

# General Education Assessment Summary

Weber State University

---

*Reporting on the 2018 to 2020 Academic Years*

*Prepared by*

*General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee (GEIAC)*

## Overview

- 1) Core and Breadth Area Committees are staffed with representatives from relevant departments and a liaison from the General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee (GEIAC). Area committees were involved virtually through the approval of new GE designations for courses. This list includes: BDC 1040 – Intro to Architecture, ENGL 2015 – Int College Writing and Research, HIST 1600 – AI: The Black Experience, HIST 1010-AI: the LatinX Experience, HIST 1620-AI: the LGBTQ Experience, MATH 1035: Co-requisite Contemporary Math, MATH 1090: Business College Algebra, MATH 1120: Foundations of Data Science, UNIV 1110: Intro to Social Justice in Higher Education. One course requested removal of the GE attribute: KOR 2020 (HU).
- 2) GEIAC recommends that general education (GE) courses be assessed twice in the 5-year cycle or three times in a 7-year cycle that supports Program Review. GEIAC works with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) to ensure that departments teaching GE courses both set and keep to their assessment schedules. With the recent move from annual to biennial reporting, GEIAC can expect to receive data from approximately 40% of GE courses each year.
- 3) GEIAC assumed responsibility for assessment of General Education courses beginning with the 2019/20 academic year. This replaces the seven-year Gen Ed renewal process via the University Curriculum Committee. GEIAC developed an evaluation rubric in 2020 and revised it for the 2021 assessment (see appendix A). That rubric was used to evaluate the submitted assessment reports and provide feedback to the department chairs of each assessed course. This feedback was included with the Biennial Assessment Report feedback provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
  - a. Assessment was done in teams of two faculty each with initial training to support consistency and some level of inter-rater reliability. Feedback on that process is being sought as GEIAC works to develop an efficient and effective assessment process.
- 4) The common reporting tool – evidence of learning rubric –includes these items (see [https://www.weber.edu/ie/Review\\_and\\_Assessment/Checklists\\_and\\_Templates.html](https://www.weber.edu/ie/Review_and_Assessment/Checklists_and_Templates.html)):
  - a. GE learning goal
  - b. Course-specific measurable learning outcome aligned to GE outcome
  - c. Identified assessment(s) for measuring student learning
  - d. Threshold for expected student performance
  - e. Actual student performance data
  - f. Analysis/interpretation of findings
  - g. Action plan for changes to be put in place based upon performance and analysis and intentions for ‘closing the loop’ on those changes
- 5) Integration of GE reporting with Department Annual Assessment reporting.
  - a. Development of tools and functionality to support GE assessment.
    - i. Chi Tester question-level outcome alignment tool with reporting feature
    - ii. GE learning outcomes are available in Canvas as learning outcomes from which faculty can design rubrics.

- 6) Results of assessment:
  - a. Core areas: From academic years 19 and 20 (summer 2018 through spring 2020), data were gathered in 5 of 6 courses (overall yield of 83%).
  - b. Breadth areas: From academic years 19 and 20 (summer 2018 through spring 2020), data were gathered in 10 of 25 Humanities GE courses (40%), 7 of 14 Creative Arts GE courses (50%), 1 of 8 life Science GE courses (13%), 10 of 19 physical science GE courses (53%), and 15 of 22 Social Science courses (68%). This results in an overall yield of 46% of expected courses.
  
- 7) Because the renewal process through Curriculum Committee has been eliminated, it is imperative that departments submit Gen Ed assessment data with every Biennial Assessment Report. Much of the missing data is due to the every-other-year reporting cycle now in place.

### Composition

Composition courses were assessed in the previous cycle.

### American Institutions

No data were submitted for American Institutions.

POLS 1100 did not submit data

### Quantitative Literacy

- 1) Data were gathered for 100% of QL courses.
  
- 2) **Math 1030** (8 sections, 230 students)
  - a. *Findings*: Course reported a combination of direct and indirect evidence. Thresholds are mixed from '60% will achieve 65%' to '70% will achieve 70%' with the indication that this is intentional because some concepts are more difficult to master than others. Direct measures were successfully met at or above threshold for all outcomes. No additional actions planned outside of continuing to collect data and reevaluate the threshold.
  
  - b. *Feedback from GEIAC*: Reviewers would like to see more context for the types of questions used to assess the learning outcomes. This would allow reviewers to see if two questions per learning outcome are sufficiently assessing what they claim to be. Also, more explanation as to why the threshold fluctuates so much would be helpful. Last, a little more information on what action steps will be taken to overcome when students fall short of a set threshold for a given learning outcome would also be helpful. A request is made all around for more narrative and detail in subsequent assessment reports submitted at a later date.
  
- 3) **Math 1040** (6 sections, 165 students)
  - a. *Findings*: Course reported a combination of direct and indirect evidence. Direct measures indicate at least 70% of students scored 70% or higher on 4 of 5 identified learning outcomes. Outcome 3 (use arithmetical, algebraic, geometric, and statistical methods to solve problems) was not met and the identified action is 'collect more data and re-evaluate the threshold level'. (Note: this outcome threshold is 60% of students

will achieve 60% or higher). Course grades are used as an indirect measure with an identified threshold that 70% of students will pass the course (W grades not included in calculation). This metric did not meet the threshold with a pass rate of 68.56%. Action identified was to look at pass rates of individual instructors.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* not clear how pass rate is a meaningful measure of individual learning outcomes; varying thresholds with no indication of why; unclear how loop will be closed on unmet outcomes (looking at pass rate of individual instructors). Question – if specific instructors do have lower pass rates, what will the program do to address this?

4) **Math 1050** (13 sections, 300+ students)

- a. *Findings:* Course reported a combination of direct and indirect evidence. Direct measures indicate students met thresholds for 4 of 5 outcomes. Actions include plans to collect more data and re-evaluate the threshold. Outcome 3 (use arithmetical, algebraic, geometric, and statistical methods to solve problems) was not met and the identified action is ‘collect more data, focus on more review’. Course grades are used as an indirect measure with an identified threshold that 70% of students will pass the course (W grades not included in calculation). The identified threshold (70% of students will pass the course) was met.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers appreciated the use of both direct and indirect measures. Justification for varying thresholds was requested; it’s not clear why one outcome threshold is set at ‘60% of students will score 65% or better’, while another is set at ‘60% of students will score 70% or better.’ Seems to be some incongruity between outcome performance and pass-rate. Concern that a plan to ‘collect more data’ without adequate interpretation/analysis of outcomes doesn’t seem to lead anywhere.

