

# General Education

GE-GE-GE

ACM: GENERAL EDUCATION

Faculty:

## Student Learning Outcomes

SLO Count: 10

Name	Content
Critical Thinking	Think critically: Within GenEd, students who think critically recognize an object of investigation, frame questions about it, and interrogate assumptions—explicit or implicit. Critical thinking includes the evaluation of evidence, analysis and synthesis of multiple sources, and reflection on varied perspectives. Critical thinking generates a well-developed investigation that incorporates supporting and countering claims. A student engaged in critical thinking produces an informed account, a hypothesis for further study, or the solution to a problem.
Contextualized Learning	Understand historical and contemporary issues in context: Within GenEd, students who contextualize learning understand and integrate historical, contemporary, and cultural phenomena and their underlying principles in two broad applications. First, contextual learners recognize the interaction of complex forces that give rise to specific phenomena. Second, contextual learners understand and analyze related events, artifacts, practices and concepts across geographic, chronological and cultural boundaries.

Interdisciplinary Thinking	Understand and apply knowledge in and across disciplines: Within GenEd, students who use interdisciplinary thinking recognize the world presents problems, topics, or issues too complex to be satisfactorily addressed through a single lens. Thus, interdisciplinary thinkers apply multiple perspectives, paradigms, and frameworks to problems, topics, or issue.
Communication Skills	Communicate effectively orally and in writing: Within GenEd, students who communicate effectively use spoken and written language to construct a message that demonstrates the communicator has established clear goals and has considered her or his audience. Effective messages are organized and presented in a style appropriate to the context.
Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning	Use and apply quantitative and scientific reasoning to explain phenomena in the context of everyday life: Within GenEd, students who exercise quantitative and scientific reasoning use and apply these reasoning processes to explain phenomena in the context of everyday life. Quantitative reasoning includes statistical and/or logical problem-solving, the relationships between quantities, and the use and misuse of quantitative data. Scientific reasoning introduces students to the evolution and interdependence of science and technology and includes problem identification, hypothesis evaluation, experimentation, interpretation of results and the use and misuse of scientific data.
Civic Engagement	Function as an engaged citizen in a diverse and globalized world: Within GenEd, students open to civic engagement view themselves as connected to local and global communities where they participate in activities that address issues of public concern. Critically engaged students define issues, pose, probe, and solve problems with an awareness of and an inclusion of the diverse values and interests.
Information Literacy	Identify, access and evaluate sources of information: Within GenEd, information literacy encompasses a broad spectrum of abilities, including the ability to recognize and articulate information needs; to locate, critically evaluate, and organize information for a specific purpose; and to recognize and reflect on the ethical use of information.
Lifelong Learning	Promote lasting curiosity: GenEd cultivates these skills and abilities throughout the required undergraduate curriculum, and students will experience these ways of being through readings, discussions, activities, and classes throughout GenEd.

Ethical Reasoning	This Student Learning Outcome was developed for use in the context of Intellectual Heritage I and II. It addresses how students describe, analyze and evaluate the following: their own perspective in relation to that of others; values and value systems in historical, social and cultural contexts; differing ideas of social responsibility; specific positions and agency in relation to relations of power; ethical arguments for which there is no clear answer; and conceptions of the common good.
Intercultural Competency	The ability to take in, evaluate and synthesize relevant information without the bias of preconceived judgments and to translate thought into action. The overall positivity with which an individual views and responds to cross-cultural interactions.

Does this program have specialized accreditation?

No

## Assessment Activities and Results

Assessment Activity Count: 7

Assessment Activity: Written Communication in the Required Undergraduate

SLOs assessed during this report:

Communication Skills

Please provide a brief name for this assessment activity.	Written Communication in the Required Undergraduate Writing Curriculum
---	--

