

General Education Assessment Report 2018-19

Prepared by Dr. Lisa O Coulter,

Director of Assessment

Executive Summary

Over the past academic year, Dr. Lisa Coulter took over primary responsibility for leading faculty work in assessment of general education. UGEC also added general education assessment to its work along with review and approval of general education courses. Below is a summary of that work, together with future plans. The work is broken down by each general education learning outcome (GLO). In addition, there is a discussion of assessment practices as a whole and recommendations for changes, in particular with regard to the software utilized for assessment.

Major accomplishments:

1. Assessment completed for Writing (FSEM), Information Literacy (FSME, JSEM), B and H learning outcomes. The Writing artifacts have been sent to AAC&U for scoring by a national group of assessors and comparison with a national group of colleges and universities. We will have these results in Fall 2020.
2. GLO's and/ or rubrics updated for Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, "P" (Physical and Natural world) and "S" (Individuals, Societies and Social Systems.)
3. Assessment artifacts collected for Quantitative Reasoning (Fall 2018). Assessment artifacts collected for Critical Thinking and Speaking from capstone projects in SOBA and CAS.
4. Training given to faculty on collection of artifacts for speaking using Swivels and Ensemble by Dr. Kathy Pichura-Couture and Ben Brown.
5. A plan for assessment of general education has been adopted which will allow us to complete the cycle by the end of AY 2020.
6. We have decided to stop our use of AQUA for storing and scoring assessment artifacts. Although this software was used by many schools for assessment, we have found that it does not meet our needs and was much more time consuming to use than anticipated. Also, AAC&U, which was using AQUA, is now moving away from this software.

7. Dr. Lisa Coulter and Dr. Andrew Larson met in summer 2019 in order to discuss general education assessment as it relates to SOM. The general education curriculum in SOM differs from that in CAS and SOBA; hence, we recommend collecting artifacts for some of the general education outcomes in SOM from different courses. This plan will be verified by discussion with SACS and put into practice in AY 2019-20.

8. Dr. Slater was of the opinion that the Q (Quantitative Reasoning) GLO and rubric, and some of the allowed course (in particular PHIL 104Q) were not aligned with SAS requirements for general education. Research is being done on this topic and a decision is expected by the end of summer 2019.

9. An assessment coordinators workshop occurred on May 8, 2019. Attendees were able to review progress on general education assessment (Dr. Lisa Coulter); an update on requirements and due dates for assessment of program learning outcomes (Dr. Resche Heins, Angela Henderson), work on assessing using the integration of learning (Dr. Megan O'Neill) and the use of Ensemble for storing and viewing speaking artifacts (Ben Brown.)

A summary of Assessment work broken down by each general education area

Writing

Writing samples were collected from FSEMs in the Fall of 2018. These samples were scored in May of 2019 using a rubric with five dimensions (Context, Content, Genre, Sources, Syntax) using a four-point scale with 1 being the weakest and 4 being the best. Most artifacts scored a 1 or 2 on each of the dimensions, indicating introductory to developing levels of proficiency. The average overall score for the GLO was 1.73, and 46.62% of the artifacts had an average score of 2 or higher across all 5 dimensions. Stetson participated this year in the AAC&U Values Institute for written Communication. So these samples will be scored by their national group of trained scorers, which will allow comparison of our results to those of a nationwide group of institutions. We will receive these results in Fall 2019.

Information Literacy

UGEC and a committee from the Library reviewed and revised the Information Literacy GLO and rubric this past year. The revised GLO is given below.

. Information Literacy (Fluency) Learning Outcome

- a. **Approved statement:** Students can engage with information strategically and for a variety of purposes.
- b. **Previous Statement:** Students engage with information effectively and for a variety of purposes.

The rubric contains five dimensions: identifying a focused question; determine the extent of information needed; identifying and evaluate supporting information; ethical / legal use of information; and organizing and synthesizing information; Samples collected from a cohort study of writing in FSEM course in 2016 and JSEM course in 2018 were scored by library faculty and the Director of Writing. The number of usable samples was very small, with only 23 from FSEMs and 19 from JSEMs. The evaluators noted that approximately 1/3 of the samples could not be scored using the rubric. Overall, on a four-point scale the FSEM average

was 2.02 and the JSEM average was 2.048. The best results occurred in the dimensions of identifying a focused question and identifying/ evaluating information; the weakest results were in ethical/legal use of information and organizing and synthesizing information.

