UWG General Education [UWG_GEN_ED]

Cycles included in this report:
Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

Program Name: UWG General Education [UWG_GEN_ED]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

1 Compliance Declaration

In Compliance

2 Executive Summary General Education Assessment Activities, Academic Year 20-21

Assessment of the Core Curriculum occurred in three broad areas delineated by the Staggered Plan, which was adopted in May of 2020:
Baseline Collection:
Core Area Program (CAP) sections B.2, C.1, and E.3 continued to utilize the approved tool (assignment) in their classrooms every semester, submitted artifacts of student work, and leaders in Colleges assigned faculty to score artifacts.
Additionally, GEAC onboarded CAP section D.1, the sciences. At this juncture, GEAC has two CAP sections from which we will begin collecting in fall of 2021--sections D.2 and C.2.
In sum, by end of fall 2021, the entire Core Curriculum will have entered the cycle of continuous assessment mandated by The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges' (SACSCOC) principle that, "The institution identifies expected outcomes [and] assesses the extent towhich it achieves these outcomes" ("Principles of Accreditation" 66).
Analysis and Planning:
CAPs A.1 and A.2 have completed a full data cycle. Work Group Coordinators composed Improvement Plans (IPs) based on faculty discussion of student performance reflected in the aggregated data produced over two semesters alongside contextual circumstance and analysis of how the approved tool impacted student accession of the Student Learning Outcome (SLOs). After collaboration within these disciplines, English and Math programs each worked with their colleagues to create an IP based on their experiences in the classroom with the tool alongside.
CAP sections E.1 and E.2 are on the cusp of completing a data cycle and will conclude discussion of the data in early August before implementing an IP based on the aggregated data produced from their faculty's scoring sessions and teaching the tool across two semesters.
Faculty in CAP section E.4, which houses UWG's most diverse group of disciplines, received raw data from Institutional Effectiveness and are collaborating with colleagues to compose a short narrative about discussions related to what the raw data show and on early conversations centered on continuous assessment of the course.This narrative, due on August 15th, alongside the more detailed data now available from IEA, will aid faculty in section E.4's courses to complete and implement more detailed IPs in the fall and/or spring.
Finally, CAP section E.3 *begins* Analysis and Planning during fall of 2021, as do sections B.2 and C.1.
Implementation and Collection:
CAPs A.1 and A.2, along with CAP sections E.1 and E.2, will implement complete IPs in the fall of 2021 evincing that our "institution . . .provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results" ("Principles of Accreditation" 66). Implementation ushers in a new collection phase wherein faculty and GEAC will learn how each IPs' goal(s) impact student learning.

3 Prior Improvement Plan for GEAC GEAC Improvements and their Impact

The inaugural annual General Education Assessment report laid out challenges and intended improvements in GEAC processes, each of which was designed to increase efficacy for faculty and staff working to measure student performance and impact student learning positively. Our rationale that improving the processes of instruction (using the assignment), collection of artifacts, data analysis, and implementation of improvement plans is organized and streamlined, we will reach more accurate conclusions sooner, collect more artifacts, and can help faculty to implement plans that impact UWG students' learning positively. Below, find quotations from AY 20-21's report in italics and the impact on assessment and, in turn, analyzing and collaborating to improve student learning.
From last year's report: "Originally, the team planned to onboard all six CAPs by fall of 2020 and had shared this start date in the original General Education Framework. . . .each CAP would enter

the assessment cycle via baseline collection followed by scoring and the creation of yearly Improvement Plans (IPs). There was a fear that if CAPs were not asked to collect and assess data continually, forgetfulness and neglect of GEA would occur. However, once rubric development and initial data collection began, the committee quickly realized the enormity of the overall task and voted to amend this plan."

In response to this set of challenges, we developed and installed the Staggered Plan (Appendix --), which would allow the team to handle the enormous amount of data analysis better. To combat the concerns about inconsistent use of the tool because of a change, the Director of General Education Assessment informed Deans, Chairs, and Program Coordinators (Appendix --). Work Group Coordinators also communicated with their constituents, asking them to inform all of their colleagues using the Staggered Plan for explanation. In these communiques, faculty teaching in the Core were reminded that the approved assignment and Core Area Program (CAP) rubric reside in the UWG General Education Assessment Drive. We also added all faculty to the drive to help defray the workload Chairs and Program Coordinators face if asked to download a tool, upload it, and send it to specific faculty, especially in departments where up to five courses from one CAP are taught.

