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Overview

• UNCG’s General Education Program
• GE Program assessment processes
• Results from 2017-18 assessment:
  – GHP, GRD, and GMT
  – GNS (to be reported out at a later date)
• Discussion
Why We Are Here Today

- The primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of UNCG’s curriculum belongs to faculty.
- UNCG’s General Education Program belongs to all faculty.
General Education Council’s webpage
http://assessment.uncg.edu/curriculum/GEC/GEC.html
General Education Learning Goals (LGs)

Learning Goal 1: Foundational Skills *(Think critically, communicate effectively, and develop appropriate fundamental skills in quantitative and information literacies.)*

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
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Assessment Processes Currently in Use

- Process used to assess all categories—except GMT and GNS (both are LG 2 categories)—and all markers
- Process used to assess GMT
- Process used to assess GNS
Assessment Process
(for non-LG2 categories)

• Process created by faculty (in May 2011) and controlled by faculty

• Three-part process:
  1. Course instructor assessment
  2. Peer faculty validation (Workshop)
  3. Data summary/presentation (Forum)
## Results: Fall 2017: GHP; GRD

### Step 1: Course Faculty

- **GHP**: 12 of 12 sections
  ~ 100% response rate
  CF scored ~535 SWPs for both SLOs
- **GRD**: 31 of 33 sections
  ~ 94% response rate
  CF scored 618 SWPs for SLO-1 and 630 for SLO-2

### Step 2: Peer Reviewers

- **GHP** peer reviewers scored 78 SWPs for both SLOs
- **GRD** peer reviewers scored 186 SWPs for both SLOs
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Defining “proficient” student work

- For GHP category:
  - Scoring criteria was provided to course and workshop faculty

- For GRD category:
  - A Council-approved GRD rubric was provided to course and workshop faculty
Fall 2017
GHP SLO-1: Use a historical approach to analyze and contextualize primary and secondary sources representing divergent perspectives. (LG3)

Course Faculty Ratings
GHP slo-1 (n=534 SWPs)

Workshop Faculty ratings
GHP slo-1 (n=78 SWPs)
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Fall 2017

GHP SLO-2: Use evidence to interpret the past coherently, orally and/or in writing. (LG1)

Course Faculty Ratings

GHP slo-2 (n=536 SWPs)

- NP: 19%
- HP: 35%
- P: 46%

Workshop Faculty ratings

GHP slo-2 (n=78 SWPs)

- UR: 31%
- HP: 11%
- P: 33%
- NP: 25%
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GHP Instructors’ Discussion of Results

• What did your results tell you about student achievement of GHP SLOs?
  – As expected, the majority of students achieved proficiency
  – Students struggled to do multiple things in one assignment (analyze, interpret, and contextualize)

• How will you use this evidence in your GE course to improve student learning?
  – Provide greater emphasis to application and interpretation of historical evidence
  – Be more explicit in the use of the GHP criteria throughout the semester
GHP peer reviewers’ comments

• GHP SLOs continue to lack clarity; need a detailed rubric
• Some assignments “were not appropriately designed to assess the SLOs”
• To what extent should student writing be factored into the scoring process
Fall 2017
GRD SLO-1: Critically evaluate written, oral, and/or visual arguments. (LG1)

Course Faculty Ratings

GRD slo-1 (n=618 SWPs)

- NP: 22%
- HP: 33%
- P: 45%

Workshop Faculty ratings

GRD slo-1 (n=186 SWPs)

- UR: 10%
- NP: 17%
- HP: 15%
- P: 58%
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Fall 2017
GRD SLO-2: Construct cogent, evidence-based arguments. (LG1)

Course Faculty Ratings

GRD slo-2 (n=630 SWPs)

- HP: 40%
- P: 43%
- NP: 17%

Workshop Faculty ratings

GRD slo-2 (n=186 SWPs)

- HP: 16%
- P: 63%
- NP: 21%
GRD Instructors’ Discussion of Results

• What did your results tell you about student achievement of GLT SLOs?
  – Some instructors found students to be more proficient at one SLO and less so with the other SLO while others found students achieving consistently and at high rates for both SLOs

• How will you use this evidence in your GE course to improve student learning?
  – Rework assignments, making the SLOs more explicit
  – Provide more frequent student feedback
  – Reinforce the interrelatedness of the SLOs
GRD Peer reviewers’ comments

• GRD rubric provided helpful guidelines for rating students’ work products.

• Regarding assignments:
  – “the more detailed and layered [the prompt], the higher quality of work was turned in”
  – “Better prompts either had one assignment for each SLO, or clearly indicated how each part of a single assignment spoke to each SLO.”
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GMT Assessment Process

• Questions embedded into all GMT final exams
  – Based on course content
  – Each SLO adequately represented

• Math faculty collect, aggregate, review, and provide assessment results with:
  – Findings (i.e., % of students who scored questions correctly)
  – Discussion
  – Recommendations
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### GMT Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMT slo-1: Reason in mathematical systems beyond data manipulation. (LG1)</th>
<th>Sp 2016 Results</th>
<th>Fa 2017 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nbr of Qs used to assess SLO</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students (n=2213) scored Qs correctly</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMT slo-2: Formulate and use mathematical models to solve real-world problems. (LG1, LG2)</th>
<th>Sp 2016 Results</th>
<th>Fa 2017 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nbr of Qs used to assess SLO</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students (n=2439) scored Qs correctly</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GMT slo-3: Communication mathematical solutions clearly and effectively. (LG1)</th>
<th>Sp 2016 Results</th>
<th>Fa 2017 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nbr of Qs used to assess SLO</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students (n=2439) scored Qs correctly</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GMT Results

Sp 2016 GMT

% Students (n=2213) scored Qs correctly

Fa 2017 GMT

% Students (n=2439) scored Qs correctly
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GMT Faculty Discussion of Results

• Findings:
  – Students who demonstrated average knowledge of course content achieved each of the GMT SLOs.

• Discussion:
  – Redesign of MAT 112 (since spring 2016) was effective in that students demonstrated significant improvements in mastering GMT SLOs.
  – Increased percentage of SLO-2 questions from 23% in spring 2016 to 30% in fall 2017.
GMT Faculty Recommendations

• Future actions to improve student learning:
  – Improve placement of students who need only one GMT course
  – Improve quality of teaching in online GMT sections by reducing the size of online sections from 125 students to 50 students
  – Continue to ensure the SLO-2 questions are adequately represented in all GMT final exams
Your turn:

1. What do these results tell you about student learning in the General Education Program?

2. What do the results tell you about the assessment process currently being used to assess the GE Program?
Discussion Questions (cont.)

3. What *changes* would you make to your course as a result of viewing this presentation?

4. What other comments, suggestions would you make for improving the assessment of the Gen Ed Program?
Thank You!

Questions?

• Aaron Terranova, Chair, General Education Council (abterran@uncg.edu)
• Jodi Pettazzoni, Director of Assessment & Accreditation (jepettaz@uncg.edu)
• Terry Brumfield, General Education Assessment Coordinator (tebrumfi@uncg.edu)