ASSESSMENT OF GER 7 (HUMANITIES)
SUMMARY REPORT

Name of Institution: _____SUNY CANTON_____

Academic Year:___2018___

Prepared by: Kirk Jones_____

{*specify name of branch campus, if relevant*}

Program improvements made as a result of the previous (2014-2015) assessment of GER 7:

During our last cycle in 2014-2015 we developed a list of adjustment goals listed below:

- Increase rigor of courses so students who exceed standards does not exceed 30% of all students in classes assessed. As our incoming students improve, our courses will have to be altered to account for this improvement.
- We will be returning to the course-by-course, objective-by-objective approach when Task Stream is implemented Fall 2015.
- Due to the implementation of Task Stream, we will be moving towards annual assessment cycles. However, before we move to an annual assessment cycle, we need to find a methodology which allows us to consolidate SUNY mandates and our local Task Stream method of assessment in a way that produces meaningful results and also proves cost effective, particularly in the context of time management. This includes, but is not limited to:
    o Altering our rubric so it aligns with the three-category rubric system employed by Task Stream. We have already acquired approval from SUNY Central.
    o Altering our methodology so data reports exported from Task Stream can provide the majority of our assessment figures.
    o Discussing the efficiency of the embedded objective model we used this semester.
    o Revising our methodology to reflect the changes we implemented this semester to maximize transparency.
    o Simplifying the rhetoric of assessment and the process.

Updates to each area based on our previous plan:

- Increase rigor of courses so students who exceed standards does not exceed 30% of all students in classes assessed. As our incoming students improve, our courses will have to be altered to account for this improvement.

Update: Instead of focusing on the rigor of the courses as a whole, it is more important to focus on the criteria as established by the CSLOs. So as we revise our GER 7 courses, we will be looking at both the requirements embedded within the CSLOs and the alignment of CSLOs to GER 7. This will happen before the next cycle.

- We will be returning to the course-by-course, objective-by-objective approach when Task Stream is implemented Fall 2015.

Update: This is true. We have returned to this approach. However, there is an added caveat. Curriculum Committee has updated the master syllabus so reflection of alignment between CSLO and GER is required. So, instead of assessing all CSLOs in the GER 7 courses, we only will be assessing the CSLOs aligned with GER 7.

To simplify this process we hope to revise our two previous objectives to extract more meaningful data.

- Due to the implementation of Task Stream, we will be moving towards annual assessment cycles. However, before we move to an annual assessment cycle, we need to find a methodology which allows us to consolidate SUNY mandates and our local Task Stream method of assessment in a way that produces meaningful results and also proves cost effective, particularly in the context of time management. This includes, but is not limited to:

  - Altering our rubric so it aligns with the three-category rubric system employed by Task Stream. We have already acquired approval from SUNY Central.
- Update: Done

  - Altering our methodology so data reports exported from Task Stream can provide the majority of our assessment figures.

- Update: Done, but we still provide faculty the option of turning in results via e-mail as they are adjusting.

  - Discussing the efficiency of the embedded objective model we used this semester.

- Update: Done.

- o Revising our methodology to reflect the changes we implemented this semester to maximize transparency.

- Update: Done

  - o Simplifying the rhetoric of assessment and the process.
- Update: Done, but there is still work to be done.

Based on the figures we acquired for this GER 7 assessment cycle, we will endeavor to make the following adjustments:

1. Ultimately the aggregate approach we used this semester is more conducive to faculty autonomy. However, it doesn't allow us to parse out the details of individual outcomes. The biggest challenge for us has been finding a balance between faculty autonomy, the quality of assessment, and the workload associated with the assessment. Thus far, the best course of action seems to reconvene with the humanities department and discuss revision of our GER 7 outcomes so we have aligned data points and quality outcomes that can be assessed and reported out on separately. Ultimately, this is the best from each of our previous methodologies.
2. Other than that, our students are meeting the standards we have set. We may infuse higher-order learning skills within our humanities outcomes, but that isn't required by SUNY as of yet, and higher-order learning skills are still occurring in the courses. They just aren't occurring in the GER 7-aligned CSLOs.

Course-specific improvements:

ENGL 304: I am going to give students more written response assignments throughout the semester that explain more explicitly, in the instructions, how they reflect the course objectives that they reflect. I sometimes give students too much credit for discerning the connections themselves

ENGL 216: In order to increase the success of students, the assignment will be introduced earlier in the semester and include an outline stage that will be turned in and reviewed.

Course material on literary elements will be updated to be more accurate and stress their importance. The assignment description and rubric will be updated to reflect this.

Methodology on Record

GER 7 Humanities

Students will demonstrate:
- 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.

Method:

A random selection will be chosen by the Director of Institutional Research by the end of the semester prior to the semester in which assessment is needed. A minimum 50% sampling rate will be used.

Instructors will develop and assign one of the following:

1. An essay question which allows students to demonstrate proficiency in all course objectives

   OR

2. A short answer exam with separate questions, each of which will be designed to gauge the students' proficiency in a single course objective.

   OR

3. A set of exam questions which allows students to demonstrate proficiency in course objectives.

Faculty will collect student artifacts, assess student proficiency utilizing the rubric (included below).
Results will be entered on Taskstream.

For each measure and corresponding finding reported, please indicate the measure and finding is intended for GER 7 assessment data.

