Process

• History
  – May 2011: Faculty Planning Workshop
    • Scoring Scale: Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient
    • Survey
    • Timetable
  – Oct 2011: GE Council approved process
  – Fall 2011: Piloted assessment process
  – Spring 2012: Process used to evaluate LG3 recertified categories (GFA, GLT, GPR)
Gen Ed Program Assessment Process

Two steps

Step 1
Instructor identifies student work product aligned with SLO.

Instructor scores work product (HP, P, NP) for all students in the class, then submits aggregate data set.

Step 2
Peer instructors with category-specific experience score the work products from six students chosen at random.
Gen Ed Program Assessment Process

• **Step 1: application of the process**
  – Fall 2012: course instructors applied process (data set 1)
    • 143 sections sampled + 1 section volunteered
      – 95 sections provided total class data
      – 38 departments from all six academic units and five special programs represented
      – 32 sections provided only sample (n=6) data
      – 17 sections provided no course data

Overall → 88% response rate
Gen Ed Program Assessment Process

• Step 2: validation of the process
  – Jan 2013: Faculty peers read and scored student work products (SWPs), using a rating scale designed by faculty (data set 2).
  – SWPs were provided by 24 departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>GN</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRD</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Course Instructors' Number of Times Taught Course

- 1= 1st time
- 2= 2-5 times
- 3= 6+ times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st time</th>
<th>2-5 times</th>
<th>6+ times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFA (n=6)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP (n=11)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRD (n=29)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB (n=18)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL (n=32)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN (n=16)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI (n=36)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI (n=30)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GFA SLO-1: Describe the aims and methods of aesthetic and intellectual expression in the creative arts. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 36%
- Not Prof: 23%
- Prof: 41%

(n=341 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Highly Prof: 22%
- Not Prof: 38%
- Prof: 40%

(n=50 ratings)
GFA SLO-3: Identify the fundamental roles of artistic expression in personal or collective experience. (LG5)

Assessment by course instructor

(n=342 students)

- Highly Prof: 30%
- Prof: 36%
- Not Prof: 34%

Assessment by peer instructors

(n=50 ratings)

- Highly Prof: 22%
- Prof: 40%
- Not Prof: 38%
GFA Student Learning Outcome #2: Describe and interpret art forms in relation to cultural values.

Assessment by course instructor

- Proficient, 50%
- Highly Proficient, 40%
- Not Proficient, 10%

Assessment by peer instructors

- Proficient, 41%
- Not Proficient, 37%
- Highly Proficient, 21%

Oct 2012
SI SLO-1: Speak clearly, coherently, and effectively as well as to adapt modes of communication to the audience. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 33%
- Prof: 54%
- Not Prof: 13%

(n=626 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Highly Prof: 25%
- Prof: 50%
- Not Prof: 25%

(n=24 ratings)
GRD SLO-2: Construct cogent, evidence-based arguments. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

(n=557 students)

Highly Prof 28%
Not Prof 22%
Prof 50%

Assessment by peer instructors

(n=254 ratings)

Highly Prof 5%
Unrated 5%
Not Prof 41%
Prof 49%
GRD SLO-1: Critically evaluate written, oral, and/or visual arguments. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

- Prof: 48%
- Highly Prof: 31%
- Not Prof: 21%

(n=537 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Prof: 30%
- Highly Prof: 4%
- Unrated: 22%
- Not Prof: 44%

(n=254 ratings)
GSB SLO-1: Based on empirical information, describe or explain individual behavior or social conditions, contexts, or institutions. (LG4)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 34%
- Not Prof: 21%
- Prof: 45%
(n=534 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Highly Prof: 19%
- Unrated: 13%
- Not Prof: 9%
- Prof: 59%
(n=161 ratings)
GSB SLO-2: Using the theories of the social and behavioral sciences, analyze individual behavior or social conditions, contexts, or institutions. (LG4, LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 28%
- Not Prof: 29%
- Prof: 43%
(n=531 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Unrated: 47%
- Not Prof: 16%
- Prof: 26%
- Highly Prof: 11%
(n=161 ratings)
GHP SLO-2: Use evidence to interpret the past coherently, orally and/or in writing. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 26%
- Not Prof: 20%
- Prof: 54%