Another challenge the team tackled was "linked to data analysis after examining the efficacy of extracting data from Scantrons. As much of the reportage from Scantron is proprietary, extracting data in malleable formats is near impossible. The decentralization of scanning all materials in the Testing Center in 2018 meant that Colleges and departments purchased all manner of Scantron machines that possessed varied capabilities. To study this issue with the goal of crafting streamlined directions for faculty utilizing multiple choice tests as their assessment tools, the Director of General Education Assessment convened an ad hoc committee to study Scantron use across campus and to discuss potential solutions."

A burgeoning solution arrived as a result of moving all instruction online during the spring of 2020. We noted that using CourseDen could allow faculty ensure parity across sections of courses using multiple choice tools. Crafting a portable Module for all sections of a course and asking faculty to import it would, we reasoned, reduce workload and increase efficacy in data analysis. During fall of 2020, we met with each of the course representatives in CAP E.4 to discuss how they administered their common assessment in the spring of 2020. We learned that many of them had used the CourseDen quiz tool. Several course representatives' success with using CourseDen to administer the tool across all sections led us to approach the CAP section in which the largest group of multiple choice tools exist: D.1--the sciences.

With the help of a professor from our Anthropology program, we developed help tools--visual and written--for setting up a common quiz in CourseDen and provided directions for how to extract data after the semester.

While reviewing data extracted from CourseDen, we realized we still did not have the data in a format that would allow us to analyze it in alignment with our rubrics and success criterion. Faculty members from the Gen Ed Economics courses had previously established a system and program in SAS to analyze their data in the same format that was needed for all of Gen Ed. As of May 2021, the Director of Assessment and Assessment Coordinator were working with the Economics Department Chair to write a script in SAS that would allow us to analyze CourseDen data. Part of this will require a slight modification to the data extract instructions provided to faculty using CourseDen. These are planned to be completed and in place by the start of the fall semester.

4 CAP Learning Outcome A1 SLO 1

Recognize and identify appropriate topics for presentation in writing

4.1 Success Criterion Met?

Partially Met

4.2 Results

In examining student performance for SLO 1, 73.3% of ENGL 1101 students demonstrated competence in "adapting written communication to specific purposes and audiences," with slightly higher achievement in ENGL 1102 with 82.1%. Student achievement in SLO 1 suggests "proficient" student achievement with room for improvement. The frequency and percent for each of the four rubric scores for SLO 1 are presented in Table 1 (ENGL 1101) and Table 2 (ENGL 1102).

Table 1
ENGL 1101

Rubric Score	Frequency	Percent
1 - Unsatisfactory	4	3.1%
2 - Developing	31	23.7%
3 - Proficient	58	44.3%
4 - Exemplary	38	29.0%
Total	**131**	**100.0%**

Note. Learning Outcome 1

Table 2
ENGL 1102

Rubric Scores	Frequency	Percent
1 - Unsatisfactory	0	0.0%
2 - Developing	29	17.9%
3 - Proficient	78	48.1%
4 - Exemplary	55	34.0%
Total	**162**	**100.0%**

Note. Learning Outcome 1

5 CAP Learning Outcome A1 SLO 2
Synthesize and logically arrange written presentations

5.1 Success Criterion Met?

Not Met

5.2 Results

Data for SLO 2 identified 56.5% of ENGL 1101 students and 65.4% of ENGL 1102 students managed to "synthesize and logically arrange written presentations," indicating "developing" student achievement pertaining to this specific LO. The frequency and percent for each of the four rubric scores for SLO 2 are presented in Table 3 (ENGL 1101) and Table 4 (ENGL 1102).