Speaking

A random sample of students was selected from senior projects in the College of Arts and Sciences and MGMT 495 in the School of Business. Faculty were trained in the use of recording technologies (in particular Swivel) by Kathy Piechura-Couture of the Education Department and in saving artifacts to Ensemble by Ben Brown of OOLET. A faculty group gathered from UGEC and those whose courses would be assessed for speaking met and determined that the artifacts would be scored on the dimensions of “Central Point and Supporting Content: and “Delivery.” Artifacts are being transferred to Blackboard and will be scored in early Fall 2019.

Critical Thinking

The GLO and rubric for critical thinking were updated by a faculty committee consisting of UGEC members and faculty who were teaching courses which would be assessed for this GLO. The previous and revised statements are given below:

. Critical Thinking Learning Outcome

- a. **Approved statement:** Students can analyze, evaluate, and synthesize data to reach a conclusion or develop a position.
- b. **Previous statement:** Students, having identified a topic of inquiry and gathered relevant data, can synthesize and evaluate those data to reach an appropriate conclusion or conclusions. (3/14/09.)

This faculty committee also decided on a rubric for Critical Thinking based on one used in SOBA by Dr. Carolyn Nicholson. We will use this rubric to score written senior projects (capstone from A&S, MGMT 495 from SOBA). We will only score these artifacts on the dimension of “Conclusions, Implications and Consequences.” See appendix for the complete rubric. Artifacts were collected in spring of 2019, and scoring will take place in early Fall 2019.

Quantitative Reasoning

Quantitative Reasoning has been among the most problematic general education areas in terms of assessment since the new general education curriculum was adopted

by Stetson. Basically, Q is considered one of the foundations of general education; however, students are only required to take one Q class for graduation, and so by default that class must allow for introduction, development and mastery of the Q GLO.

In addition, the Q GLO is bifurcated due to the dual nature of course which are allowed to count for the Q learning outcome. The “old” Q GLO is: Students can apply quantitative techniques to solve problems or analyze data OR Students can apply mathematical or symbolic reasoning to move from a set of assumptions to a conclusion. This allows for classes like Business Calculus and Statistics to be considered Q, along with PHIL 104Q (Introduction to Logic) which is taught by the Philosophy Department.

There has been debate as to whether PHIL 104Q should count for the Q designation. Dr. Alicia Slater, who preceded Dr. Coulter as Director of Assessment, was of the opinion they could not count based on SACS regulations. Based on this understanding, Dr. Coulter and UGEC approved a new GLO for Q in Fall of 2018, and recommended using the Value rubric from AAC&U in assessment of the Q GLO. The new GLO is given below.

Approved statement: "Students are able to explain and apply quantitative techniques to analyze data or solve problems."

It would, clearly, be problematic for Stetson to change its current practices and disallow PHIL 104Q to count for the Q outcome; hence, when samples for Q assessment were collected in Fall 2018, we made sure to include a random sampling drawn from these courses as well. All Q samples will be scored in early Fall 2019.

Clearly, one of the most important things from the point of view of our general education practices in the near future is to determine if we will keep allowing Formal Logic to count as Q. A decision on this issue is being sought in the summer of 2019.

Knowledge of Cultures and Natural World

There are six areas under “Knowledge of Cultures and the Natural World.” Depending on their course of study, all students at Stetson take course in at least some of these areas. Assessment work and updates are outlined below for each outcome.

1. “A” Creative Arts

Drs. Greg LeFils and Nathan Wolek have held discussions of the GLO and rubric have been held over the past academic year. We plan on collecting artifacts in the Fall and having faculty who teach each class score their own samples, as is done by U of Florida.

2. “B” Cultural and Belief

The B GLO and rubric were updated in Spring 2018 by faculty from Philosophy and Religious Studies. The updated GLO is, “Students can reflect critically on their own and others’ cultural beliefs and practices. “. Artifacts were collected from B classes in spring of 2018, and a faculty group, led by Dr. Joshua Rust, met to score the samples in Fall 2018. 27 artifacts were collected, and the average score on the GLO was a 2.3 on a 4-point scale. 55.56% of samples were rated as 2.5 (satisfactory) or higher on an average of the dimensions. Concerns remain in terms of getting better faculty compliance in providing samples, as well as in providing samples which are better aligned to the learning outcome. A full report was prepared in summer 2019 by Drs. Lisa Coulter and Joshua Rust.