(n=275 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Unrated: 8%
- Not Prof: 37%
- Highly Prof: 10%
- Prof: 45%

(n=94 ratings)
GHP SLO-1: Use a historical approach to analyze and contextualize primary and secondary sources representing divergent perspectives. (LG3)

Assessment by course instructor:
- Prof: 60%
- Not Prof: 24%
- Highly Prof: 24%
- Not Prof: 16%
(n=279 students)

Assessment by peer instructors:
- Unrated: 46%
- Not Prof: 25%
- Highly Prof: 7%
- Prof: 22%
(n=94 ratings)
GL SLO-1: Find, interpret, and evaluate information on diverse cultures. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 43%
- Not Prof: 15%
- Prof: 35%
(n=296 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Highly Prof: 42%
- Not Prof: 15%
- Prof: 31%
(n=74 ratings)
GL SLO-2: Describe interconnections among regions of the world. (Must include substantial focus on at least one culture, nation, or sub-nationality beyond Great Britain and North America.) (LG3)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 29%
- Not Prof: 17%
- Prof: 54%

(n=388 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Unrated: 27%
- Prof: 26%
- Highly Prof: 32%
- Not Prof: 15%

(n=74 ratings)
GL SLO-3: Use diverse cultural frames of reference and alternative perspectives to analyze issues. (LG5)

Assessment by course instructor

(n=396 students)

- Highly Prof: 27%
- Not Prof: 20%
- Prof: 53%

Assessment by peer instructors

(n=74 ratings)

- Unrated: 28%
- Not Prof: 19%
- Prof: 20%
- Highly Prof: 33%
GN SLO-1: Find, interpret, and evaluate information on diverse cultures. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

(n=675 students)

- Highly Prof: 34%
- Prof: 36%
- Not Prof: 30%

Assessment by peer instructors

(n=90 ratings)

- Unrated: 34%
- Not Prof: 30%
- Prof: 20%
- Highly Prof: 16%
GN SLO-2: Describe interconnections among regions of the world. (Must include substantial focus on cultures, nations or sub-nationalities in the Caribbean, Latin America, Middle East/North Africa, Asia, Africa, pacific Island, or indigenous peoples around the world.) (LG3)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 37%
- Prof: 46%
- Not Prof: 17%
(n=662 students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Unrated: 39%
- Not Prof: 29%
- Prof: 20%
Highly Prof: 12%
(n=90 ratings)
GN SLO-3: Use diverse cultural frames of reference and alternative perspectives to analyze issues. (LG5)

Assessment by course instructor

(n=611 students)

- Highly Prof: 34%
- Prof: 52%
- Not Prof: 14%

Assessment by peer instructors

(n=90 ratings)

- Not Prof: 21%
- Prof: 14%
- Highly Prof: 11%
- Unrated: 54%
**WI SLO-1:** Demonstrate the ability to write clearly, coherently and effectively about a particular discipline. (LG1)

Assessment by course instructor

- Highly Prof: 32%
- Prof: 55%
- Not Prof: 13%

(\(n=424\) students)

Assessment by peer instructors

- Prof: 57%
- Highly Prof: 23%
- Unrated: 4%
- Not Prof: 16%

(\(n=206\) ratings)
**WI SLO-2: Adapt modes of communication to the audience.** (LG1)

**Assessment by course instructor**

- Highly Prof: 39%
- Not Prof: 9%
- Prof: 52%

*(n=423 students)*

**Assessment by peer instructors**

- Unrated: 39%
- Highly Prof: 12%
- Prof: 40%
- Not Prof: 9%

*(n=206 ratings)*
**WI SLO-3:** Incorporate constructive feedback from readers to improve the written work. (LG1)