5) **Math 1080** (4 sections, 104+ students)

- a. *Findings:* Course reported a combination of direct and indirect evidence. Direct measures indicate students met thresholds for 4 of 5 outcomes. Actions include plans to collect more data and re-evaluate the threshold. Outcome 1 (interpret mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables... and draw inferences from them) was not met and the identified actions is ‘collect more data, focus on more review’. Course grades are used as an indirect measure and the identified threshold was not met - with an action to ‘carefully examine the situation.’
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers questioned whether 1 to 3 questions provided enough variation and depth to indicate success and questioned the use of course grades as an effective measure. Inconsistent thresholds are a concern because that suggests some outcomes are more important than others, and low thresholds appear to not even suggest a passing grade. Interpretation of results was minimal; could be more detailed and thoughtful around the consideration of pedagogy. Actions need to be better explained.

6) **Math 2020** (1 section, 29 students)

- a. *Findings:* Course reported a combination of direct and indirect evidence. Direct measures indicate students met thresholds for 4 of 5 outcomes. Actions for the outcomes that were met suggested the inclusion of additional relevant items on the homework and more focus in reviews. Actions for the unmet outcome (outcome 5; recognize that mathematical and statistical methods have limits) focus on finding better questions and also assessing on the final exam. Report indicated improvement from previous assessment - evidence of continuous review and improvement.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Not clear that depth of assessment is adequate. Thresholds were consistent and that was appreciated.

### Information Literacy

IL courses were assessed in the previous cycle.

### Diversity

- 1) Data were gathered for all three outcomes in 1 course (Musc 1040)
- 2) The following DV courses did not report data in the 2018-2020 period: Anth 1000, Anth 1020, Anth 1040, Anth 2010, CHF 2400, Geog 1300, Geog 1520, Hnrs 2130, POLS, 2500, *Soc 1010, Soc 1020, WGS 1500, WGS 2500*. Data will potentially be submitted in the coming year for the courses in italics.
  - a. While the Diversity requirement is being discussed at a broader level this year, there still exists the expectation that courses designated as DV continue to assess the current DV outcomes. Department chairs may need to be reminded about this.
- 3) **Musc 1040** (2 sections; fall 19 and spring 20)
  - a. *Findings:* the three diversity outcomes were assessed using a variety of measures including assignments, quizzes, field research and presentations. Thresholds were identified as 'average 70% or higher' on the measure. Results ranged from a low of 72% average to a high of 93% average; students met all outcomes successfully. Interpretation and actions based on results were thorough and highly reflective, incorporating issues presented by the pandemic.
  - b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers commend this report/department for providing such through detail and reflection on student performance on the learning outcomes. Even when students exceeded the threshold, a thoughtful reflection of how pedagogical changes could be made was provided. Thank you for taking the time to write a thoughtful and meaningful report.

### Physical Science

- 1) Data were gathered for 53% of PS courses
- 2) The following PS courses were not assessed during the 2017-2019 period: Chem 1360; GEO 1130, 1350; Hnrs 1500, 2030; Phys 1040, 1360, 2010, 2040, 2210.

3) **Chem 1010** (9 sections)

a. *Findings:*

Outcome NS1: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome NS2: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome NS3: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome NS4: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS1: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS2: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS3: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS4: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers commend and appreciate the level of detail you provided for the assignments and measures you use; however, it is unclear how the assignments align to the learning outcomes. Making this explicit on future assessment reports would be helpful. Also, GEIAC suggests more clarity on why the threshold is set where it is and why it is lower than previous semesters (i.e. 70% dropped down to 60%). It is noted that this report does a good job of closing the loop and discussing proposed action plans.

4) **Chem 1050**

a. *Findings:*

Outcome NS1: threshold vary between sections and often within a single measure; outcome generally met

Outcome NS2: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome NS3: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome NS4: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS1: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS2: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS3: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

Outcome PS4: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC requests that you aggregate data and provide a more detailed narrative of what is being measured. For example, some sections of this course reported multiple measures for a learning objective while others reported one. Then the thresholds were not consistent across semester offerings of this course. While it is not a requirement that the curriculum be standardized because that is ultimately up to departments how the content should be taught, synthesis of your report would be helpful for GEIAC to glean what is really going on and where improvements (and suggestions) could be made.

5) **Chem 1110** (6 sections)

a. *Findings:*

Outcome NS1: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater. Findings - outcome generally met in the range of 69% to 85%.

Outcome NS2: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater. Findings

- outcome generally met in the range of 69% to 85%.  
Outcome NS3: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater. Findings - outcome generally met in the range of 72% to 86%.  
Outcome NS4: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater; Findings - outcome generally met in the range of 69% to 86%.  
Outcome PS1: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater.; Findings - outcome generally met in the range of 69% to 86%.  
Outcome PS2: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater.; Findings - outcome generally met in the range of 69% to 86%.  
Outcome PS3: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater.; outcome generally met  
Outcome PS4: Threshold = 70% of students earn an average of 70% or greater.; outcome generally met

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers commend this course for having multiple assessment metrics collected at multiple iterations across the semester. The threshold is meaningful and multidimensional (i.e. such as 12 lab reports or 13 chapter exam). Additionally, GEIAC appreciates your thoughtful reflection upon what the findings mean, and even when thresholds are met, what additional pedagogical tweaks could be made to help students better learn the content and meet the learning outcomes. Thank you for the level of detail that you provided on this report.

## 6) Chem 1210

- a. *Findings:*  
Outcome NS1: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met  
Outcome NS2: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met  
Outcome NS3: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met  
Outcome NS4: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met  
Outcome PS1: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met  
Outcome PS2: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met  
Outcome PS3: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met  
Outcome PS4: thresholds vary between sections; outcome generally met
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers would like to see more information about the measures used for the learning outcomes. The report mentions exam questions without any explanation as to how many questions per outcome, or from which exams the material is being drawn. This makes it difficult for an outside assessor to see that content aligns between questions and learning outcomes. Little was provided in the way of a narrative for an interpretation of the findings, action plan, or how the course plans to close the loop and use the findings to improve future iterations of the course. More detail in the second half of the report would be helpful in subsequent reports.

