

GSW GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW 2014/2015
(Prepared by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning)

Table of Contents..... Page

Section 1-Overview of General Education Attainment Program..... 2

Section 2-Area A1 6

Section 3-Area A2 9

Section 4-Area B 11

Section 5-Area C 24

Section 6-Area D 27

Section 7-Area E..... 36

Section 8-US Perspectives Overlay 39

Section 9-Global Perspectives Overlay 41

Section 10-Critical Thinking Overlay 43

Section 11-External Review 45

Appendix 46

SECTION ONE

OVERVIEW

To ensure the efficacy of the Core Curriculum, GSW engages in an ongoing program of assessment of student attainment of the general education learning outcomes. The assessment process was overseen by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the School of Computing and Mathematics during 2011-12 and 2012-13; the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning (IEP) assumed responsibility for the assessment in 2013-14. The Deans and the Director of IEP work with faculty to develop assessment plans for the various learning outcomes, to collect data on student mastery of learning outcomes, and to implement plans for improving student learning. Reports on the assessment of general education outcomes are reviewed by the General Education Assessment Review subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee and disseminated among the broader university community.

GSW began tracking student attainment on its General Education Outcomes in 2011-12 after the approval of its Core Curriculum outcomes by the USG General Education Council in 2010. A committee chaired by the Dean of Arts and Science and the Dean of Computing and Mathematics elected to create a three-year cycle for assessing student attainment on the approved learning outcomes. The measures and attainment targets for these assessments were devised by the programs responsible for serving the specific Core Areas and Overlays. The table below summarizes the details of the student attainment plan:

Learning Outcome	Outcome Measure	Review of Outcome
Area A1 Students will be able to write effectively for a variety of audiences to demonstrate collegiate level writing development in various contexts	Baseline Assessment: Midterm Exam in ENGL 1101 Composition I Attainment Assessment: Final Project in ENGL 1102 Composition II Both assessments carried out using the GSW Gen Ed Writing Assessment Rubric	Outcome data reviewed by the Department of English and Modern Languages Assessment Committee and the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee once every three years beginning in 2011-12
Area A2 Students will be able to analyze and apply mathematical concepts in various forms in order to solve a variety of quantitative problems	Assessment of course-appropriate problem on the final exam in each targeted Mathematics course Problem assessed using GSW Rubric for General Education Mathematics	Outcome data reviewed by the Department of Mathematics faculty and the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee once every three years beginning in 2011-12
Area B Students will be able to evaluate information critically	Assessment of final project in LIBR 1101 Information Literacy Project assessed using GSW Area B Information Literacy Rubric	Outcome data reviewed by the Library faculty and by Committee and the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee once every three years beginning in 2013-14

Students will be able to understand cultural differences	Assessment of final project in WMST 2001 Project assessed using GSW Area B Intercultural Knowledge Rubric	Outcome data reviewed by the Women's Studies faculty and by Committee and the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee once every three years beginning in 2013-14
Area C Students will be able to articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning humanities and fine arts	Assessment of an essay question on the final exam for English Courses in Area C Essays assessed using the GSW Area C Assessment Rubric	Outcome data reviewed by the Department of English and Modern Languages Assessment Committee and the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee once every three years beginning in 2012-13
Area D Students will be able to interpret symbolic representations of data relevant to the physical world Students will be able to evaluate the relationship between observation and inference in the natural sciences	Assessment questions included on Final Exam in Biology, Geology, and Physics courses that evaluate the students' ability to (1) interpret graphical data, (2) evaluate relationships from the graph and (3) predict relationships from the graph Questions assessed using GSW Area D Assessment Rubric	Reviewed once every three years by the Biology, Geology, and Physics faculty and by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee beginning in 2013-14
Area E Students will be able to articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning societal dynamics	Assessment of final exam questions in HIST 1111, HIST 1112, HIST 2111, HIST 2112, and POLS 1101 Questions assessed using course specific rubrics	Outcome data reviewed once every three years by the Department of History and Political Science faculty and by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee beginning in 2012-13
US Perspectives Students will be able to articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning historical and societal dynamics within the United States	Assessment of final exam questions in HIST 2111, HIST 2112 & POLS 1101 Questions assessed using the GSW US Perspectives Assessment Rubric	Outcome data reviewed once every three years by the Department of History and Political Science faculty and by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee beginning in 2012-13
Global Perspectives Students will be able to articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning world-wide societal dynamics	Assessment of final exam questions in HIST 1111 & HIST 1112 Questions assessed using the GSW Global Perspectives Assessment Rubric	Outcome data reviewed once every three years by the Department of History and Political Science faculty and by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee beginning in 2013-14

<p>Critical Thinking Students will be able to analyze and evaluate the main issues that relate to problems or texts, and then apply an organized, coherent and accurate response</p>	<p>Baseline Assessment: Midterm Exam in ENGL 1101 Composition I</p> <p>Attainment Assessment: Final Project in ENGL 1102 Composition II</p> <p>Both assessments carried out using the GSW Gen Ed Critical Thinking Rubric</p>	<p>Outcome data reviewed by the Department of English and Modern Languages Assessment Committee and by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee once every three years beginning in 2011-12</p>
---	---	--

The table below lists the courses targeted for collecting assessment artifacts in each Core Area and Overlay.

Core Area	Targeted Courses
A1	ENGL 1101 Composition I ENGL 1102 Composition II
A2	MATH 1101 Introduction to Math Modeling MATH 1111 College Algebra MATH 1113 Precalculus MATH 1120 Calculus I
B	LIBR 1101 Foundations of Information Literacy THEA 1110 Performance Skills for Business and Professions WMST 2001 Introduction to Women's Studies
C	ENGL 2110 World Literature ENGL 2120 British Literature ENGL 2130 American Literature
D	BIOL 1107 & BIOL 1107I Essentials of Biology I Lecture and Lab BIOL 1108 & BIOL 1108L Essentials of Biology II Lecture and Lab BIOL 1500 - Applied Botany BIOL 2107 - Principles of Biology I BIOL 2108 - Principles of Biology II CHEM 1211 Principles of Chemistry I Lecture and Lab CHEM 1212 Principles of Chemistry II Lecture and Lab GEOL 1121 Earth Materials, Processes, and Environment GEOL 1122 Earth History and Global Change PHYS 1111 Introductory Physics I PHYS 1112 Introductory Physics II PHYS 2211 Principles of Physics I PHYS 2212 Principles of Physics II

E	HIST 1111 World Civilization I HIST 1112 World Civilization II HIST 2111 US History I HIST 2112 US History II POLS 1101 American Government
US Perspectives	HIST 2111 US History I HIST 2112 US History II POLS 1101 American Government
Global Perspectives	HIST 1111 World Civilization I HIST 1112 World Civilization II
Critical Thinking	ENGL 1101 Composition I ENGL 1102 Composition II

The Three-Year Assessment Cycle

Year One (starting with 2011-2012)

- Area A1 Communication
- Area A2 Mathematics
- Critical Thinking Overlay

Year Two

- Area C Humanities/Fine Arts
- Area E Social Sciences
- US Perspectives Overlay

Year Three

- Area B Institutional Options
- Area D Natural and Computational Sciences
- Global Perspectives Overlay

During the first two years of the assessment cycle, the assessments were overseen and the reports written by the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Dean of Computing and Mathematics. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning took assumed these duties during the third year of the cycle.