Table 3
ENGL 1101

Rubric Score	Frequency	Percent
1 - Unsatisfactory	9	6.9%
2 - Developing	48	36.6%
3 - Proficient	64	48.9%
4 - Exemplary	10	7.6%
Total	**131**	**100.0%**

Note. Learning Outcome 2

Table 4
ENGL 1102

Rubric Scores	Frequency	Percent
1 - Unsatisfactory	5	3.1%
2 - Developing	51	31.5%
3 - Proficient	82	50.6%
4 - Exemplary	24	14.8%
Total	**162**	**100.0%**

Note. Learning Outcome 2

6 CAP Learning Outcome A1 SLO 3

Adapt written communication to specific purposes and audiences.

6.1 Success Criterion Met?

Not Met

6.2 Results

Data collected and assessed for SLO 3 for ENGL 1101 revealed only 55.7% of students achieved the learning outcome and 35.9% of students in ENGL 1102 met the targeted skills for LO3. Both ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 assessment for SLO 3 suggests student success for this specific LO in terms of the rubric scored "unsatisfactory" or "developing," neither of which meet the 70% required by GEAC to demonstrate competence in and achievement of the specific LO. The frequency and percent for each of the four rubric scores for SLO 3 are presented in Table 5 (ENGL 1101) and Table 6 (ENGL 1102).

Table 5
ENGL 1101

Rubric Score	Frequency	Percent
1 - Unsatisfactory	16	12.2%
2 - Developing	42	32.1%
3 - Proficient	59	45.0%
4 - Exemplary	14	10.7%
Total	**131**	**100.0%**

Note. Learning Outcome 3

Table 6
ENGL 1102

Rubric Scores	Frequency	Percent
1 - Unsatisfactory	29	17.9%
2 - Developing	75	46.3%
3 - Proficient	55	34.0%

4 - Exemplary	3	1.9%
Total	**162**	**100.0%**

Note. Learning Outcome 3

7 CAP Learning Outcome A2 SLO 1
Students demonstrate a strong foundation in college-level mathematical concepts and principles.

7.1 Success Criterion Met?
Met

7.2 Results

	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
MATH 1001	4	234	102	336	67.50%
	3	76	26	102	20.50%
	2	32	12	44	8.80%
	1	13	3	16	3.20%
	TOTAL	355	143	498	
MATH 1111	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
	4	259	152	411	43.00%
	3	277	45	322	33.70%
	2	141	9	150	15.70%
	1	72	0	72	7.50%
	TOTAL	749	206	955	
MATH 1113	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
	4	183	130	313	68.50%
	3	68	24	92	20.10%
	2	27	5	32	7.00%
	1	14	6	20	4.40%
	TOTAL	292	165	457	
MATH 1634	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
	4	36	25	61	55.00%
	3	23	2	25	22.50%
	2	5	3	8	7.20%
	1	13	4	17	15.30%
	TOTAL	77	34	111	
	NO SCORE	0	17		

8 CAP Learning Outcome A2 SLO 2
Students demonstrate the ability to apply symbolic representations to model and solve real-world problems.

8.1 Success Criterion Met?
Partially Met

8.2 Results

	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
MATH 1001	4	34	26	60	51.70%
	3	22	12	34	29.30%
	2	3	10	13	11.20%
	1	5	4	9	7.80%
	TOTAL SCORED	64	52	116	
	NO SCORE	15	18		
MATH 1111	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
	4	283	82	365	38.10%
	3	169	45	214	22.40%
	2	125	33	158	16.50%
	1	172	48	220	23.00%
	TOTAL SCORED	749	208	957	
MATH 1113	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
	4	19	31	50	38.50%
	3	28	22	50	38.50%
	2	16	2	18	13.80%
	1	9	3	12	9.20%
	TOTAL SCORED	72	58	130	
	NO SCORE	12	13		
MATH 1634	SCORE	FALL	SPRING	COMBINED	PCT
	4	6	19	25	43.10%
	3	8	4	12	20.70%
	2	3	4	7	12.10%
	1	10	4	14	24.10%
	TOTAL SCORED	27	31	58	
	NO SCORE	1	20		

9 CAP Learning Outcome E1_SLO 1

Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.