## 7) Geo 1030 (8 sections in a variety of delivery formats with 263 students)

- a. *Findings:* outcomes were measured in a variety of ways including class activities, exams, quizzes, and projects. The thresholds were consistent across courses and across outcomes at '70% of students will score 70% or better' on the activity. Students met or

exceeded the threshold in all instances with a range of 71% of students achieving at least 70% to 100% of students achieving 70%. Lower scores were often due to students not turning in assignments, and actions included reminding students of assignment due dates.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers appreciate the fact that you use multiple measures to assess each learning objective. Also, the thresholds seem meaningful and multi-dimensional which is great. However, the reviewers wonder why the threshold changes by objective: some more detail here would be helpful. Last, it is suggested that when a learning objective is not met that some narrative as to why and what will be done about it would be helpful.

8) **Geo 1060** (3 sections, 182 students)

- a. *Findings:*

Outcome NS1: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 89.4% scored above 70%, avg score = 89.6%. Threshold met.

Outcome NS2: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 92.1% scored above 70%, avg score = 89.5%. Threshold met.

Outcome NS3: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 93% scored above 70%, avg score = 89%. Threshold met.

Outcome NS4: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 88% of students scored above 70%, avg score = 85%. Threshold met.

Outcome PS1: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 94.5% scored above 70%, avg score was 94%. Threshold met.

Outcome PS2: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 88.1% of students scored above 70%, avg score = 89.3%. Threshold met.

Outcome PS3: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 90% of students scored above 70%, avg score = 89.5%. Threshold met.

Outcome PS4: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students  $\geq 70\%$ " - findings: 87.9% of students score above 70%, avg score = 88.6%. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers suggest adding multiple measures for each learning outcome and diversifying how learning outcomes are assessed (as it currently appears to be through exam questions). Also, while these questions may align quite nicely to the learning outcomes, it is requested that samples or examples be submitted in future assessment reports so that outside assessors can better contextualize your report and findings. GEIAC would also like to see more narrative on subsequent reports since there is little provided in the way of interpretation of findings and/or action plans linked to said findings.

9) **Geo 1110** (3 sections, 50 students)

- a. *Findings:*

Outcome NS1: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students



>=70%" - findings: 94% scored above 70%, avg score = 76%. Threshold met.  
 Outcome NS2: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students >=70%" - findings: 84% scored above 70%, avg score = 79%. Threshold met.  
 Outcome NS3: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students >=70%" - findings: 94% and 96% scored above 70% (2 measures). Threshold met.  
 Outcome NS4: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students >=70%" - findings: 92% and 96% of students scored above 70% (2 measures). Threshold met.  
 Outcome PS1: threshold = "70% correct answers" - findings: 82% correct answers. Threshold met.  
 Outcome PS2: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students >=70%" - findings: 96% of students scored above 70%, avg score = 80%. Threshold met.  
 Outcome PS3: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students >=70%" - findings: 98% of students scored above 70%, avg score = 78%. Threshold met.  
 Outcome PS4: threshold = "70% of students will score 70%, avg score of all students >=70%" - findings: 94% of students score above 70%, avg score = 82%. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* There are multiple measures used to assess student performance, this is a strength of the report and assessment plan. GEIAC reviewers note that the interpretations of the findings are a tad vague and that when the threshold was not met, little discussion as to why this was the case was provided. The action plan seemed to be "continue with the current structure"; however, it would be helpful to know when the objectives are not being met if it was a one-off thing or a recurring problem over multiple iterations of the course. These are the types of things that departments can monitor, so GEIAC is simply bringing it to your attention.

#### 10) Phys 1010 (1 section)

- a. *Findings:*

Outcome PS1: threshold = "80% correct answer on conceptual mult. Choice" - findings: Measure 1, 62% pre, 62% post-test; Measure 2, 30% pre-, 48% post-test. Threshold not met, but actions identified.

Outcome PS2: threshold = "80% correct answer on conceptual mult. Choice" - findings: 78% pre, 89% post-test. Threshold met, actions provided.

Outcome PS3: threshold = "60% correct answer on conceptual multi choice" - findings: Measure 1; 28% pre-, 43% post-test. Major improvement, but threshold not met. Measure 2; 75% pre, 79% post-test, meets threshold. Actions identified for both measures.

Outcome PS4: threshold = "80% correct answer on conceptual mult. Choice" - findings: 91% pre, and 89% post-test. Threshold met, but will reevaluate the question used.

Outcome NS1: not evaluated

Outcome NS2: not evaluated

Outcome NS3: not evaluated

Outcome NS4: not evaluated

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* The reviewers note that while your report mentions the questions being difficult, there is some concern raised as to whether or not one or two questions per each outcome are enough to fully assess said outcome? This criticism

aside, GEIAC complimented this report as exceptional in all other categories that were evaluated.

### 11) Phys 2090 (3 sections)

a. *Findings:*

Outcome NS1: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: average score on assignment = 81%. Threshold met.

Outcome NS2: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: 84% scored above 70%, average score on assignment = 74%. Threshold met.

Outcome NS3: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: average score on assignment = 91%. Threshold met.

Outcome NS4: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: average score on assignment = 93.5%. Threshold met.

Outcome PS1: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: average score on assignment = 8.5%. Threshold met.

Outcome PS2: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: average score on assignment = 88% Threshold met.

Outcome PS3: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: average score on assignment = 75%. Threshold met.

Outcome PS4: threshold = “60% = mostly proficient, 75% proficient” - findings: average score on assignment = 88%. Threshold met.

b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* There are multiple measures that appear to map to the learning outcomes. This description is appreciated. It is also noted that the thresholds are meaningful; however, students are often far exceeding the threshold. As such, GEIAC suggests revisiting student performance to assess whether students are being sufficiently challenged when learning the content. There is little in the way of an action plan discussed, and GEIAC encourages you to review how pedagogy can continually improve even when thresholds for learning outcomes are being met.

### Life Science

- 1) Data were gathered for 13% of expected LS Courses.
- 2) The following LS courses were not assessed during the 2017-2019 period: Anth 1020; Btnt 1203; Hnrs 2040; Micr 1113, 1153; Zool 1010.