The following sections of this review record results of the first three-year cycle of student attainment assessment as well as responses from the specified data reviewers.

SECTION TWO

AREA A1

Productivity

During the period under review, the Department of English and Modern Languages generated 8466 credit hours in Area A1, 4437 hours from ENGL 1101 Composition I and 4029 from ENGL 1102 Composition II. See appendix for term by term productivity from Summer 2011 through Fall 2014.

Assessment of Attainment

To assess students' mastery of this learning outcome artifacts collected in both ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 during fall 2011 and spring 2012 were assessed during summer 2012. The ENGL 1101 assessments were intended to establish a baseline for comparison with the ENGL 1102 assessments when students have completed the two-course composition sequence. In ENGL 1101, a random sample of students' midterm writing assignments was collected (n=153) and in ENGL 1102, a random sample of the course capstone research paper was collected (n=112). These student artifacts were evaluated by a faculty committee using a rubric developed by the faculty of the Department of English and Modern Languages. Faculty evaluators were trained in the use of the rubric to ensure the consistency of assessment. See tables below for summary of results.

Table 1. Results of assessment of writing skills for ENGL 1101

	Mean	Mode	Stdev	Exceeds (3 pts)	Meets (2 pts)	Falls Below Expectations (1 pts)
Purpose	1.88	2	0.64	23	88	42
Conceptual	1.76	2	0.62	16	85	52
Development/Research	1.68	1	0.74	25	54	74
Structure/Organization	1.75	2	0.62	15	85	53
Language	1.9	2	0.48	11	116	26

Table 2. Results of assessment of writing skills for ENGL 1102

	Mean	Mode	Stdev	Exceeds (3 pts)	Meets (2 pts)	Falls Below Expectations (1 pts)
Purpose	1.77	2	0.63	12	62	38

Conceptual	1.75	2	0.61	10	64	38
Development/Research	1.71	2	0.68	14	50	46
Structure/Organization	1.63	2	0.61	8	54	49
Language	1.79	2	0.55	8	73	31

Response to Data by the Department of English and Modern Languages

These results were shared with faculty in the Department of English and Modern Languages and possible responses were discussed. The faculty are not convinced that the midterm in 1101 is accurately reflecting our students' work. Anecdotal evidence from professors suggests, for example, that the readings for the F12 midterm were considerably more complex than previous exams. More than one professor has expressed frustration at the way this was reflected in their students' essays. So, we plan to change the 1101 midterm to an assessment that allows students to choose an artifact from their essays in 1101 that they decide reflects the critical thinking and gen ed writing standards. The artifact will require source integration and will be due in Livetext at the end of the term. The faculty think that this shift will more accurately reflect the outcome of the writing process that is being taught in 1101. Additionally, it will function like a mini portfolio in that the students will choose the appropriate artifact and will, arguably, have to use critical thinking to address that part of the process as well.

The data from the writing template is not what faculty would expect since the 1101 students seem to have written better essays than the 1102 students. The faculty feel that changing the artifact for 1101 will result in a truer comparison of data since the 1101 artifact was considerably more prescriptive than the 1102. For example, for 1101 the students didn't do any research; the research was given to them. The 1102 artifact is based on research the student has acquired.

For academic year 2012-2013 the Department of English and Modern Languages will be conducting assessment of writing skills using the modified approach (described above) in an attempt to collect data that better represent students' mastery of this learning outcome.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The subcommittee recorded no response to this data in its April 19, 2013 report to the Committee on Academic Affairs.

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

The problem with the results identified by the English faculty is more complicated than the faculty's analysis suggests. For instance, the focus on research writing with sources is not reflected in the outcome for the area, which does not address research directly but which is part of the rubric. In addition, the rubric with only three levels of achievement creates two problems. It creates the expectation that significant number of students will exceed

expectations for college level writing by the end of a two-course sequence that most students complete before the end of their sophomore year, and this expectation was exacerbated by the inexperience of the assessors. It should also be noted that many degree programs have discipline-specific written communication outcomes that would suggest that students will receive more writing instruction and experience further development during their academic careers. If the rubric had more levels of achievement, less emphasis on research writing, and more emphasis on general writing skills, two benefits might be realized. Assessors would have a more nuanced scale to apply to the student writing and attainment targets could be set that would discourage overly high assessments of freshmen-sophomore writing. Accordingly, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning has recommended that the English Faculty consider adopting the AACU VALUE Rubric for written communication, which has essentially five levels of attainment ranging from does not meet benchmark through two levels of milestones before reaching a capstone level. It has also been recommended that the faculty set a target for students exiting ENGL 1102 of either a percentage will reach the second milestone or a majority will reach one of the two milestones. Such a target would allow room for student development if degree programs chose to adopt the same rubric for measuring their discipline-specific written communication outcomes.

SECTION THREE

AREA A2

Productivity

During the period under review, the Department of Mathematics generated 8281 credit hours in Area A2, 1119 hours from MATH 1101 Math Modeling, 4470 from MATH 1111 College Algebra, 1860 from MATH 1113 Pre-Calculus, and 832 from MATH 1120 Calculus I. See appendix for term by term productivity from Summer 2011 through Fall 2014.

Assessment of Attainment

At the end of the spring term 2012, the Mathematics Department evaluated the proficiency of core level mathematics students in solving a single problem based on the content of each separate course in the core, MATH 1101, MATH 1111, MATH 1113, and MATH 1120. The assessment used the five-point rubric can be found below the results. The results are presented below, both as a combined assessment of all these courses, and for individual courses separately.

All Courses Combined	3. 17%
5. 15%	2. 13%
4. 11%	1. 22%
3. 23%	0. 26%
2. 10%	MATH 1113
1. 15%	5. 14%
0. 26%	4. 18%
Individual Courses	3. 36%
MATH 1101	2. 7%
5. 6%	1. 11%
4. 19%	0. 14%
3. 25%	MATH 1120
2. 6%	5. 16%
1. 19%	4. 8%
0. 25%	3. 12%
MATH 1111	2. 12%
5. 22%	1. 12%
4. 0%	0. 40%

Rubric for A2 Outcomes

- 5. Solves the given problem, and in a way which has a wider range of applicability (A, B)
- 4. Solves the given problem. (A, B)
- 3. Understands the given problem and attempts to solve it, but fails to get an acceptable solution. (C)
- 2. Shows evidence of understanding the problem, but does not attempt to solve it. (D)

1. Fails to understand the problem, but attempts a solution. (F)
0. Does nothing or submits an attempt that suggests little effort. (F)

Response to Data by the Department of Mathematics

Notice that 51% of students in Mathematics core courses had little or no proficiency in solving a content-based problem. The situation was somewhat similar for the individual courses MATH 1101, 50%; MATH 1111, 61%; MATH 1113, 32%; MATH 1120, 64%. These numbers are much worse than those for comparable courses taken in the fall of 2011. Unfortunately, this is no great surprise, since department records suggest that students with weaker mathematical skills tend to populate spring-term classes. Following up, the Department will continue to address this issue in a number of ways: more emphasis on translation of problems into symbolic language, and on practical problem solving methods. In addition, the faculty will try to sharpen problem-solving skills by requiring that students include explanations to justify steps in the problem-solving process. There is also a project to develop prototypes of MATH Workstations for all core-level Mathematics courses, starting with MATH 1111. This should be ready in spring 2013.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The subcommittee recorded no response to this data in its April 19, 2013 report to the Committee on Academic Affairs.

