

**OVERVIEW**

This proposal is a two-semester collaborative process for assessing the College-Wide General Education Learning Outcomes (CWGELO). It will take coordination between the CWGELO committee, the Assessment Council (AC), the Office of Institutional Research (IR), and faculty from across the college.

One semester will focus on creating the sampling plan, conducting scoring, and analyzing results. The AC will have primary responsibility for these tasks. The second semester will focus on conducting and analyzing the impact of professional development, with the CWGELO committee having primary responsibility.

The focus of general education learning outcomes assessment is on the teaching and learning of the outcomes, not an evaluation of individual courses, students, or instructors. It is to determine patterns of student learning in an effort to be aware about student experiences, and to draw on that awareness to make decisions about how faculty approach teaching the outcomes. The Assessment Council and College-Wide General Education Learning Outcomes committee will need to determine the purpose for the assessment; this proposal presumes it is to identify a baseline of how the outcomes are enacted and to learn about how instructors respond to the professional development offered. In the future, it may be beneficial to determine how student learning in the outcomes and components *improve* by comparing data from different years.

**Timetable**

CWGELO	2017-18		2018-19		2019-20		2020-21	
	FA	SP	FA	SP	FA	SP	FA	SP
<b>Cultural Understanding</b>								
<b>Creative Thinking</b>								
<b>Problem Solving</b>								
<b>Communication</b>								
<b>Information Literacy</b>								

**Key**

Sample plan; score &amp; analyze samples



Offer professional development; conduct indirect assessment

**SEMESTER 1**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Who's responsible</b>	<b>When</b>
Determine which courses, number of course sections, and number of samples to use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AC Gen Ed group</li> <li>work with IR</li> </ul>	Weeks 1-4
Determine the kinds of samples that would work well for this assessment project.	AC Gen Ed group CWGELO committee	Weeks 1-4
Communicate to faculty about assessment project.	Administration?	Weeks 1-4
Collect the student artifacts.	Not sure	Weeks 4-8
Score student artifacts.	Full AC	Weeks 4-8
Analyze results.	CWGELO committee AC Gen Ed group work with IR	Weeks 8-12
Share results.	CWGELO committee AC Gen Ed group AC Communications group	Weeks 8-12
Determine next steps.	CWGELO committee	Weeks 12-16

**SEMESTER 2**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Who's responsible</b>	<b>When</b>
Offer professional development.	CWGELO committee	Weeks 1-4
Analyze impact of professional development.	CWGELO committee Support from Office of Effectiveness, Planning, and Accreditation	Weeks 8-12
Analyze results and determine next steps.	CWGELO committee	Weeks 12-16

## PROTOCOL

### Semester 1

- 1. Determine sampling plan.** In Spring 2018, the Vice President of Academic Affairs required all official course outlines to indicate the appropriate CWGELO. From this information, the Dean of Learning Resources and Assessment is creating a map to ensure each component of each outcome is enacted across the curriculum. For the purposes of CWGELO assessment, the map will identify the courses eligible to be sampled for each outcome. Based on the map, the AC and IR can create a five-year plan that identifies which courses will be included in the CWGELO assessment project each semester. In Spring 2018, the AC reached out to specific faculty to volunteer for a small pilot assessment project. If the map is not completed by Fall 2018, the AC may wish to do so again, perhaps beginning with faculty on the AC and/or CWGELO committee. The sampling plan should include 16-, 14-, 12-, 8- week, and online courses as available, as well as sections taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty. The primary emphasis will be in high-enrolling courses and courses in the General Education core curriculum; however, all courses in the catalogue will be eligible.
- 2. Determine the kinds of samples to request from faculty.** The SP18 assessment did not ask for specific assignments, but it was clear some (1-2 p writing samples) were easier to review than others (worksheets; 4-6 p writing samples). And, in fact, since the SP18 project was a pilot used to establish a baseline, faculty were told they did not need to submit student artifacts that explicitly addressed the outcome at all. Jason Evans, Professor of English, suggested to ask, "Thinking about your own classes, how do your students demonstrate XXX?" as a way to collect student work that meaningfully addresses the CWGELO.
  - **The CWGELO committee and the AC General Education assessment working group will need to determine whether to ask for artifacts that address the outcome or any artifact from the course.**
- 3. Communicate to faculty about the CWGELO assessment project.** At the beginning of the semester, the VPAA and/or division deans should inform faculty about CWGELO assessment. This will enhance transparency and will address concerns that assessment is done in a vacuum. It will also allow faculty who will submit student artifacts to begin preparing. Throughout the process, PSC should underscore assessment is undertaken in an effort to better understand teaching and learning on campus, that it is generative (not evaluative), and that student and faculty privacy will be upheld.
  - **The VPAA, Dean of Learning Resources and Assessment, CWGELO committee, and AC General Education assessment working group will need to determine how best to communicate expectations regarding participation in CWGELO assessment.**
- 4. Collect the student artifacts.** Once the sampling plan is complete, the CWGELO committee and AC Gen Ed working group need to determine how to collect, anonymize, and store the artifacts. D2L, the G Drive, or Google Drive are logical storage spaces.
- 5. Score student artifacts.** The SP18 scoring session was intentionally held at a regularly-scheduled AC meeting, and the number of artifacts scored was dependent on the amount of time for the meeting. That is, the AC only collected the number of samples they could reasonably score and discuss in 90 minutes. Importantly, the AC agreed to conduct CWGELO assessment on the condition that it be a reasonable workload. The AC originally (2016-17) met twice monthly; that was changed (2017-18) to monthly meetings for the full AC and monthly meetings for the working groups. It is possible that the scoring sessions could be held in lieu of the regular monthly and working group meetings for one month.