### 3) Honors 1510 (2 sections, 16 students)

- a. *Findings (1st section):* three of the natural science and four life science outcomes were assessed via two take home exams; one natural science outcome was assessed via an in-class presentation. Thresholds for all measures were defined as ‘all students will demonstrate average competency’ and all students exceeded the threshold. No actions intended because the topic will not be taught again.
- b. *Findings (2nd section):* a variety of measures were used for assessment of the eight outcomes; threshold was established at ‘class average > 72%’ and students consistently exceeded the threshold. One outcome was not measured due to pandemic interruption. The instructor felt the measures were effective and intends to continue using them.

- c. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers would like to see results aggregated for future reports. Also, while a variety of assignments are assessed and mention is made of a rubric used to evaluate this, more clarity would be helpful as to what the rubric(s) looks like and how said assignments align to the learning outcomes. The threshold fluctuates from section to section of the course, so it is suggested that a standardized threshold be set for all sections of this course.

## Social Science

- 1) Data were gathered for 15 of 28 expected SS courses (68%).
- 2) The following SS courses were not assessed during the 2018-2020 period: Gert 1010; ; Hnrs 2110, 2120, 2130; Soc 1010, 1020; WS 1500; POLS 1520.
- 3) **ETC 2001** (2 sections)
  - a. *Findings:*

Outcome SS1: threshold = “60%” - findings: 81% and 84% of students met threshold.  
Outcome SS2: threshold = “60%” - findings: 87% and 100% of students met threshold.  
Outcome SS3: threshold = “60%: - findings: 88% and 83% of students met threshold.
  - b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* The assessment is described clearly; however, some of the decisions that are made could use further explanation. One thing noted was the threshold. If students are scoring in the upwards of 80-90%, why is the threshold set so low? Additionally, a multidimensional threshold would be more meaningful (i.e. X% of students will score X% or better on Y). The only other suggestion is to have multiple measures of each learning outcome as they are currently measured through one metric.
- 4) **Hlth 1030** (multiple sections, 434 students)
  - a. *Findings:*

Outcome SS1: threshold = “at least 80% of students will score 70% or higher on aligned exam questions” - findings: 82% (semester 1) and 84% (semester 2) of students scored 70% or higher. Threshold met.  
Outcome SS2: threshold = “at least 80% of students will score 70% or higher on aligned exam questions” - findings: 86% and 93% of students scored 70% or higher. Threshold met.  
Outcome SS3: threshold = “at least 80% of students will score 70% or higher on aligned exam questions” - findings: 68% and 71% of students scored 70% or higher. Threshold not met; will review questions using item analysis.
  - b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC commends you for having multiple measures to assess each learning outcome; however, asks for some samples of the types of assignments administered to help them to better see alignment between assignment and learning outcome. The threshold is noted as being multidimensional and aspirational and the interpretation of findings are robust. GEIAC notes one issue or point of concern which is changing exam questions when a particular learning outcome was not being met without providing any narrative as to what may be problematic about said questions. A little more reflection here may be helpful before tossing out questions due to an unmet metric.

## 5) Honors 1520

### a. Findings:

Outcome SS1: Threshold = "80% of potential points earned" - findings: two measures, one at 94%, the other at 76%. Not clear whether faculty felt the threshold was met, but was impacted by pandemic interruption.

Outcome SS2: Threshold = "80% of potential points earned" - findings; 82.4% of students reached the threshold. Threshold met.

Outcome SS3: Threshold = "80% of potential points earned" - findings; 88.2% reached the threshold. Threshold met.

- ### b. Feedback from GEIAC:
- GEIAC reviewers commend the course for having multiple measures of each learning outcome; however, more explanation of what the assignments are and the rubric used would be helpful (simply for helping reviewers to contextualize what you are doing). The threshold is noted as sufficient, although little rationale is provided for why that threshold was selected. GEIAC notes that you provided a thoughtful consideration of the results, but little in the way of what they mean and how you will use the results to better improve the course.

## 6) Honors 2050

### a. Findings:

Outcome SS1: threshold = "all students will demonstrate competencies at the mean of each measure" - findings: threshold met.

Outcome SS2: threshold = "all students will demonstrate competencies at the mean of each measure" - findings: threshold met.

Outcome SS3: threshold = "all students will demonstrate competencies at the mean of each measure" - findings: threshold met.

- ### b. Feedback from GEIAC:
- GEIAC reviewers ask for more data and interpretation on future iterations of similar reports. It is unclear what is being measured as reference is made to a rubric that is not readily available to the reviewers. As such, please explain and discuss how assignments align to area learning outcomes. GEIAC notes a goal that you identified and encourages you to follow-up on it, and that is mapping the outcomes to course content. This would be useful activity.

## 7) MIS 1100

### a. Findings:

Outcome SS1: measure 1 threshold = "85% of students will score 80% or better on 6 questions" - findings: 92.16% of students scored 80% or better. Measure 2 threshold = "students will average 4 of 5 on assessment rubric" - findings - students' average was 4.3. Threshold met with both measures.

Outcome SS2: threshold = measure 1 threshold = "85% of students will score 80% or better on 6 questions" - findings: 92.5% of students scored 80% or better. Measure 2 threshold = "students will average 4 of 5 on assessment rubric" - findings - students' average was 4.1. Threshold met with both measures.

Outcome SS3: not assessed.

- ### b. Feedback from GEIAC:
- GEIAC reviewers like how you have multiple measures for your assessment and that you provide a narrative of what these assignments look like. This is

exemplary. There is some confusion as to what a “4” means in the context of thresholds, so please explain this in further detail on subsequent reports in the future. The interpretation and action plans seem sound. Thank you for your thoughtful report!

**8) PEP 2700**

a. *Findings:*

Outcome SS1: threshold = “class average of 80% or greater” - findings: measure 1, mean score = 88.4%, measure 2, mean score = 85.6%. Threshold met.

Outcome SS2: threshold = “class average of 80% or greater” - findings, mean score of 90.1% (32.6% improvement over pre-test). Threshold met.

Outcome SS3: threshold = “class average of 80% or greater” - findings: mean score of 86.3%. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers would like more detail on the measures used to assess the learning outcomes. Many seemed to only have one indicator, and at that, there was some concern about the use of pre-post test data. Without more context, the reviewers are unable to see what this testing process is measuring and whether or not students are meeting/exceeding what that test is designed to measure. GEIAC is also critical of a “continue as is” mentality as there is always room for improvement, especially in light of none of the thresholds being met.