9.1 Success Criterion Met?

Not Met

9.2 Results

Assessment of 333 student artifacts yielded an average score of 2.84 out of 4, which is below the target for success of 3. The percentage of students in Core Area E1 who received scores of 3 or 4 for each of the three components of the SLO measured by the rubric (factual accuracy; understanding of the economic, political, social, or cultural dimensions of history; and understanding of cause-and-effect relationships and other related aspects of historical thinking) averaged a few percentage points below 70 percent, which is the target for success. However, in HIST 1111 students' average scores for at least some of the three rubric components were 70 percent or higher. In Core Area E1, 78 percent of the HIST 1111 student essays achieved a

score of 3 or 4 for rubric components 1 and 2, and 55 percent did so for rubric component 3. Sixty-five percent of the HIST 1112 student essays received a score of 3 or 4 for rubric component 1, 61 percent did so for rubric component 2, and 64 percent achieved this for rubric component 3.

All of this discussion pertains to performance on the assessment instrument. None of this refers to the overall grade in the course.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

AY20 E1 HIST 1111-1112 Data_SP20-F20 Ix

10 CAP Learning Outcome E2_SLO1

Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.

10.1 Success Criterion Met?

Not Met

10.2 Results

The history program assessed all sections of Core Area E1 courses HIST 2111 and 2112 with an essay question.

Instructors have the freedom to select the point in the semester when the assignment is given and whether it is given as an in-class or take-home assignment, as long as the essay is considered a "summative" assignment (that is, it represents a summation of student knowledge gained in the semester – which means that it should not be given during the first few weeks of class). However, unless otherwise directed by the General Education Assessment Committee, the assignment should be given *before* the final week of the semester.

Faculty had the ability to tailor the question to their course, so long as it assessed the learning outcome. A sample tool is attached. It explains to students its purpose this way: "The purpose of this assignment, in part, is to measure the extent to which students in all sections of this course have learned what we have been trying to teach. We will collect and analyze essays from all sections in order to find ways to help future students learn this material more fully." It asks students about one of the most important political, social, economic, or cultural developments during this period of American history. It calls on them to explain how and why this development emerged, how it changed (or didn't change) over time, and how it shaped the development of U.S. history.

Essays are assessed using a rubric developed by faculty who teach courses in Core Area E.2. It gauges the essays according to three subcriteria of the learning outcome. Those criteria are: factual knowledge; political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions; and understanding of historical context, cause and effect, and chronological relationships. Four levels of performance are defined for each subcriterion.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

CAP E.1 and E.2 Rubric
CAP E.1 and E.2 Sample Tool

11 CAP Learning Outcome E4_SLO3

Students will demonstrate knowledge of the fundamental concepts of a discipline examining the social world.

11.1 Success Criterion Met?

Partially Met

11.2 Results

CAP E4 is large and made up of courses from several different programs. Below are the results provided by each contributing area.

Anthropology: We have a data sample of 139 students from this period of time. The data from both semesters show that the strongest area of competency is in the category of Global Diversity Over Time and Space, with 93.4% of students answering all four questions correctly,

closely followed by the category of Cultural Competency, with 92.4% of students answering all four questions correctly. Percentages were markedly lower in the other two categories, with 79.7 % of students answering all questions correctly in the Methods and Sub-fields category, and 78.8 % of students answering all questions correctly in the Intracultural Diversity category. We are also able to identify specific questions that had the highest and lowest correct response rates. The highest response rate (99.3%) was for a question asking for students to identify where the genus Homo evolved, and the lowest response rate was for a sub-field question about code-switching (65.5%). These scores point to a fairly high level of competency across the four areas, with some clear places where we could stand to improve.

Economics: The economics faculty reviewed the core area E assessment results from spring and fall 2020 at the spring 2021 faculty meeting on May 18. The faculty noted that the strongest area for our students was the topic of scarcity where 95.7% of students meet or exceeded expectations in spring 2020 and 98% of students met or exceeded expectations in fall 2020. Students also performed well on the topic of market equilibrium. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in this area was 85.7% in spring 2020 and 89.5% in fall 2020. Students were weakest in the areas of opportunity cost and supply and demand. On the topic of opportunity cost, 79.5% of students met or exceeded expectations in spring 2020 and 83.5% met or exceeded expectations in fall 2020. On the topic of supply and demand, 79.9% of students met or exceeded expectations in spring 2020 and 80.6% met or exceeded expectations in fall 2020. The weakest question in both semesters was question 7, which covers the concept of opportunity cost in terms of a production possibilities frontier. In spring 2020, only 60.4% of students got this question correct while in fall 2020 just 61.6% got the question correct. In fall 2020, the data was broken down by Principles of Microeconomics and Principles of Macroeconomics. Although there were some minor differences in student performance between the two courses, faculty felt the results were similar enough that focusing on the overall results makes sense at this point. A spreadsheet of the results for fall 2020 broken down by course (Micro versus Macro) and by questions are attached.