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

Given that the students in these Mathematics courses fall into two separate groups, non-science majors with few or no additional requirements beyond MATH 1101 or 1111 and science majors with requirements beyond MATH 1120, it would seem that this groups should be disaggregated for assessment purposes and separate attainment targets set for each group.

The rubric created by the Department of Mathematics seems to concentrate more upon understanding and effort than on actual problem solving skills. It is difficult to see how one would know what specific remedies to try in any given course on the basis of the data generated. It is also of some concern the highest percentage of students with little or no proficiency in solving the problem were in the highest level course, where they had presumably passed the prerequisite course in either high school or college. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning suggests that the Department of Mathematics adapt some portions of the AACU VALUE quantitative reasoning rubric for assessing student attainment.

SECTION FOUR

AREA B

Productivity

During the period under review, 8703 credit hours were generated in Area B. The hours were distributed as follows by department: the Department of Computer Science generated 3957 credit hours in CIS 1000 Computer Applications, the Department of English and Modern Languages 135 from ENGL 2200 Introduction to Professional Writing, the Department of History and Political Science 1578 from POLS 2401 Introduction to Global Issues and SOSC the World and Its Peoples, the Library 198 from LIBR 1101 Introduction to Information Literacy, the Department of Theater, Communication and Media Arts 2124 from COMM 1110 Fundamentals of Speech and THEA 1110 Performance Skills for Business and the Professions, and the Women's Studies Program 711 from WMST Introduction to Women's Studies. Just under 35% of the hours were generated in courses targeted for attainment assessment. See appendix for term by term productivity for individual courses from Summer 2011 through Fall 2014.

Assessment of Attainment

Since Area B has two learning outcomes deriving from courses taught by different academic and academic support units, there are two sections to the attainment report for this area.

Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to evaluate information critically

A sample of seventy-two students was assessed on their final projects in LIBR 1101 Information Literacy, forty at the end of fall term 2013 and thirty-two at the end of spring term 2014 by a group of three Library Faculty members experienced in teaching information literacy. Note that one test assessment was discounted in the final results.

Outcome: Students will be able to evaluate information critically.

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others’ assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Meets Well (3): Identifies own and others’ assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Meets Adequately (2): Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others’ assumptions than one’s own (or vice versa).	Benchmark (1): Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.	Does not meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	19	23	22	6	3	73	2.67

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Meets Well (3): Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Meets Adequately (2): Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Benchmark (1): Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.	Does not meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	26.03%	31.51%	30.14%	8.22%	4.11%	73	2.67

Statistic	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically
Min Value	0
Max Value	4
Mean	2.67
Variance	1.17
Standard Deviation	1.08
Total Responses	73

Outcome: Students will be able to evaluate information critically.

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth	Meets Well (3): Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.	Meets Adequately (2): Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purposes is not fully achieved.	Benchmark (1): Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved.	Does not meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	28	28	11	5	0	72	3.10

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth	Meets Well (3): Communicates, organizes, and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.	Meets Adequately (2): Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purposes is not fully achieved.	Benchmark (1): Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved.	Does not meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	38.89%	38.89%	15.28%	6.94%	0.00%	72	3.10

Statistic	Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose
Min Value	1
Max Value	4
Mean	3.10
Variance	0.82
Standard Deviation	0.91
Total Responses	72

Response to Data by the Faculty of the Library

Since over 93% of the students sampled were able to use information to achieve a purpose at or above the meets adequately level and over 87% were able to evaluate information critically at or above the meets adequately level, attainment on this Area B outcome exceeds the target of 85% attainment at or above the meets adequately level. Programs with information literacy outcomes should note that students' ability to critically evaluate information needs more development than their ability to use information.

Learning Outcome 2: Students will be able to understand cultural differences

A sample of seventy-nine students was assessed on their projects in THEA 1110 Performance Skills for Professionals, twenty-seven during fall term only, and WMST 2001 Introduction to Women's Studies, thirty-two at the end of fall term 2013 and twenty-two at the end of spring term 2014. The artifacts were assessed by the course instructors using the GSW Area B Intercultural Knowledge Rubric.

Outcome: Students will be able to understand cultural differences. Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample that does not meet benchmark level performance.

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Articulate insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description).	Meets Well (3): Recognize new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer).	Meets Adequately (2): Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others).	Benchmark (1): Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others).	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Cultural Self-Awareness	9	29	26	8	7	79	2.32

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description).	Meets Well (3): Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness ; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer).	Meets Adequately (2): Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others).	Benchmark (1): Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others).	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Cultural Self-Awareness	11.39%	36.71%	32.91%	10.13%	8.86%	79	2.32

Statistic	Cultural Self-Awareness
Min Value	0
Max Value	4
Mean	2.32
Variance	1.19
Standard Deviation	1.09
Total Responses	79

Outcome: Students will be able to understand cultural differences. Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample that does not meet benchmark level performance.

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Meets Well (3): Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Meets Adequately (2): Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Benchmark (1): Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Knowledge of Other Worldviews	8	14	23	26	8	79	1.85

#	Question	Exceeds (4): Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Meets Well (3): Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Meets Adequately (2): Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Benchmark (1): Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)	Total Responses	Mean
1	Knowledge of Other Worldviews	10.13%	17.72%	29.11%	32.91%	10.13%	79	1.85

Statistic	Knowledge of Other Worldviews
Min Value	0
Max Value	4
Mean	1.85
Variance	1.31
Standard Deviation	1.14
Total Responses	79

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

The students assessed were generally more adept at recognizing their own cultural assumptions and biases, over 80% of the students at least adequately met expectations on this dimension, than they were on recognizing elements that are important to members of another culture, over 43% were at or below benchmark on this dimension. These results support the need for the Windows to the World Program and the need for major programs to enhance understanding of other worldviews where appropriate.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The Subcommittee recommended that all involved programs should briefly describe their sample questions used in the measurement and data collection procedures and include the actual questions of measurement in the appendix.

SECTION FIVE**AREA C****Productivity**

During the period under review, 8838 credit hours were generated in Core Area C. The Department of English and Modern Languages generated 3966 of those credit hours in the three literature courses from which each student must choose one: ENGL 2110 World Literature, ENGL 2120 British Literature and ENGL 2130 American Literature. The total credit hours generated in literature courses, which are the courses targeted in this area for attainment assessment, accounts for approximately 45% of the total hours generated. The balance of the credit hours in Area C were generated by the Department of Music (1623), the Department of Theater, Communication, and Media Arts (2052), and the Department of Visual Arts (1197) in their respective appreciation MUSC 1100 Music Appreciation, THEA 1100 Theater Appreciation, and ARTC 1100 Art Appreciation. See appendix for term by term productivity from Summer 2011 through Fall 2014.

Assessment of Attainment

During spring term 2013, the Department of English and Modern Languages assessed student progress Core Area C learning outcome. Students were assessed using the rubric below. The artifact used for assessment was an essay question on the final exam which reflected the student's ability to "articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning literature." Each professor teaching a 2000 level core literature class randomly sampled a third of his or her students for assessment with the rubric. We taught eight sections. The sample for assessment was 68 students.