<p>Describe the assessment method used to assess the learning outcome(s). Provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.</p>	<p>The AAC&amp;U Written Communication VALUE Rubric was used to score student collected in First Year Writing and Writing Intensive classes. The questions guiding this project were as follows: •To what extent are students practicing and developing writing skills in First Year Writing (FYW) classes and Writing Intensive Courses (WIC's)? •Is it possible to discern development in writing skills throughout the three-course sequence of FYW and the two WIC's? •Are students at higher levels of achievement in certain domains of written communication, as defined in the AAC&amp;U rubric for written communication? •Do students make more significant gains across the three course sequence in certain domains of written communication, as defined in the AAC&amp;U rubric for written communication? Items of student work were collected from three cohorts of students representing three broad disciplinary groupings: Arts; Science/Technology/Engineering; Quantitative Fields. In the initial study design, we intended to also collect items from students studying in a Humanities/Social Sciences field, but were unsuccessful in implementing this element of the study design. We selected a major to represent each disciplinary grouping and collected items of student work from FYW sections, a 2000 level Writing Intensive (WI) course, and a 3000 or 4000 level WI course. We identified 20 students enrolled in FYW sections who had declared the three selected majors (20/major for a total of 60 students), and selected WI courses from within those majors. By assessing student work generated by students in a specific major at the FYW, WI 2000 level and WI 4000 level, our goal was to assess the development of writing across the required writing curriculum for undergraduate students at Temple. Students enrolled in FYW sections were randomly selected from among all students enrolled in a FYW section who had declared the specified major. WI sections were selected by recommendation from the chair, and then by randomly selecting one section if the instructor was teaching more than one section. Items of student work were identified by asking instructors to select the assignment that best reflected the elements of the selected rubric. Collected work was then anonymized and scored by FYW and WI instructors, as well as one paid graduate extern, using the AAC&amp;U Written Communication rubric. Each item was scored by three readers. Only scores where there were at least two scores that were the same or adjacent were used. We included a score of "0" for cases where readers felt an item did not reach benchmark 1 and a score of "NA" for cases where readers felt the item was not applicable to that element of the rubric. "NA" was not considered to be adjacent to any score 0-4. Valid Scores, Written Communication Standard 1 Standard 2 Standard 3 Standard 4 Standard 5 FYW 93% 91% 96% 91% 93% WIC 96% 97% 94% 90% 97%</p>
--	--

What were the findings from this assessment?

Summary:•Demonstrated writing skills at the FYW and 2000 WI levels are appropriate for lower level undergraduate students, though scores assigned for use of sources and evidence at the First Year Writing level should be reviewed to determine whether additional support is required.•Students appear to make gains in awareness of context and disciplinary conventions, use of sources and control of mechanics as they move from FYW to their 2000 level WI courses.•The assessment of 3000 and 4000 level WI courses was inconclusive due to a small sample size at the 3000/4000 level and a lack of fit between the highly general AAC&U Written Communication rubric and the very disciplinary specific writing courses.Reviewing averages for all three disciplinary cohorts combined, students in First year Writing fell within benchmark 2 of the AAC&U Written Communication rubric for all elements of the rubric.1.Context and Purpose benchmark 2: Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).2.Content Development benchmark 2: Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.3.Genre and Disciplinary Conventions benchmark 2: Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation.4.Sources and Evidence benchmark 2: Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.5.Control of Syntax and Mechanics benchmark 2: Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.Students showed gains in their written communication skills in all areas at the 2000 level WI course. However, at the 3000 and 4000 level, average scores dropped. For two elements, Genre and Disciplinary Conventions and Sources and Evidence, averages fell below those assigned at the FYW level and into benchmark 1 for each element.3.Genre and Disciplinary Conventions benchmark 1: Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.4.Sources and Evidence benchmark 1: Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.The gains between FYW and WIC's at the 2000 level are encouraging. The decline in scores between the 2000 and 3000/4000 level may warrant more investigation, but should be considered with caution for the following reasons:•As we were unable to acquire student work from a 3000 or 4000 level course in our selected Quantitative major, scores reflect only items drawn from two WI sections at the 3000/4000 level;•The instructor of one of the remaining 3000/4000 level WI courses selected a group project as the assignment from which items were collected.These factors significantly reduced the N for WI student artifacts generated at the

	<p>3000/4000 level to less than half the number of those produced at the 2000 level. Beyond these issues, some elements of the rubric such as 3) Genre and Disciplinary Conventions and 4) Sources and Evidence are difficult for generalist readers to apply as they may not be fully aware of the conventions students were attempting to replicate or types of evidence deemed acceptable within a particular field or for a particular assignment. In addition, as students move through their coursework, assignments become more complex, and students are, in some cases, granted a greater level of autonomy in the completion of those tasks. Thus, weaker scores may reflect the student response to a greater level of challenge or higher level of autonomy, rather than students regressing in their skills. Finally, the rubric was not developed by and for WI courses, which, especially at upper levels, are designed to be field specific. As such, it may be a better fit for FYW and lower level WI courses.</p>
<p>How are you using or planning to use the findings from this assessment for program improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you are making to the program as a result of your findings.</p>	<p>We do not yet know how, or whether this project will be used to make any changes.</p>

With whom did you share findings from this assessment activity?

