General Education Assessment Report – CY 2018 with Appendices

Table of Contents

General Education Assessment Summary Report—CY 2018

Preamble

In a report focusing on the assessment of student learning for a calendar year that included the category of Fine and Performing Arts, we beg your indulgence. Robert Creeley, one of the most important American poets of the second half of the twentieth century, gives us the following as the first of a group of twelve poems he labeled "A Calendar":

THE DOOR
Hard to begin
always again and again,

open that door
on yet another year

faces two ways
but goes only one.

Promises, promises . . .
What stays true to us

or to the other
here waits for us.

(January)

We open with "The Door" in no small measure because you and your colleagues fight the deadening spirit of "oh no, not this again," returning again and again with livened spirit to the assessment of student learning and its connection to teaching. So it is that you are to be commended for the work done during the CY 2018 General Education assessment.

Facing Two Ways

While Creeley's poem recognizes that 1 January gives way to 2 January, and on, and on, the best of your work for CY 2018 was marked by critical articulation, by a looking back both at what had been learned in CY 2015--the time when student learning in the categories of American History, Computer and Information Literacy, Fine and Performing Arts, and Writing was last assessed—and at your CY 2018 general education assessment plan update as well as a looking ahead to what actions are to be taken given the results of your 2018 assessment.

Thus, then, of particular note with this General Education Assessment cycle was the number of departments and programs making clear with their reports that what had been learned from earlier assessments was germane to both thought and action when it came to the CY 2018 assessment. In the Basic Writing category, for example, the assessment team in place from the college writing program of the Department of English and Creative Writing was quick to contextualize the CY 2018 assessment results both in relation to the CY 2015 assessment findings in the category and its own ever-expanding experience with and commitment to assessment of student work. This produced both a richer understanding of what the student work revealed regarding assessment and what steps can be taken to help students perform better in this area.

Colleagues from Communication Studies, both in Broadcasting and in Journalism, identified in their American History assessment plan updates moves they planned to make given past assessments. In the case of the former, emphasizing global television was important, while with the latter, a recognition of the need to make learning more active and interactive led to changes in pedagogy put into play during the CY 2018 assessment. Similarly, our colleagues in Economics recognized from the CY 2015 general education assessment of American History that using a "stepwise" approach with major assignments in ECO 326 would make it more likely that students could demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of each of the three learning outcomes.

The American History assessment report from the Department of English and Creative Writing also built on what was learned from an earlier assessment, foregrounding what was noted in response to its CY 2015 American History general education assessment in the CY 2018 American History assessment plan update and following through on it with the CY 2018 assessment report. To quote from the "action to be taken" section of the aforementioned report, "In general, we believe these assessments show genuine progress, not just in addressing the General Education outcomes, but in addressing them in the critical manner native to literary study. The sign-posting and integration of outside critical texts will and should continue."

What holds for our colleagues in English holds too for our colleagues in Curriculum and Instruction. The assessment plan update for CY 2018 makes clear that substantive discussions were held in light of the CY 2015 assessment and that a plan of action was developed in an effort to better position students to do well when it comes to their work on each of the three learning outcomes. That plan of action bore fruit.

Our colleagues in the History Department, charged with doing more than their fair share of the heavy lifting in terms of general education assessment of student learning, noted that the range of HIS courses approved in the category and the varied nature of those courses--large-group instruction, small- and mid-size classes, and online courses--pose challenges when it comes to consistency concerning assessment of student learning. We note with satisfaction that the department will reinvigorate its assessment committee in order to help organize and make as uniform as possible the assessment efforts. Assessment done well is always a work in progress, of course, and it is clear that the department is keen to develop strategies geared to helping our students be in the best possible position to demonstrate what they have learned.

In the category of Fine and Performing Arts, the reports from Creative Writing continued the excellent work produced by the other programs in the Department of English and Creative Writing. The CRW 205 assessment report, for instance, positioned the CY2018 assessment results in relation to the CY 2015 assessment, noting the improvement evident in the most recent student work assessed, and in doing so made clear that greater attention paid to images in the workshops bore fruit in the students' poems. The report also provided a nuanced take to the importance of mechanics when helping aspiring poets find their voice and offer that on the page. Similarly, the CRW 208 assessment report indicated that attention paid to theme enabled students to produce stronger work in this category of the assessment. Past assessments also indicated the need to assess student work in a greater number of areas, or what our colleagues

teaching creative nonfiction call categories, and the CY 2018 assessment report both indicates that this was done in the most recent assessment and that the attention paid in class and workshops to theme, structure, and grammar and usage was worth it.

Theatre was sure to articulate actions to be taken in light of the assessment. In THT 222, for example, weaknesses in grammar and mechanics were noted; the department will develop and deploy a common rubric in an effort to address this issue. With THT 119, student work revealed difficulties in problem solving, especially when it necessitated mathematical calculations. In this case, the department plans to emphasize problem solving during review sessions with the hope that this will lead to better work in this area from the students.

As was true of Theatre, the Art assessments were forward looking. The ART 100 assessment report, for example, noted that the practice of including a norming session where faculty review and apply the department rubric before conducting the assessment was seen to be quite helpful when used during CY 2018, even though not noted as a change of practice born of the CY 2015 assessment, and that they will continue to include these norming sessions in the future. The ART 210 assessment, on the other hand, does situate the CY 2018 assessment in relation to what was learned from the CY 2015 assessment. Specifically, adopting particular procedures and revising the rubric in light of the earlier assessment provides critical context for the CY 2018 results, as does recognizing that ART 210 poses particular challenges when it comes to student learning given that it is a 200-level course taken by both majors and non-majors. Here, too, the Art Department has an eye to the future given the assessment results, planning to work together to identify possible ways to help students and instructors meet the challenges posed by ART 210. Finally, and more generally, the Art department assessment reports continue to be strong and thoughtful across the board.

The Music assessments were more of a mixed bag, perhaps in part due to the change in department leadership. Still, the MUS 290 course is an example of the quality of work that the department typically produces. Here, the actions to be taken are a result of what the assessment has revealed, especially in the area of dynamics. Given that the report made no mention of it, the plan to continue frequent chair placement tests, building on a practice begun in light of past assessments, seems to be working.