**Assessment by course instructor**

- Highly Prof: 46%
- Prof: 46%
- Not Prof: 8%
- Unrated: 63%

**Assessment by peer instructors**

- Not Prof: 4%
- Prof: 30%
- Highly Prof: 3%
- Unrated: 63%
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Comments from Course Faculty

• “The process of evaluation and training should take place prior to semester being evaluated.”
• “I often found class discussion directly linked to an SLO .... Yet, there is no tangible [SWP] (or assignment, per se) to submit to the Gen Ed Council in this regard.”
• “You need more than 3 categories ....”
• “I think it would be valuable if we had a way to assess teams or small group SWPs.”
• “I ... struggled a ... bit trying to define proficiency.”
• “… feels … strange to be evaluated on outcomes that I was not made aware of when writing the syllabus by my department.”
Comments from Course Faculty

• “Due to the nature of the course, live performances … are … the best way to show that xxx SLOx and xx SLOx are met. …due to legal constraints, these videos can’t be viewed by anyone outside of the classroom. … Many instructors … use the National Communication Association Speaking Competency Rubric … (a) widely respected and validated in our field and already uses a type of ‘proficiency scales’ to measure completion.”

• Faculty used grading to determine HP, P, NP (for short-answer/MCQ exams).

• “I … discovered that over time I have … asked fewer questions related to theory. We go over this in class, but I’m discovering that I need to ask more theory related questions on the test.”
Comments from Course Faculty

• “It would be interesting to have a workshop on proficiency levels – sharing various rubrics, exercises that others have used to address specific LGs.”
• “I had no idea how to measure [HP] vs [P] …”
• “This is my first time teaching for UNCG …. However, it feels a bit strange to be evaluated on outcomes that I was not made aware of when writing the syllabus by my department. If these are the goals for UNCG’s education, instructors should be told of these goals when they are in the Course Development stage.”
• “This survey has no way to account for students who do the assignment incorrectly …”
Comments from Course Faculty

• “xxx 100 does not include 2 of the 3 xx learning outcomes in its curriculum …”
• “… I do not actually measure [students’] ability to ‘find’ information.”
• “In my opinion, [this slo] does not fit the lower language courses. They really don’t ‘analyze issues’ at this level.”
• “Definitions for proficiency levels would help me to evaluate the class.”
• “Proficiency levels are based on the number of correct answers in each SLO over the 3 quizzes.”
Comments from Course Faculty

• “… a speaking intensive assignment … students were not video-taped.”
• “Why does the [one] marker combine into one goal aspects that are separate SLOs for [another] marker?”
• “For students to speak more proficiently, there needs to be more speaking instruction given in class.”
• “Incorporate more speaking assignments into other courses …”
• “I was unable to assess xx SLO3 because the [applicable] assignment … was done … before I was notified of this assessment.”
• “If I knew of this ahead of time, grading sheet could have been tailored for those items.”
Comments from Course Faculty

• “Any undergraduate students need to learn basic writing skills through a basic course, for example, a basic writing class 101.”

• “For all Freshmen, require an English Fundamentals class – teaching grammar, mechanics, etc. Also … add a requirement that students need to visit the Writing Center to learn more about writing correctly, etc.”

• “This course is the first time a math major is asked to (use expository writing to explain technical ideas to their peers) …. In the future, I believe it would be best to be advised of this assessment before the semester begins.”
Comments from Workshop Faculty

Process: Step 1: Should we continue to have instructors evaluate their own students’ work?