**9) POLS 2100**

a. *Findings:*

Outcome SS1: threshold: “Looking for a minimum of 80%” - findings, 3 measures - 93.25%, 88.18%, 87.18%. Threshold met.

Outcome SS2: same threshold, same results as outcome 1. Threshold met.

Outcome SS3: threshold: “over 80% considered good” - findings, average score on assignment was 86%. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC appreciates the thoughtful assessment report that was submitted for this course. There appear to be multiple measures of each learning outcome, and the threshold being set is aspiration and clearly explained. Also, interpretations of the findings and action plans based on said findings were robust and meaningful. Thank you for your thoughtful report.

**10) POLS 2200 (1 section)**

a. *Findings:*

Outcome SS1: threshold = “70% of students should score 70% or better” - findings; measure 1, 83% of students scored 70% or better, measure 2, 75% of students scored 70% or better. Threshold met.

Outcome SS2: “70% of students should score 70% or better” - findings; measure 1, 79% of students scored 70% or better, measure 2, 89% scored 70% or better. Threshold met.

Outcome SS3: “70% of students should score 70% or better” - findings; measure 1, 92% of students scored 70% or better. Measure 2 (threshold of 60% scoring 70% or higher), 89% of students scored 70% or higher. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers complimented this assessment report for providing meaningful and robust interpretations of findings. GEIAC also commends the course for having multiple measures (i.e. direct and indirect), but request examples of exam and essay questions to help reviewers contextualize the findings.

**11) POLS 2300**

- a. *Findings:*
  - Outcome SS1: threshold: “average of 80%, excluding impact of writing skills on grade” - findings; average score was 87%. Threshold met.
  - Outcome SS2: (used multiple measures) threshold: “80% average on paper assignments, 85% on exam questions” - findings; average score on papers = 85%, 100% on most test questions. Threshold met.
  - Outcome SS3: (used multiple measures) threshold: “80% average on paper assignments, 85% on exam questions” - findings; average score on paper was 84%, exam results were mixed, some above some below threshold. Threshold partly met; instructor will review this course segment before teaching again.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers note the assessment report was detailed and thorough. However, suggestions were made to clarify how the assignments being assessed (papers) relate or feed into the final metric used for the threshold (final grade in the class). Also, while GEIAC notes the mention of how one of the learning outcomes was not met according to the threshold, there is little in the way of discussions about an action plan to rectify this shortcoming.

**12) POLS 2400 (2 sections, ~78 students)**

- a. *Findings:*
  - Outcome SS1: threshold = “at least 75% expected” - findings, average scores varied from 80% to 88%. Threshold met.
  - Outcome SS2: threshold = “at least 75% expected” findings, average scores were 81% and 77%. Threshold met in both sections.
  - Outcome SS3: threshold = “at least 75% expected” findings, average scores were 79% and 80%. Threshold met in both sections.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers commended this course for the thoughtful reflections they provided on assessment data; however, suggestions were made with respect to diversifying the assessment instruments used as well clarifying the threshold that was chosen. Also, reviewers noted that the report indicated possible changes being made to an assignment to better assess SS learning outcome #2, but little context beyond this was discussed. It is suggested that if pedagogical changes may be considered, explain that to reviewers so we can help to assess change and those things that are improving/not improving student performance on said outcome.

**13) Psy 1010 (59 sections)**

- a. *Findings:*
  - Outcome SS1: threshold = “majority of students earn 60% or higher on assessment

items" - findings, 87.36% of students earned 60% or higher. Threshold met.  
Outcome SS2: threshold = "majority of students earn 60% or higher on assessment items" - findings, 76.80% of students earned 60% or higher. Threshold met.  
Outcome SS3: threshold = "majority of students earn 60% or higher on assessment items" - findings, 77.67% of students earned 60% or higher. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers would like to see more context for subsequent reports provided through more narrative. The assessment data submitted hinges on multiple choice exams, and while this may be a sufficient enough measure of the learning outcomes, GEIAC would like to see examples of the types of questions used and/or alignment of questions to said outcomes. Also, more clarification as to why the threshold was set as it was would be helpful, as reviewers noted that the threshold was set rather low at 60%.

#### 14) Psy 2000 (14 sections)

- a. *Findings:*  
Outcome SS1: threshold = "majority of students earn 60% or higher on assessment items" - findings, 83.97% of students earned 60% or higher. Threshold met.  
Outcome SS2: threshold = "majority of students earn 60% or higher on assessment items" - findings, 84.38% of students earned 60% or higher. Threshold met.  
Outcome SS3: threshold = "majority of students earn 60% or higher on assessment items" - findings, 82.36% of students earned 60% or higher. Threshold met.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers question how effectively you can assess learning outcomes that include qualifiers like "discussion" or "describe" exclusively through multiple choice questions exams. If this is the case, reviewers ask you to provide examples of such questions on your next assessment report. Additionally, they are unsure how to interpret your threshold and suggest that you include proportional information. As phrased (i.e. the majority of the students will earn a 60%) doesn't have much meaning. Also, there is some concern with having such a low threshold as 60% equates to a D. Last, reviewers note that your presentation of the interpretation of findings and action plans based on your findings was missing.

#### 15) SW 1010 (7 sections)

- a. *Findings:*  
Outcome SS1: threshold = "75% of students will respond correctly to embedded questions" (multiple measures used)- findings, adequate performance was demonstrated on 57% of items. Threshold not met; instructors will review assessment items.  
Outcome SS2: "75% of students will respond correctly to embedded questions" (multiple measures used)- findings, adequate performance was demonstrated on 69% of items. Threshold not met; instructors will review assessment items.  
Outcome SS3: 75% of students will respond correctly to embedded questions" (multiple measures used)- findings, adequate performance was demonstrated on 77% of items. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers commend you for having multiple measures (i.e. exam questions and a service learning reflection paper) to demonstrate that the learning outcomes are being assessed. Reviewers commend you for the depth you provided in this report and the reflection you offered when students did not meet a threshold. Reviewers noted in their report that this is a very thorough report and thank you for the detail that you provided.