In the area of computer and information literacy, two reports from our colleagues in the School of Education were striking in their thoughtfulness and thoroughness. The Technology Department's report makes clear that the faculty took care to incorporate in the teaching and learning of computer and information literacy what was revealed in the CY 2015 assessment. Given what the earlier assessment had revealed concerning its students' programming literacy, for instance, the department developed Learning Activity Packages (LAPs) that integrated "initial concepts and skills in different contexts." Additionally, the CY 2018 assessment report makes clear that the department continues to refine assignments and pedagogy in an effort to help improve both teaching and student learning.

The assessment report from Health Promotion and Wellness (HPW) highlighted the advantages to be gained by finding and setting before its students "real world" problems enabling them to hone their computer and information literacy skills. As they note, the assessment data supports

the “faculty insight that real-world and meaningful health issues are much more engaging for students to work with than just numbers on a page.” The HPW report also shared the forward-looking component found in other reports; with Health Promotion and Wellness the matter to keep in mind has to do with its new 100% online degree program and how students completing the major online will do when it comes to the important category of computer and information literacy.

In the sciences, the Computer and Information Literacy report from Cognitive Science was rich in detail and insight. Moreover, here the report takes pains to situate the assessment of student learning vis-à-vis the learning outcomes in the context of the field itself. Doing so, it makes a compelling case for both interdisciplinary study and the particular range of disciplines that make up Cognitive Science. While leaner, if you will, the Electrical and Computer Engineering was also marked by detail and insight. Here, the department made clear what necessitated a change in where they had planned to gather student work to be assessed and what they planned to do in light of the CY 2018 assessment results to better position students to improve. In short, the report both looked back to the assessment plan update and ahead to what needs to be done.

The computer and information literacy report from Biological Sciences was also instructive. The CY 2018 assessment indicates that students majoring in biology and zoology performed less well on the third learning outcome. Recognizing that that learning outcome necessitates “more advanced skills” than is the case for either the first or second learning outcome in the category, the department is committed to discussions concerning how they can better position their students to do better when it comes to using the computer to “locate, evaluation, and synthesize information.”

Cognitive Science
https://oswego.open.suny.edu/bbcswebdav/pid-1120760-dt-content-rid-5706342_1/orgs/GROUP-201509-AAC/Cognitive%20Science%20CY%202018%20Computer%20and%20Information%20Literacy%20General%20Education%20Assessment%20Report.pdf

Technology
https://oswego.open.suny.edu/bbcswebdav/pid-1115506-dt-content-rid-5666205_1/orgs/GROUP-201509-AAC/Technology%20CY%202018%20Computer%20and%20Information%20Literacy%20General%20Education%20Assessment%20Report.pdf

Staying True

The Biological Sciences assessment report also noted the importance of communication if assessment of student learning is to be as robust and meaningful as possible. Lines of communication must exist and stay open between chairs, program directors, and/or assessment coordinators and the faculty teaching approved general education courses being assessed. So too should there be communication between those teaching a course. Sharing ideas, concerns, problems and solutions, and best practices will help improve teaching and learning.

In the spirit of sharing, finally, please join us at the General Education assessment retreat on Tuesday, 21 May from 8:30 through lunch at the Rice Creek Field Station. We promise that there we'll have an opportunity to discuss coherence and articulation before closing the door on CY 2018, general education, assessment, and student learning.

Appendix 1—Exemplary Reports

Here we include examples of reports from Broadcasting, Creative Writing, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Health Promotion & Wellness.

General Education Assessment Report – American History

Course: _BRC 200: Social History/Broadcasting # of sections:_____1_____ Calendar Year: _____2018_____

General Education Category	Learning Outcome Students will demonstrate	Information			Results[1]							
		Semester(s) of data collection	Students Assessed		Exceeding Standards		Meeting Standards		Approaching Standards		Not Meeting Standards	
			#	%[2]	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
American History	Knowledge of a basic narrative of American history: political, economic, social, and cultural, including knowledge of unity and diversity in American society	Fall 2018	30	100%	3	10%	8	27%	11	36%	8	27%
	Knowledge of common institutions in American society and how they have affected different groups	Fall 2018	20	66%	8	40%	8	40%	4	20%	0	
	Understanding of America's evolving relationship with rest of world	Fall 2018	13	43%	4	31%	6	46%	3	23%	0	

[1] Each student should be counted only once. If assessment has taken place across multiple sections, data should be aggregated for the purpose of this report.
[2] Number should represent percentage of the total students enrolled in course.

Assessment tool and measure Did you use the assessment tool and measure identified in your assessment plan update? __X_____ Yes _____ No If No, please attach to this form a document indicating what you used instead and the rationale for doing so.

Briefly describe your **method of analysis**

Learning Objective 1: was quantitatively assessed through exam questions. These included 14 True/False questions and 3 short answer questions.
Learning Objective 2: was qualitatively assessed through a short 2-page paper. Students were given 4 prompts – 3 of which were used to assess this particular objective.
Learning Objective 3: was assessed qualitatively through a 4-5 page final paper. Students were given 4 prompts – 2 of which were used to assess this particular objective and asked about globalization and transnationalism.

Analysis of results Please be sure to address each learning outcome and both strengths and weaknesses revealed by the assessment, if any.

Learning Outcome 1: While a number of students either exceeded or met standards (37%), over half the class (63%) were approaching or not meeting standards for this learning objective. Some of this could be due to the nature of True/False questions or poor rote memorization of industrial organizations. Questions regarding specific programming information (instead of legal issues or specific historical details) were more easily answered correctly. Additionally, some of the questions were specific to the textbook and not necessarily brought up in lecture – a clear sign students may not be doing the readings. Students did better with the short answer questions: the class average for each of the three short answer questions was 74%. It was clear that more recent historical events were easier to discuss for students.