Faculty - Presentation to GenEd Executive Committee, meetings with participating faculty.

Students - Students are members of the GenEd Executive Committee.

School/College Administration - Lori Salem, director of the Writing Intensive program, and Rachael Groner, director of First Year Writing, were both presented with the findings from this study.

Assessment Activity: Critical Thinking in the Required Undergraduate Wr

SLOs assessed during this report:

Critical Thinking

Please provide a brief name for this assessment activity.	Critical Thinking in the Required Undergraduate Writing Curriculum
---	--

<p>Describe the assessment method used to assess the learning outcome(s). Provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.</p>	<p>The Critical Thinking VALUE rubric was used to score items of student work collected in First Year Writing and Writing Intensive Courses. The questions guiding this project were as follows: •To what extent are students practicing and developing critical thinking skills in First Year Writing (FYW) classes and Writing Intensive Courses (WIC's)? •Is it possible to discern development in critical thinking throughout the three-course sequence of FYW and the two WIC's? •Are students at higher levels of achievement in certain domains of critical thinking, as defined in the AAC&amp;U rubric for critical thinking? •Do students make more significant gains across the three course sequence in certain domains of critical thinking, as defined in the AAC&amp;U rubric for critical thinking? Items of student work were collected from three cohorts of students representing three broad disciplinary groupings: Arts; Science/Technology/Engineering; Quantitative Fields. In the initial study design, we intended to also collect items from students studying in a Humanities/Social Sciences field, but were unsuccessful in implementing this element of the study design. We selected a major to represent each disciplinary grouping and collected items of student work from FYW sections, a 2000 level Writing Intensive (WI) course, and a 3000 or 4000 level WI course. We identified 20 students enrolled in FYW sections who had declared the three selected majors (20/major for a total of 60 students), and selected WI courses from within those majors. By assessing student work generated by students in a specific major at the FYW, WI 2000 level and WI 4000 level, our goal was to assess the development of critical thinking and writing across the required writing curriculum for undergraduate students at Temple. Students enrolled in FYW sections were randomly selected from among all students enrolled in a FYW section who had declared the specified major. WI sections were selected by recommendation from the chair, and then by randomly selecting one section if the instructor was teaching more than one section. Items of student work were identified by asking instructors to select the assignment that best reflected the elements of the selected rubric. Collected work was then anonymized and scored by FYW and WI instructors, as well as one paid graduate extern, using the AAC&amp;U Critical Thinking rubric. Each item was scored by three readers. Only scores where there were at least two scores that were the same or adjacent were used. We included a score of "0" for cases where readers felt an item did not reach benchmark 1 and a score of "NA" for cases where readers felt the item was not applicable to that element of the rubric. "NA" was not considered to be adjacent to any score 0-4. Valid Scores, Critical Thinking Standard</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Standard 1</td> <td>Standard 2</td> <td>Standard 3</td> <td>Standard 4</td> <td>Standard 5</td> <td>FYW</td> <td>94%</td> <td>96%</td> <td>93%</td> <td>94%</td> <td>94%</td> <td>WIC</td> <td>95%</td> <td>98%</td> <td>91%</td> <td>91%</td> <td>84%</td> </tr> </table>	Standard 1	Standard 2	Standard 3	Standard 4	Standard 5	FYW	94%	96%	93%	94%	94%	WIC	95%	98%	91%	91%	84%
Standard 1	Standard 2	Standard 3	Standard 4	Standard 5	FYW	94%	96%	93%	94%	94%	WIC	95%	98%	91%	91%	84%		



What were the findings from this assessment?