3. “H” Historical Inquiry

Faculty from the History department along with others who teach “H” courses met with Drs. Slater and Coulter in spring 2018 and collaborated on updating the GLO and rubric for these courses. Samples were collected in Spring of 2018 and in Fall of 2018 a faculty committee met to score them. There are 5 dimensions on the rubric and averages on these ranged from 2.26 (on Geographical Context) to 2.77 (on Historical Context). The overall average on the H outcome was 2.51, with $26/47 = 57.78\%$ of the artifacts scored at an average of 2.5 or better.

4. “L” Modern Languages

Assessment of the “L” GLO is conducted by faculty in these courses based on their placement exams. We plan on reporting on this assessment in Spring 2020.

5. “P” Physical and Natural World

Dr. Coulter met with a group of faculty who taught “P” courses on March 18, 2019 in order to discuss the P GLO and rubric. These were updated, and plans are to collect artifacts from a random sampling of P courses in Fall 2019. The updated GLO and rubric are given below.

Updated P GLO: “Students apply knowledge and the methods characteristics of scientific inquiry to think critically about and solve theoretical or practical problems about the physical and natural world.”

Exemplary	Acceptable	Developing	Unacceptable
-----------	------------	------------	--------------

<p>All of the important elements of the answer is correct. Reasoning is thorough enough to demonstrate a comprehensive application of the scientific knowledge and methodology.</p>	<p>Factual errors or errors in reasoning are minor, but may lead to an incorrect answer. Reasoning is sufficient enough to demonstrate an adequate application of the scientific knowledge and methodology.</p>	<p>Factual errors or errors in reasoning may prevent the correct answer from being reached, but a basic understanding of the technique is still recognizable. The correct answer may have been reached, but with lapses or omissions in the reasoning to suggest that understanding of the application of the scientific knowledge and methodology is limited.</p>	<p>Major factual errors or errors in reasoning demonstrate little understanding of the application of the scientific knowledge and methodology.</p>
---	---	--	---

6. S” Individual, Society, & Social Systems

Dr. Danielle Lindner led a committee of faculty who taught “S” courses in order to update the “S” learning outcome and rubric. The updated “S” GLO is given below. We plan on collecting artifacts from “S” course in spring of 2020 and doing the scoring and reporting in summer / early fall 2020.

Updated “S” GLO: Students correctly use appropriate social science methods to analyze (classify, interpret, explain, evaluate, or investigate) social systems, institutions, events, or issues

Values (Personal and Social Responsibility)

Updating of the Values GLO and rubric will occur in Fall 2019. We plan to sample V course over AY 19-20 and do the scoring and reporting in summer / early fall 2020.

Integration of Learning

Samples for the Integration of Learning GLO will be collected from JSEM over AY 2019-20. Scoring and reporting is planned for summer / early fall of 2020. Although sampling from JSEM will allow assessment of this GLO for CAS and SOBA, students in the school of music are not required to take JSEM. Dr. Coulter met with Dr. Andrew Larson, Associate Dean of SOM in June 2019 to discuss general education and assessment in SOM. We are considering assessing for Integration of Learning in SOM using Senior Recitals. This idea will be discussed with our SACS experts to ensure it is in compliance. If it is, the plan would be to do Integration of Learning Assessment in SOM over the 19-20 AY.

Curriculum Map – CAS and SOBA

Stetson University General Education Curriculum Map									
Last Revised: April 6, 2011		Reviewed, revised, and approved by General Education Assessment Committee, April 16, 2009							
Revised: June 23, 2010, July 1, 2009		Learning Outcome							
	1.1	2.1	3.1	4.1	5.1	6.1	7.1	8.1	
General Education Area	Writing	Information Literacy	Speaking	Critical Thinking	Quantitative Reasoning	Knowledge of Cultures and the Natural World	Personal and Social Responsibility (Values)	Integration of Learning	
FSEM	I,D	I	I,D	I,D					
Writing	I,D		I,D	I,D				Disciplinary approaches are introduced throughout the curriculum. The specific goal of integration is introduced in FSEM & JSEM	
Quantitative Reasoning					I,D,M				
Knowledge of Cultures and The Natural World A=Creative Arts B=Culture and Beliefs H=Historical Inquiry						I,D,M			