	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations
Overall N	31	27	10
Overall Percentage	45%	40%	15%

GSW Core Area C Assessment Rubric

Rubric Elements	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Meets Expectations (2)	Below Expectations (1)
Understanding of the question	Student demonstrates a complex understanding of the question	Student demonstrates an adequate understanding of the question	Student demonstrates a superficial understanding of the question

Understanding and comprehension of text	Student demonstrates a complex understanding and comprehension of the text	Student demonstrates an adequate understanding and comprehension of the text	Student demonstrates a superficial understanding and comprehension of the text
Articulation of knowledge of pertinent literary issues and developments	Student adeptly articulates knowledge of pertinent literary issues and developments	Student adequately articulates knowledge of pertinent literary issues and developments	Student inadequately articulates knowledge of pertinent literary issues and developments
Overall	Meets expectations in all categories and exceeds in one or more.	Meets expectations in all categories except one	Below expectations in two or more categories

For assessing the SLO based on the rubric:

Exceeds Expectations = 9-7 points

Meets Expectations=5-6 points

Below Expectations=4 points or fewer

Response to Data by the Department of English and Modern Languages

A 75% threshold of students meeting or exceeding standards was deemed acceptable. The data shows an 85% rate of students meeting or exceeding standards for the overall performance. (31 students exceeded standards in the Overall category; 27 students meet standards; and 10 students fell below standards.) More detailed analysis of the element results will occur when the faculty returns in fall term 2013.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The subcommittee concurred that the students assessed had reached an acceptable level of attainment on this outcome when it presented its report to the Committee on Academic Affairs October 31, 2013.

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

The results seem relatively high given that the assessment was done after students had completed their first, and for many students their only, college level literature course. Perhaps a rubric with more nuanced levels of achievement is needed.

SECTION SIX

AREA D

Productivity

During the period under review, 11,533 credit hours were generated by the departments that provide the courses targeted for attainment assessment in Core Area D, 10,741 of that total in targeted courses. The departmental contributions to targeted courses in Area D are as follows: Biology 5528 credit hours, Chemistry 2061 credit hours, and Geology and Physics 2648. See appendix for term by term productivity from Summer 2011 through Fall 2014.

Assessment of Attainment

Area D is the most complicated assessment problem in GSW's general education program, since the courses targeted in the area are taught by three separate departments and encompass four separate disciplines: Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics. While the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, and Geology and Physics agreed upon a rubric for assessing student attainment, each department did the assessment on its own and filed separate attainment reports.

Department of Biology

The Biology Department collects and collates the student data for assessment of Area D of the Core. Assessments are conducted in the following courses: BIOL 1107, BIOL 1108, BIOL 2107, BIOL 2108, and BIOL 1500. This covers all of our Area D courses with the exception of the BIOL 1107/8 lab sections. These were omitted because all lab section students are assessed in their respective lecture course.

The Area D Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) were developed by a committee representing all of the natural sciences departments. These were the critical points that the committee valued across all science disciplines. Following the completion of an Area D course: 1) the student can determine a critical value from a symbolic representation of a set of values; 2) the student can provide a qualitative description of the relationship between two parameters presented in a symbolic representation of data; and 3) Based on the relationship(s) depicted in the graphic representation, the student can predict or extrapolate a value that is not given AND/OR can assess the generality or consistency of their prediction.

The assessment tool consist of one question assess each of the above SLO. These questions may be administered on a quiz or an exam or independently. The assessment of the questions for purposes of a course grade is independent of the assessment of the question using the above rubric. The assessment question(s) require minimal content recall/understanding of specific course material. Poor understanding of specific course material should not be the cause of failing to meet the standard. Each student answers will be evaluated and a value of 0 or 1 will be assigned (0= does not meet expectations; 1= meets expectations). The target for the assessment is to have 70% of students meeting the SLO expectations.

The assessment data for the past 2 academic years has been collected and the summary of that data can be seen in Table 1.

	Academic Year	Interpret	Relationships	Predict
Traditional				
Courses	2011-2012	80.3	81.4	73.4
	2012-2013	82.5	87.3	69.6
	2013-2014	81.7	86.9	60.7
Online course	2011-2012	36.8	26.3	68.4

Response to Data by the Department of Biology

For the traditional courses (not online) the percentage of student meeting expectations exceeded the target for SLO 1 and SLO 2. The number of students meeting the expectations for SLO 3 was lower. This was not unexpected because SLO 3 requires students to engage in critical thinking. Within the past three years only a single online course was taught. The assessment data from that was isolated from the traditional courses data. The same course taught concurrently but without traditional delivery, scored as high as the other traditional courses. While the sample for the online course is very limited, the dramatic difference in scoring suggest that there was a problem. Adjustments to the course have been made for spring 2015 when it will again be taught online.

Department of Chemistry

The Chemistry Department collects and collates the student data for assessment of Area D of the Core. Assessments are conducted in the following courses: CHEM 1211, CHEM 1212, CHEM 1020, CHEM 1151, CHEM 1152, ENVS 1100. This covers all of our Area D courses with the exception of lab sections. These were omitted because all lab section students are assessed in their respective lecture course.

The Area D Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) were developed by a committee representing all of the natural sciences departments. These were the critical points that the committee valued across all science disciplines. Following the completion of an Area D course: 1) the student can determine a critical value from a symbolic representation of a set of values; 2) the student can provide a qualitative description of the relationship between two parameters presented in a symbolic representation of data; and 3) Based on the relationship(s) depicted in the graphic representation, the student can predict or extrapolate a value that is not given AND/OR can assess the generality or consistency of their prediction.

The assessment tool consist of one question assess each of the above SLO. These questions may be administered on a quiz or an exam or independently. The assessment of the questions for purposes of a course grade is independent of the assessment of the question using the above rubric. The assessment question(s) require minimal content recall/understanding of specific course material. Poor understanding of specific course material should not be the cause of failing to meet the standard. Each student answers will be evaluated and a value of 0

or 1 will be assigned (0= does not meet expectations; 1= meets expectations). The target for the assessment is to have 70% of students meeting the SLO expectations.

The assessment data for the past academic year has been collected and the summary of that data can be seen in Table 2.

	Academic Year	Interpret	Relationships	Predict
Traditional Courses	2013-2014	95.6	74.3	78.4

Response to Data by the Department of Chemistry

The percentage of student meeting expectations exceeded the target for all three SLO's. Science programs in which these courses are part of Area F requirements should note that the ability to describe relationships between data represented in a graph qualitatively needs more development than the other skills measured by the assessment.

Department of Geology and Physics

The following data were collected as part of Area D Core assessment. Assessment of Core Area D was done through various questions in exams and in-class assignments for the following classes during the Fall semester of 2013: GEOL 1121 (four sections), GEOL 1122, PHYS 1111 and PHYS 2211.

Each faculty member in Geology and Physics developed questions that fit each of the categories and determined if the student met the expectation for that particular question. The data were tabulated for each class and examples of the questions used were sent to the chair for compilation. In most classes the results were sorted by class, allowing for a separate analysis of freshmen vs. other students in our classes. Almost all the data were collected in Fall 2013, with only the one section of GEOL 1122 class in Spring 2014 being included.