Learning Objective 2: Of the 30 students in the course, 20 (66%) opted to write a short paper on the prompts used for the assessment of this learning objective. The prompts asked students to connect the course readings with specific episodes of TV programming. TV programs were chosen based on historical significance and social impact on gender, race, and/or class (e.g., *The Mary Tyler Moore Show* or *All in the Family*). 40% of the students were able to acutely and accurately understand the social significance of the TV show and its impact on gender, race, and/or class – particularly the ways in which these TV series ambiguously broached historical anxiety with the Feminism Movement, Civil Rights Movement, and class in the postmodern age. The papers that "Met Standards" provided a good assessment, but the overall writing quality needed work (including issues of depth of argument and a proper thesis statement). The papers that were only "Approaching standards," failed to connect the series to its historical context, made factual mistakes, or showed signs of plagiarism.

Analysis of results (continued…)

Learning Objective 3: Of the 30 students in the class only 13 (43%) opted to write their final paper on the prompts used to assess this learning objective. The prompts utilized asked students to provide an analysis of a specific television series that was representative of either a transnational Reality TV series and examine how the versions differs between the U.S. and overseas OR examine a TV series that has been distributed internationally and adapted for American viewers. While all of the students chose an appropriate series to analyze, those that exceeded standards were able to clearly integrate their research on the series with an overarching argument about adaptation and the goal of producing a transnational series. Papers that "met standards" quite often simply listed particular characteristics of the series, but didn't fully connect it back to the concept of global television. Papers that "approached standards" had difficulty not only making the larger connections, but also in the quality of writing (e.g., proper citation, organization, and proofreading).

Action to be taken: please indicate the connection between the assessment finds and the proposed action(s); if no action is to be taken, please indicate why you think none is necessary.

Learning Objective 1: As indicated above, there may be a disconnect between students understanding the importance of doing the assigned reading and not just counting on lecture/discussion. Perhaps the implementation of chapter quizzes (either in class or online) would help make sure students are doing the course readings. The course does offer review sheets prior to each exam, but only highlights major concepts and not necessarily more minute details observed in the readings. Students are also given examples of exam questions to prepare them, but perhaps an introduction to good study skills is warranted.

Learning Objective 2: Overall the papers did well connecting the TV series with historical contexts. Students did ask for an example of this type of paper early on. Perhaps offering an example or the outline for a short paper like this is warranted. But overall, much of the issue was with writing and not content.

Learning Objective 3: While very happy with the overall content of the papers, many students chose to write about the same TV series. I believe this is indicative of a problem with how to properly define or give an example of a transnational or global TV series. The example given in class was what most students chose to write about. Perhaps excluding that example as a choice for the paper will make students have to further assess the meaning of course concepts on their own.

What has been learned that could be helpful to others as they conduct assessment of General Education:

This particular course is not necessarily taught every semester. But if multiple sections were assessed for CY 2018, there would have to be more negotiation between two different instructors as to what methods should be used to assess these learning objectives. Quantitative assessments may also be a bit easier to do than qualitative, but I do feel that offering students ways to analyze and discuss course concepts through examples is necessary to show a higher level of critical thinking skills.

General Education Assessment Report -

Course:___205_____ # of sections:_____8_____ Calendar Year:___2018_____

General Education category	Learning Outcome **Students will demonstrate**	Information			Results[1]							
		Semester(s) of data collection	Students Assessed		Exceeding Standards		Meeting Standards		Approaching Standards		Not Meeting Standards	
			#	%[2]	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Fine and Performing Arts	Knowledge of the conventions and methods of at least one of the humanities in addition to those encompassed by other knowledge areas required by the General Education program	Spring 2018 and Fall 2018	79	52%	33	42%	37	47%	9	11%		

[1] Each student should be counted only once. If assessment has taken place across multiple sections, data should be aggregated for the purpose of this report.
[2] Number should represent percentage of the total students enrolled in the course.

Assessment tool and measure Did you use the assessment tool and measure identified in your assessment plan update? ___X___ Yes _____ No If No, please attach to this form a document indicating what you used instead and the rationale for doing so on.

Briefly describe your **method of analysis**

The final project for CRW 205 is a portfolio of revised poetry. Portfolios illustrate students' ability to understand and utilize "the conventions and methods" of the art of poetry. Assessment of the portfolios (for Gen Ed purposes) was done at the time of grading in each course, with instructors across sections using a shared rubric. This rubric focused on students use of image and detail, line, voice, and mechanics in the student portfolios.

Analysis of results Please be sure to address every learning outcome and both strengths and weaknesses revealed by the assessment, if any.

Many students in CRW 205 go above and beyond our expectations of students at the introductory level, with 33% exceeding overall expectations and 89% either meeting or exceeding overall expectations. This is an improvement over our assessment of three years ago, where only 20% exceeded expectations and 76% met or exceeded expectations. This might have to do partially with a revised rubric, which takes more elements of poetry into account. It might also reflect that the poetry track has consistently been taught by the same teachers for the past three years, all of whom have deep roots in the department and extensive experience teaching the class.

Looking at particular areas of the rubric, students did best on the category of voice, with 57% of students exceeding expectation. Students struggled most with the category of mechanics, with 14% only approaching standards. While the numbers between all categories were close (i.e. 86% of students still met or exceeded expectations for mechanics), we might surmise that students are moving ahead more quickly with areas of originality rather than areas of convention. 92% of students were meeting or exceeding expectations in the category of line, and 87% met or exceeded expectations in the category of imagery and detail.

One instructor noted that students' approach to voice improved when she changed the book being used for the course. I found students doing stronger work with imagery and detail than in our assessment three years ago, reflecting more emphasis on this throughout assignments, rather than just at the beginning of the semester.

Action to be taken: please indicate the connection between the assessment finds and the proposed action(s); if no action is to be taken, please indicate why you think none is necessary.

Students sometimes resist the notion that there are mechanical conventions in poetry. CRW faculty can work to show students more examples of how compelling, contemporary poets do indeed still respond to mechanical conventions. Recently, I have had students watch videos of performance poets, then observe how these poets have transferred their work to the page. Students were surprised to see the degree to which such poets still take consistent approaches to punctuation and mechanics. I think we can embed more of this kind of analysis in CRW 205 classes. At the same time, I think it's also important that we do not overcorrect, suggesting that mechanics are the most important element of poetry (an approach that can quickly shut down students who have long struggled with mechanics in their writing).