The SP18 artifacts were scored with a simple, printed guide that broke down the outcome into its constituent parts and asked readers to answer whether the artifact met the

component (i.e., a yes/no question). Artifacts were scored twice; then, if any disparities existed, the specific component(s) were read by a third person. After all artifacts were scored, readers were asked to reflect on the session in writing, then discuss their responses. No time was spent on scoring and reviewing an artifact as a group because this was not a high-stakes situation for students, and the deliberative process was informative to discuss after the scoring session. Future sessions could score an artifact together if PSC wants the AC to be “normed,” spend more time on scoring, use fewer reflective questions, and spend less time individually writing and still be a productive, congenial experience. Results were manually entered into Excel; comments were analyzed for overarching themes that were then represented in the analysis. Future sessions could use electronic forms for scoring and open-ended questions to eliminate the manual entry, archive results, and share information (particularly with IR to assist with analysis, or to compare scores over time). Future sessions could also use a different scoring guide (e.g., a modified AAC&U VALUE rubric).

6. **Analyze results.** Analysis should identify the scores in general, for each component, and for each Gen Ed area. It may be useful to identify trends in various course formats, or to identify inter-rater reliability. IR should be able to provide this information. The CWGELO committee and AC General Education assessment working group can collaborate to consider what the scores suggest about patterns of student learning at PSC and to identify questions about the CWGELO that emerge from the results and discussion.
7. **Share results.** Once the analysis is written, it should be shared with the AC, participating faculty, and VPAA (who will share it with Cabinet). The CWGELO committee, AC Gen Ed assessment working group, and AC Communications working group can collaborate to determine other stakeholders who will need to see the full analysis. An executive summary should also be prepared to share with all faculty and publish on the PSC website. Participating faculty should also receive a thank-you note from the AC General Education assessment working group to acknowledge their goodwill since the assessment could not happen without them. Doing so can help to improve the assessment culture on campus.
8. **Determine next steps.** The CWGELO committee will need to determine what to do with the results of the scoring session. Questions to consider include: What professional development can be offered? How can conversation about the outcome or its components be enhanced on campus? What should be done differently in the next assessment project? What revisions to the CWGELO and their components should be made? What revisions to course outlines should be made? What revisions to the CWGELO curriculum map should be made?

## **Semester 2**

1. **Offer professional development.** Convocation is a likely space for this to occur, either conducted by the CWGELO committee or an external facilitator.
2. **Analyze impact of professional development.** This will serve as the indirect method of assessment to complement the direct method of scoring student artifacts, and will help preserve continuity with the CWGELO committee’s historical work on campus. Faculty can be asked how their practices changed as a result of the professional development offered (e.g., new assignments, new wording). This can be done in focus groups, interviews, electronic surveys, etc. (the Office of Effectiveness, Planning, and Accreditation can offer support with surveys).
3. **Analyze results and determine next steps.** As a result of the information from faculty about the impact of the professional development, the CWGELO committee will determine what else should be done to address questions about the outcome and who to share that information with.