The following tables show the results of our assessment in the various classes, and include an example of the questions that were used to evaluate the Area D assessments.

Course / CRN	Instructor	Assessment 1	Number	Met (1)	Did Not Meet (0)
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	What is the elevation of a selected location. (Map exercise)	N = 54	38 (70.4%)	16
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	What is the elevation of the highest point...(three different maps used)	N = 19	9 (47.4%)	10

GEOL 1122 / 8020	Carter	Use a graph to determine the ages of two igneous rocks	N = 11	7 (63.6%)	4
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	Determine the strike and dip of a fault based on a block diagram of the structure without strike and dip symbols.	N = 25	18 (72%)	7
PHYS 1111 / 8026	Kostov	Determine acceleration using Newton's Second Law given force and mass.	N = 21	19 (90.5%)	2
PHYS 2211 / 8027	Kostov	Determine acceleration using Newton's Second Law given force and mass.	N = 20	20 (100%)	0
		Totals	150	111	39
		Percent of Total		74%	26%

Course / CRN	Instructor	Assessment 2	Results	Met	Did not Meet
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	In which general direction does Lower Little Swatara Creek flow? Does Swatara Creek flow continuously? Explain.	N = 54	32 (59.5%)	22
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	What is the relief from... (relief is difference in elevation between two points; three different maps used)	N = 19	9 (47.4%)	10
GEOL 1122 / 8020	Carter	Assess the reliability of the radiometric ages through comparison to another technique.	N = 11	7 (63.6%)	4
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	What type of structure is shown in the block diagram based on the distribution of the two rock types in the drawing?	N = 25	16 (64%)	9

PHYS 1111 / 8026	Kostov	Identify a linear and quadratic relationship between velocity and time and distance and time.	N = 21	18 (85.7%)	3
PHYS 2211 / 8027	Kostov	Identify a linear and quadratic relationship between velocity and time and distance and time.	N = 20	18 (90%)	2
		Totals	150	100	50
		Percent of Total		66.7%	33.3%
Course / CRN	Instructor	Assessment 3	Results		
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	What is the latitude and longitude of St. Mark's Church?	N = 54	20 (37%)	34
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	What is the gradient of xxx Creek... (gradient is the slope of the creek; three different maps used)	N = 19	5 (26.3%)	14
GEOL 1122 / 8020	Carter	Apply the derived radiometric ages to a schematic diagram to estimate the age of a third object.	N = 11	7 (63.6%)	4
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	Determine the nature of movement and fault type for the fault shown in the diagram from the offset of the rock units.	N = 25	15 (60%)	10
PHYS 1111 / 8026	Kostov	Graph of force vs. mass and compare to theoretical predicted acceleration and discuss consistency with experimental results.	N = 21	16 (76%)	5
PHYS 2211 / 8027	Kostov	Graph of force vs. mass and compare to theoretical predicted acceleration and	N = 20	18 (90%)	2

		discuss consistency with experimental results.			
		Totals	150	81	69
		Percent of Total		54%	46%

Response to Data by the Department of Geology and Physics

The assessment indicates that most of our students can determine a critical value from a symbolic representation (i.e. read a graph) however they have more difficulty describing the data (Assessment 2) or analyzing or extrapolating the data and making a prediction based upon this result (Assessment 3). Students in the physics classes have better analytical skills, which is to be expected given their mathematical backgrounds and often advanced status. The type of question asked may also have played a role. For example, the question asked in the GEOL 1122 class presupposed knowledge of geology that the students may not have possessed at the beginning of the term. Questions asked in GEOL 1121 reflect skills that should have been known by the students as there were numerous opportunities in class or lab to practice these tasks.

The percentage of students meeting expectations in **all** areas should exceed 70%, especially since the assessment is done towards the end of the term. This only happened on Question 1. Perhaps an earlier assessment coupled with one at the end of the course would allow us to see ***progression during the semester?***

Results – Freshmen only

Dean McCoy requested that we attempt to sort the data relative to the class level of the students. In particular, he was interested in the relative performance of freshmen versus other students in the same classes. The following tables show the results of our assessment for freshmen only in the four classes for which we have separate data. The same questions were used and therefore are not included.

Assessment 1 – Freshmen Only

Course / CRN	Instructor	Number	Met (1)	Did Not Meet (0)
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	N = 11	6 (54.5%)	5
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	N = 10	5 (50%)	5
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	N = 8	5 (62.5%)	3
	Totals	29	16	13
	% of Total		55.1%	44.9%

Assessment 2 – Freshmen Only

Course / CRN	Instructor	Number	Met (1)	Did Not Meet (0)
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	N = 11	8 (72.7%)	3
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	N = 10	4 (40%)	6
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	N = 8	6 (75%)	2
	Totals	29	18	11
	% of Total		62.1%	37.9%

Assessment 3 – Freshmen Only

Course / CRN	Instructor	Number	Met (1)	Did Not Meet (0)
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	N = 11	4 (36.4%)	7
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	N = 10	4 (40%)	6
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	N = 8	4 (50%)	4
	Totals	29	12	17
	% of Total		41.4%	58.6%

Note that three of the classes did not have a breakdown of freshmen, and therefore we do not have the complete picture at this time. However, it is doubtful that there were any freshmen in the Physics classes, as most freshmen do not have the necessary pre-requisite mathematics courses to enable them to be in those classes.

The tables below summarize the percentages of students that met expectations for each question broken into three groups: freshmen, non-freshmen and all students.

Assessment 1

Course / CRN	Instructor	Overall % Met	% Met, Freshmen	% Met, Non-Freshmen
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	70.4%	54.5%	74.4%
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	47.4%	50%	44.4%
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	72%	62.5%	76.5%
	Total	66.1%	55.1%	71.0%

Assessment 2

Course / CRN	Instructor	Overall % Met	% Met, Freshmen	% Met, Non-Freshmen
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	59.5%	72.7%	55.8%
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	47.4%	40%	55.5%
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	64%	75%	58.8%
	Total	58.7%	62.1%	56.5%

Assessment 3

Course / CRN	Instructor	Overall % Met	% Met, Freshmen	% Met, Non-Freshmen
GEOL 1121 / 8018-8019	Weiland	37%	36.4%	37.2%
GEOL 1121 / 8017	Peavy	26.3%	40%	11.1%
GEOL 1122 / 2003	Weiland	60%	50%	64.7%
	Total	43.1%	41.4%	43.5%

The results show that expectations were not met at the 70% level for freshmen in any of the classes for which the data were collected. They also show that on Assessment 1 freshmen had more difficulty reading a graph or map than non-freshmen. They did much better on Assessment 2 (providing a qualitative explanation for points on a graph or map), with a higher percentage of freshmen meeting the criteria. Most students struggled with the third question regardless of class, as less than half were able to extrapolate data or evaluate the consistency of a prediction. Overall, students in the GEOL 1122 classes were better at these exercises than those in GEOL 1121 – not surprising given their greater experience in Area D classes. Only non-freshmen were able to answer Assessment 1 with over 70% success. There is not enough data at this time to make any general conclusions about pre-college preparation or general ability of students to work with graphical or symbolic data sets.