One action that is indirectly related to our recent assessment is the need to communicate clear objectives to new instructors in the genre. Starting in Spring 2019, two instructors are teaching CRW 205 for the first time, and a third will teach the class for the first time in Fall 2019. As mentioned above, the CY 2018 assessment cycle saw all CRW 205 classes taught by veterans of the course, which might have helped with the high rate of student success. We have some excellent new instructors joining the team, but they deserve mentoring as they get to know the course. To that end, I've shared syllabi and sample assignments with the new instructors, and will continue to work with them.

Overall, while we'll continue to work towards having 100% of students meet or exceed expectations, we were pleased with the CY 2018 assessment results.

What has been learned that could be helpful to others as they conduct assessment of General Education:

As a whole, the Creative Writing Program assessed over 25 sections and 250 student projects for our 2018 Fine and Performing Arts assessment. We found that embedding general education assessment within classes greatly streamlined the assessment process.

General Education Assessment Report – Computer and Information Literacy

Course: _____ECE475_____ # of sections: _____3_____ Calendar Year: _____2018_____

General Education Category	Learning Outcome Students will demonstrate the ability to	Information			Results[1]							
		Semester(s) of data collection	Students Assessed		Exceeding Standards		Meeting Standards		Approaching Standards		Not Meeting Standards	
			#	%[2]	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Computer and Information Literacy	Perform the basic operations of personal computer use	Spring 2018 and Fall 2018	15	37	9	60	5	33.3	1	6.7	0	0
	Understand and use basic research techniques	Spring 2018 and Fall 2018	15	37								
	Locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources	Spring 2018 and Fall 2018	15	37								

[1] Each student should be counted only once. If assessment has taken place across multiple sections, data should be aggregated for the purpose of this report.
[2] Number should represent percentage of the total students enrolled in course.

Assessment tool and measure Did you use the assessment tool and measure identified in your assessment plan update? _____ Yes __x___ No If No, please attach to this form a document indicating what you used instead and the rationale for doing so.

We did use one of the 3 courses that were marked as embedding Computer and Information Literacy – ECE475 Computer Architecture. Originally, it was intended that these outcomes be assessed in the introductory CSC212 but the data to be assessed is owned by the CS department and the ECE department has neither control of the instruments nor easy access to the data. As such it was determined that one of our courses could best be used in this assessment. Learning Outcomes 2 and 3 were already being assessed in ECE475 for our ABET accreditation process so it was determined that this course was the best suited to be used for this assessment as well.

Briefly describe your **method of analysis** :

The extent to which all 3 learning outcomes were achieved were evaluated using 2 separate assignments in ECE475 – Computer Architecture. 15 students, chosen at random from Spring 2018 and Fall 2018 were assessed for each outcome.

Learning Outcome 1 (L1) : Perform the basic operations of personal computer use

Assessment Instrument

Performance indicators:

- L1.1 - The ability to connect peripherals to a port on a computer
- L1.2 - The ability to save data with a particular name and file format
- L1.3 - The ability to maintain a correct folder structure when submitting a multi-folder assignment
- L1.4 - The ability to find and manage multiple applications including exporting data from one app to another.
- L1.5 - The ability to use a word processor to submit a text-based assignment in a pre-determined format
- L1.6 - The ability to download and upload files to appropriate locations on the internet

Description of instrument:

The students were given a laboratory assignment which was to be downloaded from the Backboard Course management page for the course. The assignment involved connecting an FPGA development board to a computer using the USB port, write code to create registers using an IDE and download the synthesized result to the development board. They were then required to navigate the IDE and copy the schematic of their design to their lab report which was to be a MSWord document formatted in a pre-determined manner. They were then required to zip all their code files, their IDE project and their project report (maintaining a required folder structure) under a file with a specific name and upload these to a dropbox on Blackboard. 15 out of a total of 41 students were assessed (8 from Spring 2018 and 7 from Fall 2018) using the rubric below

L1.1: The ability to connect peripherals to a port on a computer					
o Excellent (5)	o Good (4)	o Satisfactory (3)	o Unsatisfactory (2)	o Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)
L1.2: The ability to save data with a particular name and file format					
o Excellent (5)	o Good (4)	o Satisfactory (3)	o Unsatisfactory (2)	o Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)
L1.3 The ability to maintain a correct folder structure when submitting a multi-folder assignment					
o Excellent (5)	o Good (4)	o Satisfactory (3)	o Unsatisfactory (2)	o Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)
L1.4: The ability to find and manage multiple applications including exporting data from one app to another					
o Excellent (5)	o Good (4)	o Satisfactory (3)	o Unsatisfactory (2)	o Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)
L1.5: The ability to use a word processor to submit a text-based assignment in a pre-determined format					
o Excellent (5)	o Good (4)	o Satisfactory (3)	o Unsatisfactory (2)	o Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)
L1.6: The The ability to download and upload files to appropriate locations on the internet					
o Excellent (5)	o Good (4)	o Satisfactory (3)	o Unsatisfactory (2)	o Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)

Learning Outcome 2 (L2) : Understand and use basic research techniques

Assessment Instrument

Performance Indicators:

- L2.1: The ability to determine the extent of information needed and to know where to look for it
- L2.2: The ability to select information appropriately and use it effectively.

Description of instrument:

The students were required to write a 2-page research paper on a topic in Advanced Computer Architecture, explaining the topic and its relevance to modern computing. The students were required to read and cite at least 3 journal articles on the topic and write the paper according to a given format. . 15 out of a total of 41 students were assessed (8 from Spring 2018 and 7 from Fall 2018) using the rubric below

L2.1: The ability to determine the extent of information needed and to know where to look for it.					
○ Excellent (5)	○ Good (4)	○ Satisfactory (3)	○ Unsatisfactory (2)	○ Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)
L2.2: The ability to select information appropriately and use it effectively					
○ Excellent (5)	○ Good (4)	○ Satisfactory (3)	○ Unsatisfactory (2)	○ Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)

Learning Outcome 3 (L3) : Locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources

Assessment Instrument

Performance Indicators:

- **L3.1: The ability** to **determine the extent of information needed and to know where to look for it**
- **L3.2: The ability to critically evaluate information and its source(s) in terms of its level of factual content, its academic rigor and its bias.**

Description of instrument:

The students were required to write a 2-page research paper on a topic in Advanced Computer Architecture, explaining the topic and its relevance to modern computing. The students were required to read and cite at least 3 journal articles on the topic and write the paper according to a given format. . 15 out of a total of 41 students were assessed (8 from Spring 2018 and 7 from Fall 2018) using the rubric below

L3.1: The ability to determine the extent of information needed and to know where to look for it.					
○ Excellent (5)	○ Good (4)	○ Satisfactory (3)	○ Unsatisfactory (2)	○ Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)
L3.2: The ability to critically evaluate information and its source(s) in terms of its level of factual content, its academic rigor and its bias.					
○ Excellent (5)	○ Good (4)	○ Satisfactory (3)	○ Unsatisfactory (2)	○ Not attempted (1)	Total (out of 5)

Analysis of results Please be sure to address each learning outcome and both strengths and weaknesses revealed by the assessment, if any.