16) **SW 2100 (6 sections)**

- a. *Findings:*
  - Outcome SS1: threshold = “combined student performance 70% or higher” - findings, all sections in the range of 95%. Threshold met.
  - Outcome SS2: Threshold = “combined student performance 70% or higher” - findings, all sections in the range of 86% to 91%. Threshold met.
  - Outcome SS3: Threshold = “combined student performance 70% or higher” - findings, all sections in the range of 82% to 88%. Threshold met.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* The reviewers would like to see multiple measures to demonstrate that the learning objectives were being met. Additionally, there are some concerns about having all learning outcomes assessed through 12 questions. It is suggested that on future assessments, the department/program consider submitting examples of question types they used to assess the learning outcomes. Additional suggestions revolve around clarifying the threshold and why it was selected as well as providing a more detailed narrative of the interpretation and what (if any) action plans will be implemented based on the findings.

17) **SW 2200 (11 sections)**

- a. *Findings:*
  - Outcome SS1: threshold = “combined student performance of 70% or higher” - findings, student performance ranged from 90% to 95%. Threshold met.
  - Outcome SS2: threshold = “combined student performance of 70% or higher” - findings, student performance ranged from 88% to 97%. Threshold met.
  - Outcome SS3: threshold = “combined student performance of 70% or higher” - findings, student performance ranged from 95% to 98%. Threshold met.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* The reviewers note the robustness of the report, but also highlight some spots where improvements could be made. One area where suggestions were made was to have multiple measures (i.e. direct and indirect measures) to demonstrate the learning outcomes are being met. Additionally, it is noted that the threshold would be more meaningful if it was multidimensional. As presented, 70% for “combined student performance” is unclear. Last, the reviewers compliment the department for the level of detail that they’ve provided for this report.



## Creative Arts

- 1) Data were gathered on 7 of 14 (50%) of expected Creative Arts courses.
- 2) The following CA courses were not assessed during the 2018-2020 period: Art 1010, 1030, 1110, 2450; Arth 1090, 1100; CS 1010; Hnrs 1530, 2020. Theatre completed a delayed program review and will be expected to submit data for 1013, 1023, 1033, 1043 in the next report (Nov, 2021).

### 3) Honors 1530

- a. *Findings:* Thresholds for both outcomes were identified as 'demonstrating a medium level of competency' and 100% of students met or exceeded both outcomes. No additional discussion was provided, nor actions indicated.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers would like a little more detail on the assignment that you note as tapping into the learning outcomes. We take you at your word that it does in fact assess what you claim it is, but more context is always helpful. The threshold seems adequate, but there is little explanation as to why that particular threshold was selected. GEIAC asks for more narrative in the second half of the report (i.e. interpretation of findings, action plan, etc.) in future years as it is hard to see what your findings mean and what you plan to do about (if anything) the results that you noticed.

### 4) Honors 2020

- a. *Findings:*  
CA Outcome 1: no threshold was set; faculty indicated goals were met.  
CA Outcome 2: no threshold was set; faculty indicated goals were met.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC would like more clarification as to what is being measured and aligning assignments to the learning outcomes. For example, the signature assignment appears to be one of the main mechanisms by which assessment data is extracted; however, it is unclear what students did for this assignment. Also, a little clarification as to why the threshold was set as it would be helpful.

### 5) Musc 1010 (six sections, fall 2019 and spring 2020)

- a. *Findings:* Multiple measures of each CA outcome were identified and assessed. Thresholds were set at '70% or higher' for all but one measure, which had a threshold of '75% or higher'. Thresholds were generally met (though Covid interruption prevented some from being completed) except for 'listening quizzes (a 3rd measure of outcome 2). Concluded that in class practice of listening examples is needed. Reflective actions were provided even when outcomes were met.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC notes the well-thought-out measures used to assess the learning outcomes. GEIAC would like some more context as to why the threshold was selected and also why it fluctuates from one objective to the next. GEIAC also appreciates the level of detail you provide for the interpretation and action plans inferred from the findings. Thanks for your thoughtful report!

6) **Musc 1030**

- a. *Findings:* Multiple measures for each CA outcome were identified and assessed. Thresholds were set at “class average of 70% or higher. Thresholds were met or exceeded for all measures except exams, where the average score across students was 68%. Reflective actions were provided for all outcomes - those met and those not met.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers were impressed with the level of detail provided throughout this report: there are multiple measures of the learning outcomes and assignments clearly align to said outcomes, the threshold is sufficient, and the interpretation of findings and action plan discussed was impressive. Thanks for your thoughtful assessment report.

7) **Musc 1033 (2 sections)**

- a. *Findings:*  
CA Outcome 1: threshold = ‘class will average 70% or higher’ - outcome met at 85% and 88% on one assignment and at 90% and 90% for a second assignment  
CA Outcome 2: threshold = not set; no measures taken; assessment incomplete.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC appreciates the fact that you use multiple indicators (i.e. types of assignments) to assess the learning outcomes; however, notes that there may be some missing information as one of the learning outcomes does not coincide with an assignment. GEIAC appreciates the reflection discussed for changing the prompts on subsequent iterations of the course/assignment.

8) **Musc 1035 (2 sections)**

- a. *Findings:*  
CA Outcome 1: threshold = ‘class will average 70% or higher - 1 measure; outcome met at 89% and 87%  
CA Outcome 2: threshold = ‘class will average 70% or higher - 3 measures; students met threshold for 5 of 6 measures outcomes (89%, 92%, 88%, 91%, 80%), and missed for one measure (64%).
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers were impressed with the level of detail provided in this report. There are multiple measures used for the Signature Assignment, and they appear to be directly linked to the learning outcomes. Also, the interpretation was meaningful and the action plans seem thoughtful and likely to impact student improvement. Overall, this was a well written report - thank you!

9) **Musc 1040 (2 sections)**

- a. *Findings:*  
CA Outcome 1: threshold = ‘class will average 70% or higher - 3 measures; students met thresholds on all measures (74%, 83%, 85%, 72%, 90%).  
CA Outcome 2: threshold = ‘class will average 70% or higher - 4 measures; students met thresholds on all measures (87%, 87%, 87%, 94%, 85%, 72%, 77%)

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers appreciate that you have used multiple measures for each outcome; however, a little additional narrative of what the assignments entailed would be helpful. GEIAC also noted that the level of detail provided on the action plans based on findings is robust and commendable. Overall, the strategies proposed for improvement seem sound.