Students in Area D courses in the Geology and Physics department were only able to meet our expectations for Assessment 1 (reading a graph). Students in the Physics classes performed better overall as we would expect given their background in math and science. Freshmen were outperformed in all areas except Assessment 2 which calls for a qualitative interpretation of the data. Given the paucity of data at this point, no general conclusions can be made. Perhaps a more comprehensive treatment with an early semester evaluation followed by one later in the term might provide more information, allowing a separation of abilities gained in the class from those brought to the class.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The subcommittee suggested that the three departments agree upon a consistent format for displaying results to facilitate comparison of results across disciplines and courses. The subcommittee also suggested the inclusion of the specific questions assessed in each course as part of the results. These recommendations were passed along to the affected departments.

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

As with the assessment of Area A2, students in Area D fall into two groups: non-science majors who typically take only three science courses in their college career, and science majors who not only take more hours of science in general education but also will take many more hours during their college careers. In addition, no provision has been made for disaggregating

the students in a given class how have taken and passed another college science class from those taking their first college science class. It will be recommended to the science departments that the results for non-science and science majors be disaggregated, as well as first science class takers from those taking at least their second science class, and that they consider setting separate attainment targets for each of these groups.

SECTION SEVEN

AREA E

Productivity

During the period under review, 26,835 credit hours were generated by the departments that provide the courses to Core Area E, 18,420 of that total in targeted courses. The departmental contributions to targeted courses in Area E are as follows: History and Political Science 18,420 credit hours, Psychology and Sociology 6309 credit hours, and the School of Business Administration 2109. See appendix for term by term productivity from Summer 2011 through Fall 2014.

Assessment of Attainment

The Department of History & Political Science serves Area E of the Core by offering five courses: HIST 1111 World Civilization I, HIST 1112 World Civilization II, HIST 2111 U.S. History I, HIST U.S. History II, and POLS 1101 American Government. All GSW students are required to take one at least one of the World Civilization courses, and at least one of the U.S. History Courses, and American Government; therefore, these courses were chosen to assess attainment in Area E. In addition, HIST 2111 U.S. History I and HIST U.S. History II are the targeted courses for assessing the Core US Perspectives outcome.

Sections (both in-class and online) of each of three courses (HIST 1111 World Civilization I, HIST 1112 World Civilization II, POLS 1101 American Government) were assessed in the spring 2013 term. The courses were assessed respectively by Drs. Martin and Parkinson (World Civilization) and Drs. Berggren, Smith, and Kline (American Government). Several essay questions that reveal the ability of students “to articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning historical and societal dynamics” were chosen for each course, and assessed using the rubric below. A summary of results was compiled for each course.

The History Report (World Civilization)

Data collected here is: a) course number; b) term; c) whether the course was on-line; d) number of students that took the assessment; e) number of students that scored a 5 on the rubric; f) number of students that scored a 4 on the rubric; g) number of students that scored a 3 on the rubric; h) number of students that scored a 2 on the rubric; i) number of students that scored a 1 on the rubric.

Core Area E Assessment	Semester	Online	# of Students	# of 5s	#of 4s	#of 3s	#of 2s	#of 1s
HIST 1111	Sp2013	No	33	3	10	9	4	7
HIST 1112	Sp2013	No	36	6	3	7	8	10
Totals			69	13%	19%	23%	17%	25%

Response to Data by the History Faculty

None.

The Political Science Report (American Government)

Student performance in political science was evaluated on the basis of essay questions conducted in three sections of American Government (POLS 1101) in the spring, 2013 semester. Two sections were conducted online and one was conducted in a traditional classroom format. The essay questions were aimed at determining whether students could clearly “articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning historical and societal dynamics within the United States.” The following table summarizes the overall findings regarding the level of knowledge and proficiency of the students. Eighty-three students participated. Fifty-eight students, nearly 70 percent, performed at the satisfactory level or higher; 25 students performed below the satisfactory level.

Performance Level	# of Students
Strong Performance	27
Satisfactory Performance	31
Weak Performance	19
Unsatisfactory Performance	6

In the two online sections, students were asked to respond to four essay questions covering broad topics in American government. The question set was administered near the end of the term after students had read and studied U.S. government and politics and would be expected to do reasonably well. Dr. W. Gary Kline, the instructor of record, received responses from 64 students. The following table summarizes the findings regarding the level of knowledge and proficiency of the students in the online classes. As shown, nearly 46 students, or 72 percent, performed at the satisfactory level or higher.

Performance Level	# of Students
Strong Performance	19
Satisfactory Performance	27
Weak Performance	14
Unsatisfactory Performance	4

In the traditional class section, students were asked to respond to one multi-part essay question. The question was administered as part of a comprehensive, cumulative final exam. These questions were aimed at determining whether students could clearly “articulate factual and

conceptual knowledge concerning historical and societal dynamics within the United States.” Dr. D. Jason Berggren, the instructor of record, received 19 responses. The following table summarizes the findings regarding the level of knowledge and proficiency of the students in the traditional class. As shown, 12 students, or 63 percent, performed at the satisfactory level or higher.

Performance Level	# of Students
Strong Performance	8
Satisfactory Performance	4
Weak Performance	5
Unsatisfactory Performance	2

Response to Data by the Political Science Faculty

During the spring, 2013 semester, a relatively high percentage of students were able to articulate the sort of knowledge we hope they can master by the end of the course. Overall, nearly 70 percent were able to provide responses to essay questions at the satisfactory level or higher. As nearly one-third of students were unable to submit satisfactory responses, the results leave room for improvement.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The subcommittee did not express specific concerns about the attainments results in this area of the general education program when it presented its report to the Committee on Academic Affairs October 31, 2013.

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

Given the high numbers of students who take History and Political Science courses, the sample sizes for the assessments seem small. In addition, the History courses taught online should be sampled for assessment and the results should be disaggregated as with the Political Science results. Given the relatively high percentages of students who judged weak or unsatisfactory by the assessments either the expectations of the faculty assessors need adjustment or some pedagogical adjustments are necessary.

SECTION EIGHT

US PERSPECTIVES OVERLAY

Data collected here is: a) course number; b) term; c) whether the course was on-line; d) number of students that took the assessment; e) number of students that scored a 5 on the rubric; f) number of students that scored a 4 on the rubric; g) number of students that scored a 3 on the rubric; h) number of students that scored a 2 on the rubric; i) number of students that scored a 1 on the rubric.

Core Area E Assessment	Semester	Online	# of Students	# of 5s	#of 4s	#of 3s	#of 2s	#of 1s
HIST 2111	Sp2013	Yes	34	4	11	8	6	5
HIST 2111	Sp2013	Yes	27	0	4	11	12	0
HIST 2112	Sp2013	No	33	2	2	15	8	5
			94	6%	18%	36%	28%	11%

Student performance in political science was evaluated on the basis of essay questions conducted in three sections of American Government (POLS 1101) in the spring, 2013 semester. Two sections were conducted online and one was conducted in a traditional classroom format. The essay questions were aimed at determining whether students could clearly “articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning historical and societal dynamics within the United States.” The following table summarizes the overall findings regarding the level of knowledge and proficiency of the students. Eighty-three students participated. Fifty-eight students, nearly 70 percent, performed at the satisfactory level or higher; 25 students performed below the satisfactory level.