Assessment Results of Learning Outcome 1 (L1) : Perform the basic operations of personal computer use

NAME	L1.1	L1.2	L1.3	L1.4	L1.5	L1.6	Average
Student 1	5	4	4	5	4	5	4.50
Student 2	5	5	4	5	5	5	4.83
Student 3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.00
Student 4	5	4	4	5	3	5	4.33
Student 5	5	4	4	5	3	5	4.33
Student 6	5	5	4	5	3	5	4.50
Student 7	5	5	4	4	3	5	4.33
Student 8	5	2	2	5	2	5	3.50
Student 9	5	5	4	4	5	5	4.67
Student 10	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.00
Student 11	4	2	2	3	4	4	3.17
Student 12	5	2	2	4	4	5	3.67
Student 13	5	5	5	5	4	5	4.83
Student 14	5	5	2	5	5	5	4.50
Student 15	5	4	4	5	4	5	4.50
Average	4.73	4.07	3.60	4.53	3.73	4.73	4.23

Performance indicators:

L1.1 - The ability to connect peripherals to a port on a computer

L1.2 - The ability to save data with a particular name and file format

L1.3 - The ability to maintain a correct folder structure when submitting a multi-folder assignment

L1.4 - The ability to find and manage multiple applications including exporting data from one app to another.

L1.5 - The ability to use a word processor to submit a text-based assignment in a pre-determined format

L1.6 - The ability to download and upload files to appropriate locations on the internet

Not Meeting Standards: Average score < 2.5
Approaching Standards: 3.5 > Average score ≥ 2.5
Meeting Standards: 4.5 > Average score ≥ 3.5
Exceeding Standards > 4.5

Assessment Item	Value
Number of students assessed:	15
% of students meeting or exceeding standards:	93.3%

This learning outcome is being met to a satisfactory level as are all its constituent performance indicators. Students performed weakest in their ability to maintain a correct folder structure. Most students when told of this, however, corrected it on future assignments.

Assessment Results of Learning Outcome 2 (L2) : Understand and use basic research techniques

NAME	L2.1	L2.2	Average
Student 1	4	3	**3.500**
Student 2	4	5	**4.500**
Student 3	4	5	**4.500**
Student 4	4	4	**4.000**
Student 5	3	3	**3.000**
Student 6	4	4	**4.000**
Student 7	4	4	**4.000**
Student 8	5	5	**5.000**
Student 9	4	4	**4.000**
Student 10	3	4	**3.500**
Student 11	4	3	**3.500**
Student 12	5	5	**5.000**
Student 13	4	5	**4.500**
Student 14	4	5	**4.500**
Student 15	4	4	**4.000**
Average	4.000	4.200	4.100

Performance indicators:

L2.1: The ability to determine the extent of information needed and to know where to look for it

L2.2: The ability to select information appropriately and use it effectively

Not Meeting Standards: Average score < 2.5
Approaching Standards: 3.5 > Average score ≥ 2.5
Meeting Standards: 4.5 > Average score ≥ 3.5
Exceeding Standards > 4.5

Assessment Item	Value
Number of students assessed:	15
% of students meeting or exceeding standards:	93%

This learning outcome is being met to a satisfactory level as are all its constituent performance indicators.

Assessment Results of Learning Outcome 3 (L3) : Locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources

NAME	L2.1	L2.2	Average
Student 1	4	4	**4.000**
Student 2	3	3	**3.000**
Student 3	4	3	**3.500**
Student 4	3	3	**3.000**
Student 5	4	3	**3.500**
Student 6	4	4	**4.000**
Student 7	4	3	**3.500**
Student 8	5	4	**4.500**
Student 9	4	3	**3.500**
Student 10	4	3	**3.500**
Student 11	3	3	**3.000**
Student 12	5	4	**4.500**
Student 13	4	4	**4.000**
Student 14	4	4	**4.000**
Student 15	4	3	**3.500**
Average	3.933	3.400	3.667

Performance indicators:

L3.1: The ability to determine the extent of information needed and to know where to look for it

L3.2: The ability to critically evaluate information and its source(s) in terms of its level of factual content, its academic rigor and its bias.

Not Meeting Standards: Average score < 2.5
Approaching Standards: 3.5 > Average score ≥ 2.5
Meeting Standards: 4.5 > Average score ≥ 3.5
Exceeding Standards > 4.5

Assessment Item	Value
Number of students assessed:	15
% of students meeting or exceeding standards:	87%

This learning outcome is being met to a satisfactory level as are all its constituent performance indicators. Students performed weakest in their ability to critically evaluate information and its source(s) in terms of its level of factual content, its academic rigor and its bias.

General Education Assessment Report – Computer and Information Literacy

Action to be taken: please indicate the connection between the assessment finds and the proposed action(s); if no action is to be taken, please indicate why you think none is necessary.

- No action was taken for Learning Outcome 1 (Perform the basic operations of personal computer use) as the assessment data indicates that this learning outcome is being successfully attained by the vast majority (93%) of students.
- No action was taken for Learning Outcome 2 (Understand and use basic research techniques), as the assessment data indicates that this learning outcome is being successfully attained by the vast majority (93%) of students.
- For Learning Outcome 3 (Locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources) students performed weakest in the ability to critically evaluate information and its source(s) in terms of its level of factual content, its academic rigor and its bias. Many students upon being asked, admitted that they were unaware that they were required to critically analyze their sources in their research paper. We propose to state this requirement clearly in script for the assignment as well as make the rubric used to grade this learning outcome available to students along with the assignment requirements.