Reviewing averages for all three disciplinary cohorts combined, students in First year Writing fell within benchmark 2 of the AAC&U Critical Thinking rubric for all elements of the rubric except for element 5, Conclusions and Related Outcomes. 1. Explanation of Issues benchmark 2: Issue/ problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/ or backgrounds unknown. 2. Evidence benchmark 2: Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/ evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. 3. Influence of Context and Assumptions benchmark 2: Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). 4. Student's Position benchmark 2: Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue. 5. Conclusions and Related Outcomes benchmark 1: Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. As with the Written Communication component of this assessment project, students showed gains in their critical thinking skills in all areas at the 2000 level WI course. However, at the 3000 and 4000 level, average scores for every element of the rubric dropped below the levels demonstrated in the FYW and 2000 level WI courses. The gains between FYW and WIC's at the 2000 level are encouraging. The decline in scores between the 2000 and 3000/4000 level may warrant more investigation, but should be considered with caution for the following reasons: •As we were unable to acquire student work from a 3000 or 4000 level course in our selected Quantitative major, scores reflect only items drawn from two WI sections at the 3000/4000 level; and •The instructor of one of the remaining 3000/4000 level WI courses selected a group project as the assignment from which items were collected. These factors significantly reduced the N for WI student artifacts generated at the 3000/4000 level to less than half the number of those produced at the 2000 level. Beyond these issues, critical thinking is not a stated goal for Writing Intensive courses, and as with writing, how critical thinking is developed at the upper level may diverge significantly from the skills that are described in the rubric.

How are you using or planning to use the findings from this assessment for program improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you are making to the program as a result of your findings.	We do not yet know how or whether we will use the results of this project to make changes.
---	--

With whom did you share findings from this assessment activity?

Faculty - The study was presented to the GenEd Executive Committee and to participating faculty.

Students - Students are members of the GenEd Executive Committee.

School/College Administration - Findings were presented to Lori Salem, director of the Writing Intensive program, and to Rachael Groner, director of First Year Writing.

### Assessment Activity: Scientific Reasoning Rubric Development Project

SLOs assessed during this report:

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

Please provide a brief name for this assessment activity.	Scientific Reasoning Rubric Development Project
---	---

<p>Describe the assessment method used to assess the learning outcome(s). Provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.</p>	<p>The main purpose of this project was to test the validity of the rubric we have been developing with the help of GenEd instructors in the Science and Technology GenEd area. For the purposes of testing the second draft of the Scientific Reasoning rubric, we used student work collected from courses in the Science and Technology GenEd area during the course recertification process. Initially, all of the instructors involved in editing the rubric were to be involved in scoring student work, but because slightly more than half of the initial group was part-time, we could not award them the stipend to read student work, and only two teams of two full-time instructors ultimately scored items using the draft rubric. Each instructor was assigned approximately 60 items. Each item was read by a team of two readers. All student work was anonymized. Readers used the draft rubric to assign scores, assigning a score of 1-4 in accordance with rubric benchmarks, 0 if the student work did not reach benchmark 1 for an element of the rubric, and NA if the element of the rubric was not applicable. Ratings were submitted using a Google Form.</p>
<p>What were the findings from this assessment?</p>	<p>Because the primary purpose of this project was to test the rubric, we did not generate average scores for student outcomes. There was not sufficient agreement between readers to use the rubric for a large-scale assessment without further editing. For a score to be valid, the two readers had to either assign an item of student work the same, or adjacent scores. The percent of valid scores in each standard of the rubric was as follows, beginning with standard 1: 57%, 39%, 41%, 49%, 53%. There was also a very high number of "not applicable" scores assigned to student work, which may indicate that the rubric does not fit the work generated across the Science and Technology curriculum. The number of individual NA scores assigned for each standard out of a total of 244 scores for each standard was as follows, again beginning with standard 1: 74, 113, 93, 67, 58.</p>
<p>How are you using or planning to use the findings from this assessment for program improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you are making to the program as a result of your findings.</p>	<p>In light of the results of this test, I gathered Science and Technology instructors to work on what will hopefully be the final round of edits to the rubric. We are using the edited version on a larger number of items of student work with a full group of scoring readers this spring.</p>

With whom did you share findings from this assessment activity?

Faculty - Findings were presented to the GenEd Executive Committee and to faculty members who participated in the assessment project.

