

**GEarea****Delivery Mode:****Submitted by:****Participating Faculty and Staff:****Outcome Assessed:****Courses Used:****Course or degree outcomes to be added/changed/removed:****Course Level Assessments:**

## Assessment Reporting

**Area B - Social Sciences**

(Choose one)

R-EUREKA\Mark-Renner on 5/12/2021

Michael Dennis, Ryan Emenaker, Michelle Haggerty, Deanna Herrera, Dana Maher, Philip Mancus, Will Meriwether, Jennifer Miles, Abi Queen, Lisa Sayles, Justine Shaw and Mark Winter. Facilitator: Mark Renner

1 - Communicate intellectual ideas related to the social sciences.

ANTH-1 and 2 (F2020 in eLumen), BUS-10 (F2019), COMM-8 (S2021 in eLumen), GEOG-2 (S2018), HIST-21 (F2020), POLSC-3 (F2019), PSYCH-1 (F2020 in eLumen), and SOC-2 (F2020 in eLumen)

None noted.

0 courses were not successful at conveying this outcome.

1 course was generally successful at conveying this outcome.

8 courses were definitely successful at conveying this outcome to most of the students.

30 courses were not included in this report.

**Findings/Results:****A) PROGRAM-LEVEL DIALOGUE SUMMARY:**

1) Overall, the courses included in this outcome assessment clearly indicate that students are achieving GE area B-1 learning outcome at high levels.

2) From evaluated CSLO reports, we saw that for many sections there are atypically high levels of "Not Assessed" ('N/A') students which, we believe, reflect challenges related to:

a) The rapid (and, for S2020, sudden) change to the online modality; and

b) Other unique (and hopefully temporary) stressors upon students (and their support networks) during this unprecedented global pandemic; and

But we also noted that aside from having many 'N/A' students, those students who did the work being assessed were doing so at levels of success that are quite comparable to previous semesters.

As a result of these observations, we excluded 'N/A' student head counts when we computed GE success from CSLO reports. We further expand on the issue of 'N/A' students in section E) below.

3) This dialogue/discussion has been very productive, given that we are looking at subtle but real nuances of how to evaluate these data. We share an interest in continuing these discussions.

**B) WHAT WERE THE GENERAL FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS?**

Total number of students assessed = 332 if counting those 'N/A' during assessment process;

Total number of students assessed = 256 if excluding those 'N/A' during assessment process.

We summarized above why we chose to exclude 'N/A' students when computing the GE outcome achievement "Success", and doing so we found the following:

Percent Not Successful = 10%

Percent met expectations = 38%

Percent exceeded expectations = 52%

We made the GE outcome achievement "success" computations using this rubric for the evaluated course-level assessments:

- Not successful: If <70% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome;
- Generally successful: If 70-85% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome;
- Successful: If >85% of students met and/or exceeded the learning outcome.

Qualitative narratives/data from the evaluated CSLO reports did not raise any "red flags" for specific courses. As such, these data suggest that achievement of GE Outcome B-1 has been quite successful among the broad cross-section of disciplines mapped to this outcome.

**C) ARE THE FINDINGS UNIQUE TO A COURSE, DISCIPLINE, OR SUBSET OF COURSES?**

No; these findings appear to be reasonably consistent throughout the subset of CSLO reports evaluated for this GE report.

**D) DESCRIBE POSSIBLE CHANGES OR IMPROVEMENTS TO PROGRAM COURSES, REQUIREMENTS, RESOURCES, AND/OR OUTCOMES BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT RESULTS DISCUSSED:**

No changes/improvements to program courses, requirements, resources, and/or outcomes were suggested or

E) ADD OTHER COMMENTS THAT ARE NECESSARY TO SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE PROGRAM-LEVEL DIALOGUE:

Here we discuss the substantial number of "Not Assessed" ("N/A") head counts in the data sets, and ramifications thereof:

In many courses the number of 'N/A' entries was somewhat high, and in some courses the number of 'N/A' entries was quite high (for example, 37% in ANTH-1-F2020 and 57% in SOC-2-F2020). For all courses evaluated, the average 'N/A' was 23%, a surprisingly high value.

For SOC-2, this reflection narrative nicely explains the issue in that section:

"The class final project was used as a tool for this assessment. ... This was not an effective tool for assessing this class because students did not access enough support for development of their projects. Whereas, in a face to face class, this support is built in... for online students it takes more initiative to seek support. I suspect that students who self determined that their grades in the class were "high enough" chose not to submit the final project, so the overall yield [of assessment-related data] was low."

For PSYCH-1 an assessment reflection narrative paints a similar picture:

"Fall 2020 all sections of Psychology 1 were taught online due to the pandemic. The students who had registered for these classes did not register for online classes and therefore this was not the modality of instruction that they were prepared for. The effects of the online platform instead of face to face are hard to measure. Anecdotally, students reported high levels of stress with meeting the requirements of an online class while coping with other stressors. Students were dealing with technology problems, financial issues, caring for and educating their children along with general stress of a global health crisis. ... it appears that more students than normal did not complete work needed to assess the outcomes. Of the students that did submit the artifacts required the data trends are similar to past semesters."

During our discussion we further noted the following:

The pandemic has added extraordinary pressures beyond those that are typical, resulting in much higher-than-normal rates of "absenteeism" on assignments that instructors use as instruments of CSLO assessment; however, as one participant stated: "It's not a problem for them that they skipped/missed an assessment, it's a problem for us" inasmuch as we may have designed our LO assessments to include "grab sampling" of work from students in assignments that they might not have prioritized for completion. Another participant noted that "Sometimes my assessment is simply a question on an exam, and for a variety of reasons a student may choose not to answer that one question. Thus the student is not assessed, but a student not answering that question tells me nothing about the student's persistence or if they passed the class or if they would have scored the best (or worst) on the assessment." Yet another participant noted that "There are often many assessments that might get at an outcome" without needing to resort to high-stakes assessments where only one instrument is used to judge success of that CSLO. So, when assessing a CSLO using many instruments (not just one) there is less likelihood that that student would be unrepresented in the full assessment of that

**Actions/Changes To Be Implemented:****Course Mapping:**

52 individual CSLOs from 39 separate courses are mapped to this GE area. This analysis is based on a subset of fourteen (14) recently-assessed\* course outcomes from nine (9) courses in eight (8) disciplines mapped to this General Education outcome. This subset of mapped courses and relevant outcomes reflects the diversity of courses in the GE area. Regarding reports used for this analysis, preference was given to the most recent reports and therefore includes those generated in eLumen in F2020 and S2021 wherever possible.

(\*"Recently-assessed" means within the past 2 years in most cases; an occasional report that was 2 1/2 years old was used if no alternative existed.)

Yes, these course assessments are a sufficient sample to evaluate achievement of Area B (Social Science) outcome #1:

"Communicate intellectual ideas related to the social sciences."