What has been learned that could be helpful to others as they conduct assessment of General Education:

N/A

General Education Assessment Report – Computer and Information Literacy

Course:____HSC 488_____ # of sections:_____4_____ CalendarYear 2018_____

General Education Category	Learning Outcome Students will demonstrate the ability to	Information			Results[1]							
		Semester(s) of data collection	Students Assessed		Exceeding Standards		Meeting Standards		Approaching Standards		Not Meeting Standards	
			#	%[2]	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Computer and Information Literacy	Perform the basic operations of personal computer use	SP 18/FA18	89	100	52	58.43	25	28.09	10	11.24	2	2.25
	Understand and use basic research techniques	SP18/FA18	89	100	52	58.42	33	37.08	2	2.25	2	2.25
	Locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources	SP18/FA18	89	100	52	58.43	25	28.09	10	11.24	2	2.25

[1] Each student should be counted only once. If assessment has taken place across multiple sections, data should be aggregated for the purpose of this report.
[2] Number should represent percentage of the total students enrolled in course.

Assessment tool and measure Did you use the assessment tool and measure identified in your assessment plan update? ___x____ Yes

Briefly describe your **method of analysis:** the assessment data from the HSC 488 Research and Evaluation Report are collected via a rubric and stored in the TK20 online portfolio software system used in the School of Education. Faculty teaching HSC 488 are responsible for online data entry each semester and students must upload their assignment via Blackboard into the TK20 system. The TK20 assessment rubric is based on national Certified Health Education (CHES) Competencies. SUNY Oswego learning outcomes (#1, #2, and #3) for Computer and Information Literacy competencies have been mapped to our rubric. Students use the computer for everything in the class and the assessment. They use technology and information literacy to search for primary and secondary data to develop an evaluation tool that best aligns with the program goals and objectives. Students also evaluate and synthesize data from primary and secondary sources as part of the assessment. They collect data from actual health programs or individuals through focus groups or scripted interviews. They analyze and interpret data with basic quantitative and qualitative techniques using google sheets or excel. Students present their program evaluation in a research paper which includes graphs. They may also present with power point or prezi.

Analysis of results Please be sure to address each learning outcome and both strengths and weaknesses revealed by the assessment, if any.
SUNY Oswego LO#1 students will perform the basic operations of personal computer use:
Strength: The majority of students (86.52%) meet the standard
Area(s) for Improvement: Student who do not meet the standard did not complete the assignment or class.
SUNY Oswego LO#2 students will understand and use basic research techniques =
Strength: The majority of students (95.5%) meet the standard. Students are able to use technology-based sources of information to select valid, reliable and credible sources of data to create needs assessments and to compare against their evaluation data.
Area(s) for Improvement: Continue to find cool, real-world health problems for students to evaluate. Faculty state that students need more time to practice implementing their evaluation tools prior to collecting the real data on real subjects. Students might also benefit from more time to create the evaluation tools. We have integrated peer-to-peer assessment in regards to assessing the tool over the past year, but there is still a need for more time with getting the tool to measure what they want it to measure.
SUNY Oswego LO#3 students will locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources:
Strength: The majority of students (86.52%) meet the standard. Instructor feedback is very positive, Every semester students come up with new goals and objectives they want to measure that inform them if a health program was effective or not. By using real or simulated data, the learning experience is much more meaningful and relevant.
Area(s) for Improvement: The instructor does mid-semester assessments and will continue this practice to help clarify concepts or skills students find challenging

General Education Assessment Report – Computer and Information Literacy

Action to be taken: please indicate the connection between the assessment finds and the proposed action(s); if no action is to be taken, please indicate why you think none is necessary.

Based on the data our HSC 488 classes are effective in providing learning experiences that require students to demonstrate their computer and information literacy skills. We will continue to facilitate peer-to-peer assessment in regards to creating evaluation instruments that gather meaningful data.

As of fall 2018, we now have a 100% online major as well. It will be a few semesters until those students take HSC 488. It will be interesting to see if they perform differently than our residential students. We currently teach HSC 488 online and face-to-face—and all data has been aggregated. We have not noticed any outliers. However, most of those online students are residential students as well---thus maybe they have a different background than our 100% online students.

It might be useful to code the 100% online students as we move forward to track any unusual successes or challenges. We will need to see if the registrar code can be connected to the TK20 system in order to track those students.

What has been learned that could be helpful to others as they conduct assessment of General Education:

As our department enrollments grow and our modalities of teaching change; and, new instructors come on board, it is important to communicate effectively about course outcomes and standardization of assessment. Make sure to revisit the HPW rubric and how it maps to the SUNY rubric once each academic year.

Anecdotal data shows that students who took our new elective, HSC 230 Health and Technology, were able develop more enhanced presentations.

Data would support faculty insight that real-world, and meaningful health issues, are much more engaging for students to work with than just numbers on a page. When students develop their own evaluation instruments and collect their own data from real people—they feel a sense of ownership and they are excited to interpret and present their findings.

Appendix 2—Insights

Here you will find comments concerning communication and process, teaching and teaching supplements, and other advice, comments, and suggestions.

Communication and Process

--This particular course is not necessarily taught every semester. But if multiple sections were assessed for CY 2018, there would have to be more negotiation between two different instructors as to what methods should be used to assess these learning objectives. Quantitative assessments may also be a bit easier to do than qualitative, but I do feel that offering students ways to analyze and discuss course concepts through examples is necessary to show a higher level of critical thinking skills.

--Generally, having multiple, often short term adjunct faculty presents a challenge to consistency of data. The steps outlined above, pre-circulation of materials, early meetings, and now adding norming sessions, will help us understand the data in more meaningful ways. Another suggestion I would make is that in courses that are taught wholly or mainly by adjunct faculty members, who are often teaching at more than one institution and commute to Oswego, that we request funds to provide them with a stipend or some compensation for the extra time required to conduct norming sessions. Lastly, in this round of assessment, the instructors did not submit their data in the current version of Excel provided to them and/or in Excel at all, but in another program. It appears they may not be aware that as part of the Oswego instructional staff that they may have access to this common software. To avoid the duplicate entry of data by the committee member, we can make sure everyone knows what computing resources are available to them.

