



information on any courses and assignments relevant to the SLOs. The responses from faculty were collected in a Google form.

The returning members of the General Education Working Group, which had coordinated general education efforts for the previous two academic years or twice a month throughout AY23 and were joined by the assessment subcommittee of the GEC after membership of that group was established in the fall of 2022. From here on in this report the full group of assessment faculty is referred to as the "assessment team." After the GEC was established, the assessment team members were made to the full council.

The fall assessment team meetings included explanations and discussions to introduce new members to the existing general education assessment structure and processes, review of the information on assignments submitted by faculty, and discussions on processes for the rest of the academic year. The team concluded that artifacts from all faculty that responded and those who were individually contacted by the team to add depth and breadth. To assess the impact of general education from its introduction to its later use in both associate and baccalaureate degrees, the team requested, received artifacts from all levels (100) and from both general education and general education courses.

In spring 2023, the assessment team used artifacts from previous assessment years to begin norming exercises in Oral and Written Communication. Communication about artifacts with faculty continued. Toward the end of the semester artifacts were collected from faculty. During the week after class ended, the assessment team met over two days to finish norming with both rubrics this time using current artifacts and to divide up the individual work that was left after the live meetings. Over the summer, the scoring was completed by faculty.

In fall 2023, descriptive statistics were calculated, graphs were created, and the assessment team met to discuss the results.

3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? (1000 words or less)

Oral Communication:

The Oral Communication Rubric contained four constructs: "Uses clear and suitable verbal language cues", "Develops relevant and adequate content", "Demonstrates effective listening skills", and "Demonstrates effective speaking skills". A score of 4 on any constructs relevant to that assignment indicated "Mastery", a score of 3 indicated "Proficiency", a score of 2 indicated "Developing", and a score of 1 indicated that artifact did not meet the descriptor. The rubric was compiled by course level and a median score was computed as the summary statistic for the oral communication Likert scale data.

100-level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 100 level course artifacts for the constructs "Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization" and "Uses clear and suitable language" was a score of 3 which is the "proficient" level on our rubric. This is a score increase from a score of 2. This also is an increase from the developing level (median score of 2) in the two previous years this SLO was assessed using the same rubric. The median score on the construct "Includes appropriate verbal and nonverbal cues" was a 2 (developing) and for "Develops relevant and adequate content" the median score was a 3 (proficient). Both of these, were the same median scores as in previous years.

200 level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 200 level course artifacts for the constructs "Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization", and "Uses clear and suitable language" was a 3 (score of 3). The median scores for the constructs "Includes appropriate verbal and nonverbal cues" and "Develops relevant and adequate content" were both 2 ("Developing"). All four constructs were the same as they had been in the two previous years this rubric was used to assess artifacts at this level.

300 level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 300 level course artifacts for all four constructs was a 3 ("Proficient"). This was the first time that median scores were at the 300 level using this rubric, so this will be a baseline set of scores for future years when this SLO is assessed.

400 level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 400 level course artifacts for the constructs "Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization" was a 4, which indicates a score somewhere between the "Developing" and "Proficient" level. The median score for the construct "Uses clear and suitable language" was a 3, which is at the "Proficient" level. This will be a baseline set of scores for future years when this SLO is assessed.

Written Communication:

The Written Communication Rubric contains four assignments, "Demonstrates confident algebraic syntax and mechanics". Each artifact was assigned to that assignment. A score of 4 indicated "Master Proficiency" and the artifact was "Developing" indicated an artifact was at the "Beginning" level. meet the descriptors for the "Beginning" level.

recommendations being about process rather than about general education quality.

4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning

implemented.

6. Do you have any information about how well the 2020-21 (or later) year



can be assessed directly, perhaps through an exam. Additionally, the program may wish to investigate ways to simplify the assessment process so that it is more sustainable in the future.

2. Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc. (200 words or less)

The assessment is detailed, thoughtful and mirrors that of the general assessment committee. The committee is commended for their thorough work.

Jenny McNulty