Performance Level	# of Students
Strong Performance	27
Satisfactory Performance	31
Weak Performance	19
Unsatisfactory Performance	6

Response to Data by the History and Political Science Faculty

None.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The subcommittee did not express specific concerns about the attainments results in this area of the general education program when it presented its report to the Committee on Academic Affairs October 31, 2013.

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

The relatively high percentages of students who judged weak or unsatisfactory by the assessments suggest that either the expectations of the faculty assessors or pedagogy need adjustment. Disaggregation by delivery mode also needs to be instituted.

SECTION NINE
GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES OVERLAY

Course	5	4	3	2	1
	Provides accurate, comprehensive, and complex analysis of world-wide societal dynamics and is able to articulate knowledge in clear and precise language.	Provides concise and accurate analysis of world-wide societal dynamics and is able to articulate knowledge in effective language.	Provides only major and basic analysis of world-wide societal dynamics and is able to articulate knowledge in acceptable language.	Provides only basic and generally accurate analysis of world-wide societal dynamics and cannot articulate knowledge in acceptable language.	Provides minimal and partially accurate analysis of world-wide societal dynamics and cannot articulate knowledge in acceptable language.
HIST 1111 World Civ I (Number)	3	10	9	4	7
HIST 1111 World Civ I (Percent)	9%	30%	27%	12%	21%
HIST 1112 World Civ II (number)	6	3	7	8	10
HIST 1112 World Civ II (Percent)	18%	9%	20%	24%	29%
Total %	13.4%	19.4%	23.9%	17.9%	25.4%

Response to Data by the History Faculty

None.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

The subcommittee did not expressed concern about the low levels of attainment in this area of the general education program when it presented its report to the Committee on Academic Affairs November 11, 2014.

Response by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning

Given the high numbers of students who take these History courses, the sample sizes for the assessments seem small. In addition, the History courses taught online should be sampled for assessment and the results should be disaggregated. Given the relatively high percentages of students who judged weak or unsatisfactory by the assessments either the expectations of the faculty assessors need adjustment or some pedagogical adjustments are necessary.

SECTION TEN

CRITICAL THINKING OVERLAY

To assess student mastery of this learning outcome writing samples collected in ENG1101 and ENG1102 during fall 2011 and spring 2012 (the same writing samples used to assess writing skills, see Assessment of Area A1 above). These student artifacts were evaluated by a faculty committee using a rubric developed by the faculty of the Department of English and Modern Languages. Faculty evaluators were trained in the use of the rubric to ensure consistent assessment.

Results show that students fell below expectations in the areas of analyzing, integrating, and evaluating source material (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1. Assessment of students' critical thinking skills in ENG1101, spring 2012.

	Mean	Mode	Stdev	Level 5 (5 pts)	Level 4 (4 pts)	Level 3 (3 pts)	Level 2 (2 pts)	Level 1 (1 pts)
Conceptualize	2.69	2	1	5	28	51	52	17
Analyze	2.47	2	0.96	4	20	40	69	20
Synthesize	2.17	2	0.88	2	9	36	72	34
Evaluate	1.43	1	0.81	2	3	10	28	108
Apply	2.55	3	0.78	1	1	23	15	4

Table 2. Assessment of students' critical thinking skills in ENG1102, spring 2012.

	Mean	Mode	Stdev	Level 5 (5 pts)	Level 4 (4 pts)	Level 3 (3 pts)	Level 2 (2 pts)	Level 1 (1 pts)
Conceptualize	2.48	2	0.9	1	13	28	42	11
Analyze	2.33	2	0.97	3	7	26	41	18
Synthesize	2.07	2	0.92	1	6	20	40	28
Evaluate	2.03	2	0.89	0	7	18	41	29
Apply	2.2	2	0.92	0	8	16	33	17

Response to Data by the Department of English and Modern Languages

These results were discussed by faculty in the Department of English and Modern Languages. The faculty discussed ways to specifically address the problem with analyzing, integrating, and evaluating source material. One strategy being employed is a series of workshops offered by the Writing Center including a Plagiarism Workshop, a Citation Workshop, and a Writing Across the Curriculum Workshop.

Response to Data by the Committee on Academic Affairs General Education Review Subcommittee

When the subcommittee presented its report to the Committee on Academic Affairs on April 19, 2013, deep concern was expressed about the methodology for assessing Critical Thinking. The subcommittee consensus was that assessing an outcome that is described by the University System of Georgia as the outcome of the whole general education curriculum in a course most student complete during their sophomore year is not sound methodology. The subcommittee forwarded a recommendation to examine and revise the assessment of Critical Thinking attainment to the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate referred the recommendation to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for action during the next academic year. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee appointed a Task Force to examine and make recommendations to revise the assessment of Critical Thinking attainment. To date, the Task Force has drafted a university definition of Critical Thinking that will be considered for approval by the Full Faculty on May 1, 2015. Further work by the task force is ongoing.

SECTION ELEVEN

EXTERNAL REVIEW

During the 2013-14 academic year, GSW underwent reaffirmation of its accreditation by SACSCOC. As a part of that process, GSW's general education attainment plan was reviewed by a SACSCOC off-site review committee, an on-site review committee, and the SACSCOC Board of Trustees. The final report of those committees is quoted below:

As mandated by University System of Georgia policy, Georgia Southwestern clearly identifies its general education competencies and ensures that its students are aware of them; the general education curriculum is discussed in detail in the Institution's Undergraduate Bulletin and in the USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook. Nine areas of competency are identified and assessed, primarily through sets of target courses.

The institution has begun work on these assessments through review of course-embedded artifacts, using standard rubrics. Targets were established and the extent to which students achieve these targets have been documented. This process was recently instituted so not all of the outcomes have been assessed thoroughly at this point. However, the process is in place and is being followed.

Response to the External Review

GSW's general education attainment plan has been judged to be acceptable, but there is still work to do to bring the plan in line with best practices. Specific improvements can be made in each area of the general education core as discussed above in this report. Most importantly, a robust assessment of critical thinking must be devised to measure how students are attaining this crucial outcome through completion of the core curriculum. In addition, GSW's decision to become an eCore affiliate requires that ways be devised to measure the attainment of GSW's general education outcomes by our students who take courses through eCore and to compare those students' attainment with students who take the courses through GSW.