School/College Administration - The GenEd director has been kept apprised of the progress of this project.

Assessment Activity: Quantitative Literacy in GenEd

SLOs assessed during this report:

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

Please provide a brief name for this assessment activity.	Quantitative Literacy in GenEd
---	--------------------------------

<p>Describe the assessment method used to assess the learning outcome(s). Provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.</p>	<p>In the fall of 2017, we selected one section from each GenEd Quantitative Literacy course offered by a specific instructor. If an instructor taught more than one Quant Lit course, a section was selected from each course. Sections were randomly selected. From each section, three students and two back-up students were randomly selected by using an alphabetized list and a random number generator. Instructors were asked to save student work submitted by the selected students for all assignments throughout the semester. They were additionally asked to score items of student work using a survey set up in SurveyMonkey to reflect the elements of the AAC&amp;U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. In the spring semester of 2018, we solicited faculty volunteers from the GenEd Quantitative Literacy area to score student work using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE rubric. Four full-time instructors volunteered and three graduate students who had taught as TA's or instructors of record were hired as grad externs to fill out the team of scorers. This group met in June 2018 for a norming session, where we discussed the project and practiced scoring samples of student work. Student work was anonymized and assigned a code. Instructors then were given electronic access to student files and submitted scores over the remainder of summer 2018. Each item of student work was read by three readers. Items were assigned scores that reflected the Quantitative Literacy VALUE rubric benchmarks of 1, 2, 3, or 4 (see appendix). Items were assigned a score of "0" if benchmark "1" was not met, or a score of "NA" (Not Applicable) if that element of the rubric did not apply to that item of student work.</p>
--	---

<p>What were the findings from this assessment?</p>	<p>Students scored in the benchmark 2 range for all elements of the VALUE rubric. These are described as follows:1. Interpretation: Provides somewhat accurate explanation of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units2. Representation: Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.3. Calculation: Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.4. Application/Analysis: Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for workmanlike (without inspiration or nuance, ordinary) judgments, drawing plausible conclusions from this work.5. Assumptions: [insufficient data]6. Communication: Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.Only 18 valid scores were registered for standard 5 - Assumptions. During the norming session, this was identified as an area that was unlikely to be strongly represented in GenEd level work, so that outcome was not surprising. The lowest average was for Application/Analysis (average = 2.33) and the highest average was for Calculation (average = 2.87). Calculation was also the element of the rubric that featured the fewest scores of Not Applicable. Of the 297 valid average scores given to items of student work, 186 (63%) were in the 1-4 range, meaning that some calculating was occurring. This finding is important because the question of whether students are actually practicing quantitative skills in the GenEd Quantitative Literacy area, as opposed to writing about numbers or interpreting calculations that have already been completed, is often raised.The areas where skills appear to be least commonly practiced are Application/Analysis, described as the "Ability to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis" (180/281 valid average scores = NA) and Communication, "Expressing quantitative evidence in support of the argument or purpose of the work (in terms of what evidence is used and how it is formatted, presented, and contextualized)" (210/283 valid average scores = NA).</p>
---	--

<p>How are you using or planning to use the findings from this assessment for program improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you are making to the program as a result of your findings.</p>	<p>We will continue this analysis by comparing the reader scores with the scores assigned by faculty members to their own students' work. We have signed up to participate in the AAC&amp;U VALUE Institute using the items collected for this project, which means that we will have independent scorers apply scores to our students' work during the Institute. We also plan to analyse the scores to determine whether improvement in student skills over the course of a semester can be observed. This should be possible, given that we collected, and had readers score items from across the entire semester. Finally, we plan to review items of student work to determine the level of calculations commonly performed, which may help inform discussions of whether Math 701 should be a prerequisite for GenEd courses.</p>
--	--

With whom did you share findings from this assessment activity?

Faculty - Presented to the GenEd Executive Committee and to instructors involved with the project. I plan to present to Quant Lit instructors more broadly.

Students - Students are members of GEEC.

Department Chair - The GenEd director is kept apprised of assessment activities.