--Where and when possible we have aligned our General Education assessment with our own program assessment. This has allowed us to collect data for both at the same time from the same courses.

--As a whole, the Creative Writing Program assessed over 25 sections and 250 student projects for our 2018 Fine and Performing Arts assessment. We found that embedding general education assessment within classes greatly streamlined the assessment process.

--We recommend that future ENG 102 assessment committees consider (a) finding different ways to measure assessment – perhaps with Author's Notes, which some portfolios contained and we found very helpful – and (b) dividing the "coherence" criteria. We found three or even four separate themes combined in "coherence in common college-level forms," including organization/structure, sentence structure/usage/mechanics, substance/critical thinking, and genre knowledge of academic discourse.

--• Asking faculty to submit reflections on the assignment and their teaching of it is particularly helpful in analyzing the data.

- Would be really helpful if the class lists that we download from MyOswego had both first and second majors listed. This would allow us to have more robust data for general education requirements embedded in our major but also in our program assessment.
- We've been working to align some of our program goals to specific general education assessment so that we are not duplicating effort.

--For a variety of reasons, including faculty turnover, we were not able to collect data from all assignments listed in the Plan Update. This committee will strive to be more proactive with communications in order to achieve larger sample sizes and a wider variety of assignments.

--The more one can find ways to integrate general education assessment into student learning with respect to content of the major (i.e., the more ecologically valid the assessment), the better. Most elements of the Computer and Information Literacy assessment for cognitive science majors were incorporated fairly naturally into the framework that was established for the students' capstone research projects. For the most part, the assessment served to enrich, and enhance the integrity of, the research experience for the students.

--It might be helpful to include space to explain any major changes to the course(s) that were assessed to avoid any possible confusion. For instance, COM 303 was updated during the 2016-2017 academic year. Beginning in the Fall 2018 semester, it will only be offered as COM 403, Communication Research Methods, rather than COM 303, Qualitative Communication Research Methods. The course title now reflects the types of communication research that students encounter in other Communication Studies courses and better aligns the course with the knowledge that is expected of an upper-division Communication and Social Interaction course. COM 303 was last be offered in Spring 2018. Please note that the findings reported here are from COM 303 (Spring 2018) and COM 403 (Fall 2018), but deal with the same subject matter, exam questions, and research paper assignments.

--CSC 101, 102, and 103 each enroll a different subpopulation of students based upon their course of study. The Computer Science Department has attempted to use a single set of assessment tools in order to make meaningful comparisons across these subpopulations of students. Other departments that deal with heterogeneous groups in assessment might also want to design common methods for measuring student performance in diverse courses.

--As our department enrollments grow and our modalities of teaching change; and, new instructors come on board, it is important to communicate effectively about course outcomes and standardization of assessment. Make sure to revisit the HPW rubric and how it maps to the SUNY rubric once each academic year.

--Reliability and validity of all quantitative measures (including rubrics) is a basic prerequisite to drawing inferences about student learning. This appears to be done only with departments using published instruments designed off campus. We are not aware of any attempts on campus to establish or require reliability or validity in quantitative measures developed on campus and used to assess learning objectives.

--Cutoffs for standards need to be explained in the context of the measure used and the objective measured.

--● It takes time to combine the assessment data from multiple sections. I found getting all of the data in one spreadsheet made the analysis more efficient. I was able to repurpose the table format that I developed for the previous assessment cycle with this report. Due to a lack of fidelity between Google Sheets and Documents, it was easier to place screenshots of tables than editable

ones. I repeatedly used countif, sumif, and vlookup functions to aid in the categorizing and recoding of the data.

● With small sections or sample sizes, it is difficult to have data samples large enough to conduct comprehensive item analyses on objectively-scored items. For example, with test responses of 28 students, it would be difficult to determine item discrimination values or conduct a distractor analysis. With larger sections/samples, highly discriminating items can be determined by conducting item analyses. Positively discriminating items can then be selected for an assessment tool that is useful in separating students who have mastered content from those who have not.

● Creating and using well-defined analytic rubrics helps improve teaching and learning. However, they can be time consuming to use to assess when you also provide written feedback on where students need to improve.

Teaching and Teaching Supplements

--Giving students clear guidelines, directions and feedback on various assessment methods used in the class makes it possible to meet the learning outcomes satisfactorily. For instance, all three learning outcomes were met satisfactorily when students were made to work on their research paper drafts and feedback was given in a timely and consistent basis as well as helping them with finding relevant and credible scholarly and primary sources. If this constant feedback mechanism is not followed up and students are simply allowed to submit the paper at the end of the semester then it's quite likely that the work turned is not up to the mark.

--Create an ongoing in class assignment that creates a parallel timeline of event for students to develop throughout the course so they better understood the flow of the narrative of American history and the evolution of the United States' relationship with other nations. Revise some of the formative assessments to better address the third learning outcome. Additionally, increase the number of reading assessments by incorporating a bi-weekly, web-based component, containing a "controversial" prompt and student journal responses to facilitate students deeper exploration of the impact of American institutions and use of historic detail in personal responses. Seek out a text to replace the out of print one currently required for the course.

--The above is included as a reminder that we have to engage our students early on in the semester about the knowledge they are bringing to the classroom and course correct as needed.

--It's important to manage student expectations in all courses, but perhaps especially courses in subjects where students enter already possessing considerable (albeit often superficial) knowledge.

--Because our class sizes are always modest for our Research Methods (conceived as a stepping stone to our Major Capstone class), we have found it necessary to really use all of the class to assess any of our learning outcomes and not a sample. I think one finding that was interesting in our assessment was the fact that by breaking down our assessment outcomes assignments/exercises into multiple smaller tasks rather than one big task, I was able to pinpoint a key issue (using terminal services) that I might not otherwise have seen when calculating class performance.

--In my assessment plan, I had said I would assess all three of the course's assignments. What I found was that some students failed to turn in the first assignment due to technical difficulties (not necessarily of the student's making, but equipment issues). Perhaps the first assignment should be used more as an exemplar to then properly assess the other two assignments where students are more fully capable of and prepared to push past early technical failures. Hence, assessing only the final two assignments would provide a better path of assessing students Computer and Information Literacy.