10) **Musc 1063** (2 sections)

- a. *Findings:*  
CA Outcome 1: threshold = 'class will average 70% or higher - 2 measures; students met thresholds on all measures (90%, 90%, 98%, 94%).  
CA Outcome 2: threshold = not set; no measures taken; assessment incomplete.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC notes that there is no data submitted for outcome 2. Both outcomes should be assessed during the course of a semester. Also, the threshold being set as an average could allow for outliers to skew the data. It is suggested that a multi-tiered threshold may be easier to interpret and assess (i.e. X% of X% demonstrated Y).

Humanities

- 1) Data were gathered for 10 of 25 (40%) expected HU courses.
- 2) The following HU courses were not assessed during the 2018-2020 period: ASL 2020, CHNS 2020, ENGL 2510, 2750, 3500, 3520, 3750, HNRS 1110, 1540, 2120, 2130, ITLN 2020, PTGS 2020, THEA 2821

3) **Comm 1020**

- a. *Findings:* Outcomes were measured with standard questions on exams as well as selected speeches. Thresholds were set at 70% or higher (on speeches out of 100 points, or 3 sets of 10 embedded questions). Students met or exceeded identified thresholds for all measures of the outcomes. Results are discussed at an annual assessment retreat where questions are reviewed and rubrics designed or revised. Detailed discussion of the process was included.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* While the assignments used to measure the learning outcomes are discussed in great detail, there is some confusion for external assessors as to which assignments are used to assess which learning outcome. With that said, the narrative of your findings and action plans are robust. It is suggested that you possibly review the difficulty of your threshold since students seem to consistently perform well above said threshold (i.e. are they being challenged enough?, etc.). Thanks for the detail you provided in the report!

4) **Comm 2010**

- a. *Findings:*  
HU Outcome 1: threshold = "students will achieve an avg 70%": findings - students on average met or exceeded the threshold  
HU Outcome 2: threshold = "students will achieve an avg 70%": findings - students on

average met or exceeded the threshold

HU Outcome 3: threshold = “students will achieve an avg 70%”: findings - students on average met or exceeded the threshold

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers commend this course for the level of detail and narrative provided. This is appreciated since individuals outside of your department are the ones doing the assessing. The description of the assignments used was thorough; however, reviewers noted that the metric used changed throughout the report (i.e. at one point was referred to as drawing on the signature assignment, and at another point referred to a paper). This could have just been a typo, but clarity would be appreciated. Thank you for the thoughtful report!

**5) Comm 2110**

- a. *Findings:*

HU Outcome 1: threshold = ‘students will earn 70 points of 100’: findings - students met or exceeded the threshold.

HU Outcome 2: threshold = ‘students will earn 70 points of 100’: findings - students met or exceeded the threshold.

HU Outcome 3: threshold = ‘students will earn 70 points of 100’: findings - students met or exceed the threshold. Two measures used.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC reviewers commend this department for the thoughtful report and subsequent reflection they are noting based on the findings. This course uses both qualitative and quantitative measures to assess the area learning outcomes. While the threshold is clear, there is little narrative provided as to why the threshold was selected. While learning outcomes appear to be meeting the thresholds, there is little evidence of what action plans will be taken to improve student performance on particular outcomes. It is noted that the department will discuss findings from the data and refine assignments at an upcoming retreat. This is impressive and appreciated.

**6) FL 2600 (2 sections, 20 students)**

- a. *Findings:* All three HU outcomes were measured with two prompts. Students were scored on a 3-point scale; does not meet, meets, and exceeds and the threshold for all three outcomes was set at 70%. More than 70% of students exceeded the threshold for all three outcomes in both semesters and the conclusion was that students are meeting Gen Ed expectations for Humanities courses.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* GEIAC would encourage you to have multiple measures for outcomes as a lot is hanging on the two prompts used to assess three learning outcomes. Also, while the threshold seems adequate, GEIAC encourages you to reflect on what the threshold means in light of the majority of students meeting or exceeding it. For example, is there something this department could do to modify their pedagogy to further challenge students?

**7) FL 2020 (four languages - 16 sections, 122 students)**

- a. *Findings:*  
 Outcome 1: threshold = '65% meet or exceed expectations': findings -students achieved 75%, 60%, 65%, and 70%; threshold met 3 of 4 terms  
 Outcome 2: threshold = '65% meet or exceed expectations': findings -students achieved 72%, 60%, 50%, and 70%; threshold met 2 of 4 terms  
 Outcome 3: threshold = '65% meet or exceed expectations': findings -students achieved 64%, 65%, 75%, and 75%; threshold met 2 of 4 terms
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers appreciate the thoughtful report that was submitted, but would like to see a little more clarity on the evidence of measures provided (i.e. what types of assignments, etc.). The report is said to have a strong interpretation of findings and action plan on what changes can be made moving forward to help students better meet the learning outcomes (i.e., offer the assessments in English). Thanks for your thoughtful report!

8) **Honors 2010** (1 section, 18 students)

- a. *Findings:*  
 Outcome 1: threshold = 'students will receive a score of 78% or higher': findings - all students achieved a score of 89%; threshold met  
 Outcome 2: threshold = 'students will receive a score of 78% or higher': findings - all students exceeded the threshold; threshold met  
 Outcome 3: threshold = 'students will receive a score of 78% or higher': findings - all students exceeded the threshold; threshold met
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers would have liked more information about why the threshold was set at what it was as well as information on some of the measures as they align to learning outcomes. More specifically, GEIAC asks you to consider providing more information about how the measure assesses the outcome or attaching the signature assignment so this is clearer to course reviewers.

9) **Phil 1000**

- a. *Findings:* Outcome 1 was assessed via 15 questions on the final exam. Outcomes 2 and 3 were assessed with two different writing assignments. Threshold was set at 70% or higher. Students averaged higher than the threshold; no changes planned.
- b. *Feedback from GEIAC:* Reviewers note that there may be too many learning outcomes assessed through too few of measures/instruments (i.e. two prompts). The thresholds seem sufficient, and the interpretation of the findings are highlighted as being effectively communicated. Reviewers suggest this course further reflect upon the rate of students successfully meeting a threshold, because if students are consistently overachieving, they may need to be further challenged.