### Assessment Activity: Course Recertification 2017-2018

SLOs assessed during this report:

Critical Thinking

Contextualized Learning

Interdisciplinary Thinking

Communication Skills

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

Civic Engagement

Information Literacy

Lifelong Learning

Please provide a brief name for this assessment activity.	Course Recertification 2017-2018
Describe the assessment method used to assess the learning outcome(s). Provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.	For AY 2017-2018, courses in the inventory that have been taught for four years were required to submit a course portfolio which includes: a collaborative narrative describing how the course has changed and how it meets the overarching program goals of critical thinking, communication and information literacy, as well as goals for the Gen Ed breadth area in which the course is situated; syllabi for all sections taught in the current academic year; and student work at the above-, below and average levels that demonstrate overarching program goals. Evaluation of courses includes a rubric designed for each General Education Area. Grade lift, class size and workload differences between sections were also carefully considered.
What were the findings from this assessment?	In this cycle, twenty-five courses were up for recertification and thirty-seven recertification portfolios were received (departments often choose to submit separate portfolios where a course is taught across different departments). Nineteen of the twenty-five courses reviewed had at least one department that was put on probation. The most significant reason for courses being put on probation in this cycle was disparities between sections in workload, assessment of student work and/or how area and program learning goals were being met. The most common recommendation was to find a means of coordinating faculty members within and between departments and colleges. Reviewers were asked whether portfolios met program-wide Student Learning Outcomes, as evidenced by syllabi, assignments and samples of student work provided in the portfolio. Results to this question were as follows: Student Learning Outcome and Percent Yes Responses Required SLO's Critical thinking: 95.24% Communication skills: 89.52% Information literacy: 78.10% Optional SLO's Contextualized learning: 57.69% Interdisciplinary thinking: 49.51% Scientific and quantitative reasoning: 27.62% Civic engagement: 32.38% Lifelong learning: 45.19%



<p>How are you using or planning to use the findings from this assessment for program improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you are making to the program as a result of your findings.</p>	<p>All of the nineteen courses put on "probation" (in two of those cases, it was a specific department put on probation) were required to submit a plan by December 15th to address the issues identified with their course. The plans were received. In spring, follow-up materials will be submitted to demonstrate that the issues with the courses have been addressed. If issues have not been addressed, the courses may be removed from the GenEd inventory. The large number of courses put on probation, along with director Jon Nyquist's presentation to the deans calling for course coordination, prompted the College of Liberal Arts to identify course coordinator for their 20 largest GenEd courses and to provide stipends to support the efforts of these coordinators.</p>
--	---

With whom did you share findings from this assessment activity?

Faculty - Presented to the GenEd Executive Committee, shared with involved faculty members.

Students - Students are members of GEEC.

Department Chair - Results of recertification are communicated with the chair.

School/College Administration - Results of recertification are communicated with the associate dean.

Assessment Activity: ETS Heighten Civic Engagement Report

SLOs assessed during this report:

Civic Engagement

<p>Please provide a brief name for this assessment activity.</p>	<p>ETS Heighten Civic Engagement Report</p>
--	---

<p>Describe the assessment method used to assess the learning outcome(s). Provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.</p>	<p>100 students were administered the ETS Heighen Civic Engagement test, which includes measures of Civic Competency (civic knowledge and skills, including the ability to analyze civic- and political-related issues or situations), Civic Attitudes (reactions to realistic situations in ways that demonstrate civic efficacy and democratic norms and values) and Civic Participation (engagement in a variety of civic and political activities across a wide variety of contexts).</p>
<p>What were the findings from this assessment?</p>	<p>Results for Civic Competency measures shows that 88% of students were proficient or advanced in relation to Civic Competency. 90% were in the medium or higher range for Civic Attitude, meaning that they were likely (66%) or very likely (24%) to: agree with statements that agree with democratic values; encourage the exchange of ideas; express willingness to engage politically; see political participation as worthwhile; and express the view that individuals can effect meaningful change. Items related to Civic Participation showed that Temple students were more likely than the comparison group to participate in local, national and international activities such as participating in student government, working to resolve an issue of public concern, protecting the environment, signing petitions, or volunteering to do community service but less likely than the comparison group to vote in a local or state election. Temple students were more likely than the comparison group to discuss local/state/national political or social issues with others, raise awareness about social/political issues using social media, read articles about national and international events in the newspaper (online or hard copy), and to use online new services to access political information on a daily or weekly basis than the comparison group. They were less likely to discuss campus-related issues, to listen to the news on the radio, or to watch TV news/cable shows for information about international politics and current events than the comparison group, though in all cases, they were as or more likely to do these things occasionally. In general, Temple students appear to participate in civic activities at a higher rate than students in the comparison group, although there were some activities for which scores were fairly weak. For example, 48% of Temple respondents reported that they have not worked together on a matter of public concern.</p>