Majority of Workshop faculty responded “yes”:

- Reinforced Gen Ed learning outcomes and how faculty meet Gen Ed SLOs
- Pedagogical value
- Investment in the SLOs
- Understand the process
- Call of external accountability
- Choice of department to be in Gen Ed

For a Gen Ed course, course faculty is responsible for ensuring that SLO is met.
Comments from Workshop Faculty

**Process: Step 2:** Should we continue to have teams of “external” raters evaluate students’ work?

**Majority of Workshop faculty responded “yes”:**
- Understand good vs other assignments
- Opportunity to provide feedback
- University-wide understanding of learning
- Faculty governance and oversight of learning
- Faculty engagement in Gen Ed
- Peer evaluation needed for accountability
- Validity, objectivity (defensible to SACS)
Next Steps?

**Workshop faculty:**

- Gen Ed “training” on SLOs, program
- Share examples of “good” assignments
- Ask faculty for examples of HP, P, NP work
- SLOs problematic:
  - Clarify language; multiple verbs in SLOs
  - Fuller discussion of implementing SLOs needed (Recertification)
  - Use Workshop data in recertification discussion
- Get dept. heads, coordinators to participate in Workshop
- Define proficiency
- Communication plan needed
- A 4-point or 5-point scale needed
- Focus on learning, not assessment
- AACU rubrics: starting point?
- Departments to review assignments?
Next Steps?

Forum participants:
Appendix

- Bargraphs by Category/Marker SLO
GFA slo-1 (LG1)

- Not Prof: 23% (Crse n=341 stdts), 38% (Wkshop n=50 ratings)
- Prof: 42% (Crse n=341 stdts), 40% (Wkshop n=50 ratings)
- Highly Prof: 36% (Crse n=341 stdts), 22% (Wkshop n=50 ratings)
GFA slo-3 (LG5)

- **Not Prof**: 34% Crse (n=342 stdts), 38% Wkshop (n=50 ratings)
- **Prof**: 36% Crse (n=342 stdts), 40% Wkshop (n=50 ratings)
- **Highly Prof**: 30% Crse (n=342 stdts), 22% Wkshop (n=50 ratings)
GHP slo-1 (LG3)

- Not Prof: 16% (Crse n=279 stdts), 24% (Wkshop n=94 ratings)
- Prof: 59% (Crse n=279 stdts), 22% (Wkshop n=94 ratings)
- Highly Prof: 24% (Crse n=279 stdts), 7% (Wkshop n=94 ratings)
- Unrated: 0% (Crse n=279 stdts), 46% (Wkshop n=94 ratings)
GRD slo-1 (LG1)

- Not Prof: Crse (21%) vs. Wkshop (44%)
- Prof: Crse (30%) vs. Wkshop (49%)
- Highly Prof: Crse (4%) vs. Wkshop (31%)
- Unrated: Crse (0%) vs. Wkshop (22%)
GRD slo-2 (LG1)

- Not Prof: 22% Crse, 41% Wkshop
- Prof: 50% Crse, 49% Wkshop
- Highly Prof: 28% Crse, 5% Wkshop
- Unrated: 0% Crse, 5% Wkshop

Legend: Crse (n=557 stdts) Wkshop (n=254 ratings)
GSB slo-2 (LG4, LG1)

- **Crse (n=531 stdts)**
  - Not Prof: 16%
  - Prof: 43%
  - Highly Prof: 11%
  - Unrated: 0%

- **Wkshop (n=161 ratings)**
  - Not Prof: 29%
  - Prof: 26%
  - Highly Prof: 27%
  - Unrated: 47%
GL slo-3 (LG5)

- Not Prof: 20% Crse, 19% Wkshop
- Prof: 20% Crse, 20% Wkshop
- Highly Prof: 27% Crse, 32% Wkshop
- Unrated: 0% Crse, 28% Wkshop

Legend:
- Crse (n=396 stdts)
- Wkshop (n=74 ratings)
WI slo-2 (LG1)

- Not Prof: 9% (Crse), 9% (Wkshop)
- Prof: 52% (Crse), 40% (Wkshop)
- Highly Prof: 12% (Crse), 39% (Wkshop)
- Unrated: 0% (Crse), 39% (Wkshop)

Legend: Crse (n=423 stdts)  Wkshop (n=206 ratings)