--When we plan our instructions, we must make sure that the assignments and projects include the components of evaluation categories. This will facilitate objective evaluation of students and improve the validity and reliability of the assessment.

--Data would support faculty insight that real-world, and meaningful health issues, are much more engaging for students to work with than just numbers on a page. When students develop their own evaluation instruments and collect their own data from real people—they feel a sense of ownership and they are excited to interpret and present their findings.

--Choosing appropriate assignments is crucial to accurate assessments of these learning objectives. Once the assignments are matched to the learning outcomes, the rest is simple collection of data for comparison to the standards. You don't need to invent special assignments to fulfill the requirements, as there are probably existing assignments that fit the bill. Don't make extra work for yourselves!

--It's important to evaluate these skills throughout the semester, not just at one point. Especially in this area of Gen Ed, I support in-class exercises when possible because students can learn from each other and that provides another way of learning for students (from a peer).

--We have just highlighted three areas that linguistics students find challenging: a) use of various visual means to convey data and patterns; b) drawing inferences from data and c) evaluating and synthesizing information from various sources. We do not believe that these challenges are limited to linguistics majors. For instance, we have noticed, especially in works submitted by students in LIN 100 and in works submitted by students in graduate education courses, a tendency to rely, exclusively, on the use of words and prose to convey their understanding or findings. This is understandable if we consider the types of writing students are used to producing in high and middle schools. This means that we need to start emphasizing different kinds of writing from the beginning, such as in ENG 102. Students, in these courses, need to practice looking at different kinds of data such as statistic data or data presented in graphic forms or unstructured data, organizing and presenting data in table and other forms and writing about them. Such instruction is necessary if students are expected to research and present their research findings.

--Students having a choice on the subject matter related to their discipline when assigned to write a paper or give a presentation is highly recommended.

--Aside: A practical spreadsheet application of using data in their discipline to plot data and perform statistics builds student confidence in using interactive computer application tools.

Other Advice, Comments, and Suggestions

--1. Consider taking the successful strategies in the general education courses and adapting them to other areas of the curriculum to leverage general education assessment for overall program improvements.
2. The best picture of student accomplishment will come from clear expectations and a roadmap to a successful project.

--It is important that, as we have done here, assessments take into consideration not just the outcomes as written, but the outcomes as they play within different disciplinary environments. Because it can be hard to know how to think in isolation, some degree of sharing the aggregate results (while maintaining the privacy and integrity of Departments) might be helpful.

--Each of the CRW foundational genre classes emphasizes the links between reading and writing. Since students often have writing interests and/or experience in other genres, discussions of "cross-pollination" between those genres can be facilitated by instructors.

--While these 3 specific grammar issues have been highlighted in fiction writing, are there other grammar issues specific to the other genres that could be highlighted and discussed in class?

--The assumption of students coming with less preparation in the genre is not just based on the results of one outcome, but with in-class discussion of what they are bringing to the class in previous knowledge. More students have never seen a live play; more students are not reading any plays in high school beyond one or two Shakespeare plays; musicals are their major knowledge of theater and that is frequently from film, not live performance.

-- What has been learned for other instructors? Students badly need a first semester college wide course on study skills and possibly two semester course.

--One instructor suggested that "Students badly need a first semester college-wide course on study skills."

--I am not sure that this group performance dynamics can be transferred to many other disciplines outside of music (the notable exception being sports and theatre).

--If I had mentioned to the students that I would conduct this assessment at the beginning of the semester, the students may have focused on learning on the points of the assessment.

--CSS uses computer technologies for research and creative practice. It's embedded in the DNA of the program. It seems that students quickly become familiar with the technical use of the software, perhaps to the point where potential to use the software becomes overlooked. Meaning that they know how to create a fade or dissolve, but do not know how to use it. They can export a movie clip, but do not always organize their clips in the process. On the research end, the

challenge is to encourage students to use library resources to locate up to date journals and develop the habit of documenting information for credit purposes. Perhaps, more student projects could include check-in steps along the way to make sure they are generating a list of credits. Too often students are moving quickly, trying to use technology to complete a project the night before and miss these key steps. Just like papers go through revisions, movies go through revisions. The challenge is to guide students to see how the tools can help them revise their work toward a finished project.

--Anecdotal data shows that students who took our new elective, HSC 230 Health and Technology, were able develop more enhanced presentations.

Appendix 3 - Rubric

Here we include the rubric members of the General Education Council and the Assessment Advisory Committee used as part of the review of your general education assessment reports.

Learning Outcomes with Information and Results
Did they report numerical data?
0 No entries
1 Learning outcomes have most of the (a) numeric values for n and percent of students **and** (b) numeric value for n and percent of students exceeding, meeting, and approaching.
2 Every outcome has (a) numeric values for n and percent of students **and** (b) numeric value for n and percent of students exceeding, meeting, and approaching.
3 Every learning outcome has (a) numeric values for n and percent of students **and** (b) numeric value for n and percent of students exceeding, meeting, approaching, and not meeting. The sample size is appropriate.

Tool & Measure and Method
0 No information provided
1 Information provided concerning tool and measure but no description of method of analysis
2 Information provided concerning tool and measure **and** description of method of analysis
3 Information provided concerning the rationale for changing tool and measure, if any, is cogent **and/or** articulation of method of analysis is more than perfunctory

Major Findings

Did they provide an analysis of the data?
0 No entry; or no entry that speaks to the learning outcomes.
1 The report identifies only strengths or weaknesses but not both.
2 The report identifies strengths and weaknesses in student learning with respect to learning outcomes.
3 Findings are supported by the data. The report identifies strengths and weaknesses in student learning with respect to learning outcomes.

Action

Did they specify actions to be taken to address shortcomings identified in the analysis?
0 No entry
1 Suggests an action that indicates some awareness of and reflection on shortcomings.
2 Partially identifies appropriate action to address shortcomings, but does not clearly identify specific steps.
3 Clearly identified specific steps to be taken. Action is an appropriate means to address the identified shortcomings. [Or no shortcomings identified and the data and analysis support this.]

Insights

Did I learn anything helpful about assessment?
1 [Bonus] Report provides something useful