Geography: To begin it should be noted that the setup of the assessment was done in a way where the determination of a student's mastery across all four learning categories proved impossible. Here it the explanation:
"Because the individual question responses per each category were inadvertently made the unit of observation in the data rather than the student-question across the entire quiz, re-assembling the assessment proved impossible. Therefore, only question-level results by category were available for analysis. For categories and questions with higher average percentages for rubric scores of 3 or greater, one could reasonably assume that every student scored as 'proficient' (meets expectations) or 'exemplary' (exceeds expectations). However, for categories and questions with higher average percentages for rubric scores of 1, or 2, there is no way to assign the success criteria."
With that said, some extrapolations could still be made:
In GEOG 1013:
In the case of World Geography students struggled the most in the demography section, followed by major political concepts.
In GEOG 2553:
It is here possible to see that the students, in general, seemed to master each category, with an average of 83% correct in three and 92% correct in another category.

Philosophy: In this round of data collection, our success criterion (that at least 70% of students would achieve a score of 3/Proficient or better) was achieved, as 70.6% of the 34 students whose work was assessed achieved that score.
That said, there is clearly room for improvement. Looking at each of the SLO Components distinctly, students did not achieve an average score of 3/Proficient or better on any of them. The averages ranged from 2.76 for Component 2 to 2.94 for Component 3. Additionally, only a relatively small percentage of students achieved the highest score of 4 on any of the SLO Components. Using this measure, students once again performed the worst on Component 2, for which only 11.8% (4 students) achieved a score of 4.

Political Science: Of the 20 students who took the POLS 2201 GE Assessment Quiz, 95% of responses were correct.
Because the individual question responses were accidentally made the unit of observation in the data rather than the student-question, re-assembling the assessment proved impossible. Therefore, only question-level results were available for analysis.

Psychology: Though we were unable to draw conclusions that directly align with the established success criterion and rubric that is on the individual student-level, we were able to calculate useful data in the form of total average percent of students scoring a 3 or better for each theory. More detailed data is available in the .xlsx documents attached.

Spring 2020

Number of Students Assessed			280	
TOTAL AVERAGE PERCENT of Students Scoring 3 or Better on Rubric			45.1%	

Fall 2020

Number of Students Assessed		471	
TOTAL AVERAGE PERCENT of Students Scoring 3 or Better on Rubric		31.4%	

Sociology: Having only one section of SOCI 1101 (no other sections and no sections of the other core course, SOCI 1160) reporting results, we feel that it is not appropriate to discuss results for this AY.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

ANTHROPOLOGY E4 ANTH 1102 SP20-F20 F.I_2021.06.11
ECONOMICS analysis Core Area E Assessment Results Fall 2020
PHILOSOPHY F.II SP20-F20 E4 PHIL 2130 v.1.1_2021.05.28
POLITICAL SCIENCE E4 POLS 2201 SP20_2022.03.15
PSYCHOLOGY1 S20 PSYC 1101 Data Template F.I
PSYCHOLOGY2 F20 PSYC 1101 Data Template F.I

12 Gen Ed Assessment Committee (GEAC) Next Steps Looking Ahead: GEA in the Next Academic Year

During the coming year, GEAC will:
- Continue to institute Xitracs' various capabilities to organize, score, and report.
- Continue to collaborate with a faculty member in Economics on a Statistical Analysis System (SAS) formula for aggregation and analysis of multiple choice data.
- Continue to clarify and update GEAC's website with an eye towards making protocol and procedure clear to General Education faculty members.
- Incorporate the three Graduate Research Assistants granted to us by the Provost's office into our team. Thus far, for instance, GRAs have helped our three-person team to compose and edit documents, aid in organization and analysis of data, and audit the student work faculty submitted.

End of report