<p>How are you using or planning to use the findings from this assessment for program improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you are making to the program as a result of your findings.</p>	<p>We will extend this analysis by working with ETS to compare freshmen scores with scores generated by juniors and seniors. I do also plan to present this, and NSSE information to instructors teaching in U.S. Society and Race and Diversity courses.</p>
--	---

With whom did you share findings from this assessment activity?

Department Chair - These results of this analysis were discussed with GenEd director Jon Nyquist.

Assessment Activity: ETS Heighten Assessment of Intercultural Competenc

SLOs assessed during this report:

Intercultural Competency

<p>Please provide a brief name for this assessment activity.</p>	<p>ETS Heighten Assessment of Intercultural Competency and Diversity</p>
<p>Describe the assessment method used to assess the learning outcome(s). Provide enough detail so that we understand the nature of the project.</p>	<p>100 students were administered the ETS Heighten Intercultural Competency and Diversity test, which includes the measures “Analyze and Act” (the ability to take in, evaluate and synthesize relevant information without the bias of preconceived judgments and to translate thought into action) and “Approach” (the overall positivity with which an individual views and responds to cross-cultural interactions).</p>

<p>What were the findings from this assessment?</p>	<p>83% of Temple respondents were proficient or advanced in relation to “Analyze &amp; Act” measures, meaning that in interactions with culturally different others, test takers were moderately or highly aware of, or able to identify the impact of: their own culture, values, etc. on their responses; how certain actions and behaviors may be interpreted by others; how nonverbal behaviors might signal feelings, thoughts and intentions; others’ responses to their own actions and signals; other potential viewpoints; how to use cultural knowledge to enhance interactions; and the importance of monitoring response behavior to engage in culturally appropriate behaviors. This was slightly higher than students in the comparison group. 97% of Temple respondents were in the neutral (81%) or high (16%) groups for “Approach”, meaning that test takers’ view of their own ability to adapt to and navigate within cross-cultural environments, communicate with and understand the intentions and viewpoints of cultural different others, and respond to cross-cultural interactions in a positive way was neutral or high 97% of the time. This was slightly higher than the comparison group.</p>
<p>How are you using or planning to use the findings from this assessment for program improvement? Where applicable, give specific examples of changes you are making to the program as a result of your findings.</p>	<p>As with the Civic Competency instrument, we plan to extend this analysis by working with ETS to analyze outcomes for freshmen versus juniors and seniors. I plan to present this information to Race and Diversity and World Society instructors as well.</p>

With whom did you share findings from this assessment activity?

Department Chair - These results of this analysis were discussed with GenEd director Jon Nyquist.

## Planned Assessment





Information Literacy		X									X						
Lifelong Learning		X															
Ethical Reasoning	X																
Intercultural Competency	X																

Indirect Assessment Activities

SLO	None	Current Student Survey	Graduating Student Survey	Alumni Survey	Employer Survey	Focus Groups	SFFs	Other
Critical Thinking	X							
Contextualized Learning	X							

Interdisciplinary Thinking	X							
Communication Skills						X		X
Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning	X							
Civic Engagement	X							
Information Literacy	X							
Lifelong Learning						X		
Ethical Reasoning	X							
Intercultural Competency	X							

Outcome/Achievement measures planned to monitor this year:

GPA

Other assessment activity planned for upcoming year/ assessment activity details:

This year, we plan to carry out an analysis of workload between different GenEd sections to determine whether and why certain sections demand more of students than others, and whether there are any discernible patterns in variations (e.g., do certain areas feature more or less work outside



the class than others?).

Supporting Documents:

Draft Analysis of Grade Inflation in GenEd.docx(Report)

Assessment committee proposal.pptx(Other: Proposal to integrate direct assessment of )

Ake & Dawson Poster Presentation CAT 2019.pptx(Report)