L=Modern Languages P=Physical and Natural World S=Individuals, Societies, and Social Systems								
V (Values) D=Human Diversity E=Ethical or Spiritual Inquiry J-Social Justice R=Environmental I Responsibility W=Health and Wellness				I,D			I.D.M	
JSEM	D	D	D.M	D			I.D.M	I,D,M
Senior Project(CAS); MGMT 495 (SOBA)	D, M	D,M	D.M	D,M				

Curriculum Map – SOM

Drs. Coulter and Andrew Larson met in June 2019 to discuss general education assessment in the School of Music. Music students have slightly different general education requirements from those in SOBA and CAS. Perhaps the biggest difference is that they are not required to take a JSEM, which is where mastery for a number of general education areas occurs. However, all of them do take at least one V class. In addition, all music students must do a senior recital which is fundamentally different from the experience in SOBA and CAS. So certain general education outcomes are achieved in different courses than in the other schools. We list these difference' below. Where a learning outcome is not listed, it can be assumed to be achieved as it is in CAS and SOBA (for example Q and the "Knowledge" areas.) We plan to reach out to our SACS experts to get feedback on whether these plans would be acceptable.

GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOME	WHERE THESE ARE ACHIEVED IN SOM CURRICULUM
SPEAKING, M	Sophomore Decision; Conducting 1
INFORMATION LITERACY, M	MUSC 312 (Music History II)
WRITING, M	MUSC 312 (Music History II)
CRITICAL THINKING D, M	MUSA 312/3 (Lessons) , plan to use jury to assess MUSA 462 (Senior Recital)
INTEGRATION OF LEARNING, M	MUSA 462 (Senior Recital)

Assessment Plans AY 2018-19 to AY 2020-21

			<i>DRAFT</i>	<i>CALEN DER</i>			
GLO	Courses sampled	Faculty Education	Collection	Scoring	Report	Comments	Next round Starts
B		Spring 2018	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Summer 2019		Spring 2021
H		Spring 2018	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Summer 2019		Spring 2021
Writing	FSEM, JSEM		AY 2018- 19	Spring 2019	By end of 2019	part of Values Institute summer 2019	
Q		Fall 2018	Fall 2018	Aug - Sept 2019	By end of 2019		
Speaking	CAS - senior project SOBA - MGMT 495	Feb- March 2019	Spring 2019	Sept- Oct 2019	by end of 2019		
Speaking	SOM- Sophomor e Decision		Spring 2020	Aug- Sept 2020	by end of 2020		
Speaking	FSEM CAS - senior project	Aug-Sept 2019	Fall 2019	Feb- Mar 2020	Summer 2020		
Critical Thinking	SOBA - MGMT 495	Feb- March 2019	Spring 2019	Sept- Oct 2019	by end of 2019		
Critical Thinking	FSEM	Aug-Sept 2019	Fall 2019	Feb- Mar 2020	Summer 2020		
Info Lit	FSEM, JSEM		Spring, summer 2019	Summe r 2019 early	by end of 2019		
V	JSEM	Aug-Sept 2019	AY 2019- 20	Fall 2020	by end of 2020		

V	Other V Courses	Oct - Nov 2019	Spring 2020	early Fall 2020	by end of 2020	
Integration of Learning	JSEM	May 2019 Aug-Sept 2019	AY 2019-20	early Fall 2020	by end of 2020	
Integration of Learning, Critical Thinking, Writing	SOM- Music Hist 2; advanced lessonsr; senior recital	early spring 2020	spring 2020	early Fall 2020	by end of 2020	See comments in Assessment Report for suggested courses
P		Aug-Sept 2019	Fall 2019	early spring 2020	summer 2020	
A		Aug-Sept 2019	Fall 2019	early spring 2020	summer 2020	
S		Aug-Sept 2019	Fall 2019	early spring 2020	summer 2020	
L		Oct-Nov 2019	Spring 2020	Sept-Oct 2020	by end of 2020	L faculty based on Placement test