

Program Assessment Report

Program: General Education
Year: 19/20
Division: General Education
Contact: Maureen Donegan

Delta College



Actions Taken in Response to Last Year's Report

The standard was increased from 70% scoring at a 2 or 3 to 80% scoring at a 2 or 3.

Rationale for Current Assessments

Assessment 1 of 1

Goal / Project

Think Civically - Demonstrate an understanding of diverse societies, ranging from local to global, in order to enga

Outcome(s)

Think Civically

Standard / Objective

80% of students will score at a 2 or 3.

Method of assessment

Course Embedded Project(s)

Comment/Details about the method of assessment

GECAC selected students close to graduation by identifying students that had 45 or more credits in courses with an M for Think Civically on the Gen Ed audit. 627 students, from 21 disciplines, met the criteria. Scores for 363 students were submitted, including 9 students who were dropped from the course. Therefore, 354 students were included in the large sample. 150 students were also randomly selected to have samples of their work submitted to the assessment office. 86 samples were submitted. 5 samples were deemed inappropriate for the outcome, so only 81 samples were scored by the resource group.

Courses Affected

Courses with an M for Think Civically

Time Frame

Winter 2020

Submitted By

Lisa Lawrason

Result

Result

(3) Results exceeded expectation/standard

Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

"The results of the large sample of 354 students, as scored by instructors: Level 0 = 18 (5%); Level 1 = 10 (3%); Level 2 = 85 (24%); Level 3 = 241 (68%). 92% of the students scored at a level 2 or 3 by their instructor and the target was met. The results of the work scored by the Think Civically Resource Group and GECAC are as follows: Level 0 = 0 (0%); Level 1 = 19 (23.5%); Level 2 = 28 (34.5%); Level 3 = 34 (42%). 76.5% of

the student's work was scored at a level 2 or 3 by the resource group and GECAC. In comparing instructor scores with that of the resource group, there was a tendency for instructors to score the work higher than the resource group members. Compared with the resource group scores (above), instructor scores for the small sample of 81 were as follows: Level 0 = 0 (0%); Level 1 = 0 (0%); Level 2 = 24 (30%); Level 3 = 57 (70%). Part of this discrepancy can be explained by professors scoring student work based on the assignment criteria, rather than the Think Civically outcome"

What We Learned (areas for improvements, strengths, etc.)

The results of the assessment well surpassed the expectations of GECAC. We were more than satisfied with the 92% of students that scored at the 2 or 3 level. This is an increase from the 87% of students scoring at a level 2 or 3 in 2017. We also increased our sample size from 208 to 354 and had a higher rate of return! The rate of return for the large sample increased from 51% to 57%.

Use of Data to Improve Student Success

In reviewing the assignments submitted by instructors, we found a great diversity in the ways that the Think Civically outcome is measured across the disciplines represented in the sample. In reviewing the assignments, the resource group found an inconsistency in the way these measurements captured the "engage effectively in civic life" part of the Think Civically outcome. The assignments consistently measured the "understanding of diverse societies, ranging from local to global" part of the outcome, but did not prompt the student to explain how this understanding prepared he/she to be a more active citizen and better contribute to the community. Further, the resource group did not have a consistent rubric for how to score samples that lacked this piece. In evaluating the assignments, some may assume that the student is prepared to engage in civic life, by demonstrating the understanding of diverse societies, while not requiring that the student specifically articulate that part of the Think Civically outcome. Next time we assess this outcome, we would like to make clear to both instructors and those scoring the student work samples that the engagement component must be present and that the assessment should prompt this. We might reiterate to the professors collecting and scoring the work samples that the rubric for the Think Civically Outcome is different from the assignment rubric. Many of the comments by professors indicated that they were evaluating the work according to the assignment rubric, rather than the Think Civically outcome rubric. As a result, the professors scored the work slightly higher than the resource group. In the future, we would suggest that instructors adjust their measurements to capture the students understanding of how the knowledge they gained prepares them to "engage effectively in civic life."

Institutional Student Learning Outcomes

- Apply Knowledge and Skills
- Think Critically
- Communicate Effectively
- Act Responsibly

Comments and Action Plan

Discipline/Program Comments

GECAC is pleased to see an increase in the sample size and rate of return. This indicates greater participation from faculty across the college in the general education assessment. We also saw an increase in the number of students scoring at a level 2 or 3.

Advisory Board Comments

Assessment Committee Comments

It seems like the intent is to turn this statement into two outcomes by having students demonstrate understanding and then explain how to apply that understanding.

From the clarifying document on the Portal site about the meaning of the statement, it states "The intent of this statement (outcome) is that students will be able to gain a foundational understanding of communities that are pluralistic in nature, in that they are comprised of individuals with varying identities, experiences, backgrounds, environments, and worldviews. This understanding is a prerequisite for effective participation in civic society.

Meeting this outcome should prepare students to participate in the public realm, although this participation may not necessarily take place..."

The examples provided for an "M" in each category generally reflect the sentiment above.

From Business and Tech: Evaluate corporate efforts toward social responsibility and socioeconomic business model.

Health: Contrast ways of building and maintaining health in different cultures.. Discuss equitable distribution of healthcare to diverse populations.

By making this a two-stage outcome, we are no longer in best practice, we are changing our gen ed requirements, the meaning of the results from the outcome is lost, and it will apparently be relevant to an even smaller subset of all classes rather than expanding into more areas.

Curriculum Council Comments

Action Plan

"1.Instructors are invited to submit their assignments to the resource group for review and feedback on how to better meet the outcome criteria. 2.Think Civically assignment examples have been posted on the GECAC portal site for the faculty to view. 3.The Think Civically Resource group is working on revising the outcome rubric. "

Actions Taken in Response to Older Reports