10) **Phil 1120** (1 section)

- a. *Findings:*  
 Outcome 1: threshold = "70% or higher": findings - students averaged 88 out of 100. Threshold met.

Outcome 2: threshold = “70% or higher”: findings - students averaged 81 out of 100. Threshold met.

Outcome 3: threshold = “70% or higher”: findings - students averaged 83 out of 100. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC*: There is mention made to a term paper as the assessment; however, it is unclear to GEIAC whether or not all the learning outcomes are assessed through this one paper, or if there are multiple metrics used throughout the course. It is also suggested that a better threshold is one which does not use a class average since outliers tend to skew the results. It is suggested to use a multi-tiered threshold like X% of students meet X% of Y.

#### 11) Phil 1250 (1 section)

- a. *Findings*:

Outcome 1: threshold = “70% or higher”: findings students averaged 81% on the exam. Threshold met.

Outcome 2: threshold = “70% or higher”: findings students averaged 82.5% on the exam. Threshold met.

Outcome 3: threshold = “70% or higher”: findings students averaged 74% on the exam. Threshold met.

- b. *Feedback from GEIAC*: GEIAC reviewers would like more context and narrative on subsequent reports. Also, we request explanation of things that are rather jargon laden since reviewers are people outside of your department. Last, even if thresholds were met, a reflection on ways that the course could continually improve would be helpful.

### Signature Assignment as a General Education Pedagogical Approach

The General Education program at Weber State University underwent a revitalization beginning in the 2016-17 academic year. The result of campus-wide discussions was a proposal to engage students in a common activity across their Gen Ed courses in order to help them work towards mastery of a set of shared Gen Ed learning outcomes, referred to as GELOs.

The common activity included framing all Gen Ed courses around a Big Question (BQ) that taps into the heart of the discipline addressed by the course. The Signature Assignment (SA) is the pedagogical manifestation of the Big Question and is as varied as the instructors who teach the Gen Ed courses. Students have multiple opportunities to acquire and strengthen their intellectual skills, apply their learning, and develop personal and social responsibility, as they complete their General Education requirements.

The BQ and SA format was first piloted in the spring of 2017 in 31 courses across the expanse of core and breadth areas. Subsequent pilots followed, bringing additional faculty and courses. The goal was to have a full roll-out by fall semester of 2019.

One of the selling points of the BQ/SA strategy was that assessment of the signature assignments would not be the direct responsibility of the faculty teaching the Gen Ed courses, but would be conducted using volunteer faculty over a two-day assessment session. Participating faculty were provided a small stipend for their time. The faculty assessors are provided with a short training which includes a group assessment in order to support improved inter-rater reliability. Faculty then work in pairs to assess approximately 60 student artifacts.

## Conclusions

- 1) With the move from annual reporting to biennial reporting, General Education data were collected on approximately 1/3 of all Gen Ed courses last year. This year should have seen the submission of the majority of the remaining 2/3 of Gen Ed courses, but in reality, approximately another 1/3 of courses were reviewed. There are approximately 57 courses that have not been reviewed through this process. The GEIAC Chair will follow up with the department chairs of those courses.
- 2) The traditional General Education renewal process, where courses were reviewed and approved through the University Curriculum Committee, was replaced last year with an assessment process completed by the General Education Assessment and Improvement Committee (GEIAC). Gen Ed course assessment data were submitted through the Biennial Assessment Reporting process administered by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. These data were culled from the reports and made available to GEIAC. An assessment process was defined by GEIAC and included an evaluation rubric (see appendix A) against which data were evaluated. GEIAC members, in teams of two, reviewed the assessment data and provided formative feedback to department chairs based upon the rubric criteria.
- 3) Signature Assignment assessment has now been completed seven times. The first five times used a stratified random sampling methodology, selecting 10 representative artifacts from approximately 30 different courses from every Gen Ed core and breadth area. The last assessment utilized a longitudinal methodology where students who had just completed their associate degree in General Studies were culled for multiple (at least two, and sometimes three) signature assignments over several semesters. The goal was to determine if evaluators could detect academic growth over the course of the signature assignments. The most recent signature assessment exercise used the original stratified random sampling method.

### Committee Members

Molly Sween, Chair (Social & Behavioral Science)

Leigh A. Shaw, Ex Officio, Director of General Education (Social & Behavioral Science)

Barb Wachocki, Faculty Senate Liaison (College of Health Professions)

Eric Amsel, Administration

Casey Bullock, Registrar

John Cavitt, Ex Officio, Chair of Curriculum

Brock Adams, College of EAST

Reineke Holman, Health Professions

Kiley Spirito (Fall), Jonathan Cornell (spring) Science

Becky Marchant, Arts & Humanities

Dan Jonas, Arts & Humanities

Gail Niklason, Administration

C. David Walters, Science

Richard Price, Social & Behavioral Science

Matthew Romaniello, Social & Behavioral Science

Leslie Park, Ex Officio Student Success Center

Miranda Kispert, Library

Melina Alexander, Education



Appendix A: Gen Ed Assessment Evaluation Rubric

Course: [enter and bold]                      Attribute: [enter and bold]

Criteria	Proficient	Feedback
Quality of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple measures are included (direct and indirect, these can be quantitative and/or qualitative)</li> <li>-Reliable and valid evidence is collected for each outcome</li> <li>- There is depth of evidence (multiple measures, direct/indirect)</li> <li>-Clear description of assessment instrument or tool</li> <li>- Clear alignment to program/course outcome</li> </ul>	
Presence and nature of threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Threshold is meaningful and aspirational (but reasonable)</li> <li>-A multi-stepped threshold is identified indicating both level of desired achievement and percentage of students to reach that level</li> <li>-Threshold is explained</li> </ul>	
Quality of interpretation	Interpretation is robust and meaningful, and tied to an action	
Quality of the described action	There is an explicit, well-reasoned connection between the assessment results and proposed changes. The proposed changes are presented in measurable ways that can support a 'closing of the loop'.	
Other course improvements (optional – use if other issues or ideas are raised in the evaluation document)	<p>Other course improvements are indicated, not necessarily tied to outcome measurement.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporating new industry trends into a class</li> <li>- Wanting to try new approaches</li> <li>- Adopting a new textbook</li> </ul>	