Area A1 Productivity					
Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated	Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated
ENGL 1101 201105	36	108	ENGL 1102 201105	39	117
ENGL 1101 201108	265	795	ENGL 1102 201108	201	603
ENGL 1101 201202	184	552	ENGL 1102 201202	237	711
ENGL 1101 2011-12 AY	485	1455	ENGL 1102 2011-12 AY	477	1431
ENGL 1101 201205	22	66	ENGL 1102 201205	55	165
ENGL 1101 201208	303	909	ENGL 1102 201208	161	483
ENGL 1101 201302	192	576	ENGL 1102 201302	254	762
ENGL 1101 2012-13 AY	517	1551	ENGL 1102 2012-13 AY	470	1410
ENGL 1101 201305	25	75	ENGL 1102 201305	27	81
ENGL 1101 201308	301	903	ENGL 1102 201308	139	417
ENGL 1101 201402	151	453	ENGL 1102 201402	230	690
ENGL 1101 2013-14 AY	477	1431	ENGL 1102 2013-14 AY	396	1188
ENGL 1101 2011-15	1479	4437	ENGL 1102 2011-15	1343	4029
Area A1 Total 2011-14	2822	8466			

Area A2 Productivity					
Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated	Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated
MATH 1113 201105	27	81	MATH 1120 201105	15	60
MATH 1113 201108	132	396	MATH 1120 201108	28	112
MATH 1113 201202	138	414	MATH 1120 201202	31	124
MATH 1113 2011-12 AY	297	891	MATH 1120 2011-12 AY	74	296
MATH 1113 201205	26	78	MATH 1120 201205	2	8
MATH 1113 201208	120	360	MATH 1120 201208	32	128
MATH 1113 201302	131	393	MATH 1120 201302	30	120
MATH 1113 2012-13 AY	277	831	MATH 1120 2012-13 AY	64	256
MATH 1113 201305	19	57	MATH 1120 201305	10	40
MATH 1113 201308	106	318	MATH 1120 201308	28	112
MATH 1113 201402	103	309	MATH 1120 201402	32	128
MATH 1113 2013-14 AY	228	684	MATH 1120 2013-14 AY	70	280
MATH 1113 2011-15	620	1860	MATH 1120 2011-15	208	832
Area A2 Total 2011-14	2691	8281			

Area B Productivity					
	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated	Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated
Course & Term	4	12	WMST 2001 201105	0	0
THEA 1110 201105	30	90	WMST 2001 201108	40	120
THEA 1110 201108	1	3	WMST 2001 201202	20	60
THEA 1110 201202	35	105	WMST 2001 2011-12 FY	60	180
THEA 1110 2011-12 FY					
	4	12	WMST 2001 201205	30	90
THEA 1110 201205	25	75	WMST 2001 201208	38	114
THEA 1110 201208	1	3	WMST 2001 201302	21	63
THEA 1110 201302	30	90	WMST 2001 2012-13 FY	89	267
THEA 1110 2012-13 FY					
	3	9	WMST 2001 201305	35	105
THEA 1110 201305	28	84	WMST 2001 201308	33	99
THEA 1110 201308	0	0	WMST 2001 201402	20	60
THEA 1110 201402	31	93	WMST 2001 2013-14 FY	88	264
THEA 1110 2013-14 FY	96	288	WMST 2001 2011-14	237	711
THEA 1110 2011-14					
Area B Total 2011-14	3033	8703			

Area C Productivity					
Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated	Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated
ARTC 1100 201105	21	63	THEA 1100 201105	27	81
ARTC 1100 201108	152	456	THEA 1100 201108	115	345
ARTC 1100 201202	117	351	THEA 1100 201202	108	324
ARTC 1100 2011-12 AY	290	870	THEA 1100 2011-12 AY	250	750
MUSC 1100 201205	19	57	THEA 1100 201205	10	30
MUSC 1100 201208	132	396	THEA 1100 201208	105	315
MUSC 1100 201302	100	300	THEA 1100 201302	99	297
MUSC 1100 2012-13 AY	251	753	THEA 1100 2012-13 AY	214	642
MUSC 1100 201305	18	54	THEA 1100 201305	16	48
MUSC 1100 201308	142	426	THEA 1100 201308	110	330
MUSC 1100 201402	89	267	THEA 1100 201402	94	282
MUSC 1100 2013-14 AY		0	THEA 1100 2013-14 AY	220	660
MUSC 1100 2011-14	541	1623	THEA 1100 2011-14	684	2052
Area C Total 2011-14	2946	8838			

Area D Productivity								
Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated	Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated			
BIOL 1108 201105	29	87	BIOL 1108L 201105	22	22			
BIOL 1108 201108	0	0	BIOL 1108L 201108	0	0			
BIOL 1108 201202	78	234	BIOL 1108L 201202	52	52			
BIOL 1108 2011-12 AY	107	321	BIOL 1108L 2011-12 AY	74	74			
BIOL 1108 201205	24	72	BIOL 1108L 201205	22	22			
BIOL 1108 201208	0	0	BIOL 1108L 201208	0	0			
BIOL 1108 201302	83	249	BIOL 1108L 201302	70	70			
BIOL 1108 2012-13 AY	107	321	BIOL 1108L 2012-13 AY	92	92			
BIOL 1108 201305	28	84	BIOL 1108L 201305	19	19			
BIOL 1108 201308	0	0	BIOL 1108L 201308	0	0			
BIOL 1108 201402	88	264	BIOL 1108L 201402	72	72			
BIOL 1108 2013-14 AY	116	348	BIOL 1108L 2013-14 AY	91	91			
BIOL 1108 2011-14	330	990	BIOL 1108L 2011-14	257	257			
BIOL 1500 201202	46	138	BIOL 2107 201108	60	240			
BIOL 1500 201302	24	72	BIOL 2107 201208	62	248			
BIOL 1500 201402	22	66	BIOL 2107 201308	49	196			
BIOL 1500 2011-14	92	276	BIOL 2107 2011-14	171	684			
			BIOL 2108 201202	28	112			
			BIOL 2108 201302	38	152			
			BIOL 2108 201402	27	108			
			BIOL 2107 2011-14	93	372			
BIOL Total 2011-14	2366	5528						

Area D Productivity					
Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated	Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated
PHYS 1111 201108	24	96	PHYS 2211 201108	23	92
PHYS 1111 201208	22	88	PHYS 2211 201208	17	68
PHYS 1111 201308	20	80	PHYS 2211 201308	20	80
PHYS 1111 2011-14	66	264	PHYS 2211 2011-14	60	240
PHYS 1112 201202	10	40	PHYS 2212 201202	18	72
PHYS 1112 201302	17	68	PHYS 2212 201302	12	48
PHYS 1112 201402	11	44	PHYS 2212 201402	10	40
PHYS 1112 2011-14	38	152	PHYS 2212 2011-14	40	160
PHYS 1222 201105	50	150			
PHYS 1222 201205	33	99			
PHYS 1222 201305	13	39			
PHYS 1222 2011-14	96	288			

Area E Productivity							
Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated	Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated		
PSYC 1101 201105	25	75	SOCI 1101 201105	17	51		
PSYC 1101 201108	291	873	SOCI 1101 201108	186	558		
PSYC 1101 201202	138	414	SOCI 1101 201202	129	387		
PSYC 1101 201205	20	60	SOCI 1101 201205	13	39		
PSYC 1101 201208	277	831	SOCI 1101 201208	148	444		
PSYC 1101 201302	109	327	SOCI 1101 201302	114	342		
PSYC 1101 201305	21	63	SOCI 1101 201305	0	0		
PSYC 1101 201308	235	705	SOCI 1101 201308	169	507		
PSYC 1101 201402	120	360	SOCI 1101 201402	91	273		
PSYC 1101 2011-14	1236	3708	SOCI 1101 2011-14	867	2601		
PSYC-SOCI Total 2011-14	2103	6309					

Area E Productivity		
Course & Term	Total Enrollment	Credit Hours Generated
ECON 2105 201105	54	162
ECON 2105 201108	122	366
ECON 2105 201202	82	246
ECON 2105 201205	43	129
ECON 2105 201208	109	327
ECON 2105 201302	94	282
ECON 2015 201305	32	96
ECON 2105 201308	82	246
ECON 2105 201402	85	255
ECON 2105 2011-14	703	2109