For courses with more than one objective mapped to GER 7, an aggregate score will be calculated to determine overall student proficiency.

Data Collection Report

Instructor & Class_____

You are being asked to complete this form because you are teaching a course that fulfills SUNY Canton's General Education requirement under the category of The Arts. In order to fulfill that requirement, students are expected to meet specific student learning objectives. This form provides a method for documenting student achievement of these learning objectives.

<u>Instructions</u>

Please complete this form for all GER learning objectives. *Within each learning objective, please complete cells for the assessment tools you used, a description of the tool(s) used, the overall results for the SLO, and a reflection/use of the findings: and leave the others blank.*

Please add any comments or suggestions about the form or the general education assessment process at the end of this form.

In addition to completing this form, please include these findings in your course Taskstream workspace, including your assignment guidelines, the rubric used for assessment of student work, as well as at least one student artifact for each level of proficiency (exceeds, meets, does not meet). Be sure to omit all identifying information to maintain student confidentiality.

Thank you!

If you have any questions about how to complete the form or need any clarification of learning objectives or about the General Education assessment process please contact Kirk Jones, jonesk@canton.edu, ex 7719, or Wil Rivers riversw@canton.edu,.

Additional information about General Education assessment at SUNY Canton can be found at http://www.canton.edu/provost/assessment/ger.htm

This form is due to Kirk Jones no later than one week after fall final grade submission.

Learning Objectives:	Assessment tools:	Results/Findings:						Reflection/Use of Findings:
Below is the SUNY criterion for GER 7: Humanities. Faculty members are expected to record student proficiency in the first criteria.	This list represents a variety of tools commonly used to assess this SLO. Please select the tool(s) you will be using for the GER assessment. Please highlight the tool(s) you are using, and add a brief description of the tool used (e.g., final exam essay #2) in the space to the right.	Record the number and percentage of students achieving at the different levels for each objective (not each measure.) Percentages will be based the number of students who participated in the assessment only (e.g., if your course has 10 students enroll, but only 8 take the assessment, those 8 represent the denominator.)						**Based on these results, briefly address what changes you plan for improving student learning.**
1. Students will demonstrate:	**# of students participating in assessment:**	**Exceeded**		**Met**		**Did not meet**		**Please include planned changes to curriculum, teaching and assessment methods, and/or support services**
		Number	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	
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.	Assignment							
	Exam question(s)	**Description of tool(s):**						
	Oral presentation							
	Project (group or individual)							
	Quiz							
	Research paper							
	Student Artifact							
	Student Portfolio							
	Other (Please specify):							

HUMANITIES ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

COURSE OBJECTIVE (input each course objective aligned to GER 7 from course in the spaces below. If you have not completed alignment in your course outlines, select at least one course objective which best encapsulates the GER 7 objective listed above).	Exceeds Standards	Meets Standards	Does Not Meet Standards
	1. Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance meets requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives
	1. Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance meets requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives
	1. Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance meets requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives
	1. Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance meets requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives
	1. Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance meets requirements of course objectives	1. Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives

GER Assessment Policies

Faculty and students will periodically be required to engage in assessment activities to ensure that the General Education learning outcomes are being met.

- o GER student learning outcomes are assessed on a three year cycle through the courses designated as meeting that GER.
- o Any instructor (full-time or adjunct) teaching any course with a GER designator (online or face-to-face) may be called to participate in GER assessment activities.
- o A random sample of GER designated courses are selected by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness during the spring semester preceding the GER assessment year. If a faculty member is teaching two of the same course they have the option of choosing either section for assessment.

- **Timeline for GER Assessment:**
  - o February: Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) notifies GER assessment coordinator of upcoming assessment and calls for methodology revisions (if any)
  - o March 1: Methodology changes for upcoming assessment cycle must be submitted to GER Assessment Subgroup
  - o Mid-April: OIE selects courses up for GER review the following fall and notifies faculty
  - o 1st week of classes (fall): OIE reminds faculty (and notifies new faculty) of GER assessment requirements
  - o End of 4th week of classes: Faculty must enter their assessment measures of GER course SLOs into Taskstream.
  - o End of 5th week of classes: Faculty update GER coordinator on progress with measure entry in Task Stream.
  - o 1 week after final grade submission: Faculty must enter findings to Taskstream measures and submit Data Collection Reports to GER coordinator along with student artifacts.
  - o Friday before the first week of classes: faculty will meet to discuss GER findings and strategic plan for improving student learning.
  - o March 1: GER Summary Report and GER Campus Report due to GER Assessment Subcommittee for review and recommendations.
  - o March 15: GER Assessment Subcommittee presents reports and recommendations to Academic Assessment Committee
  - o April 1: Academic Assessment Committee presents reports to Deans' Cabinet for inclusion in budget (if applicable.)

- **Protocol for creating a new course for GER approval:**

- o For a course to be accepted as a GER course, the GER assessment methodology must be attached to the course proposal as it moves forward to curriculum committee. GER mapping to course SLOs must be present in course proposal.
- o Additional, indicate which course objective will be used to GER assessment.
- o Upon approval, the course objectives must be mapped to the GER the course is approved for

- **Protocol for Methodology Revision**
  - o Faculty who wish to revise their GER methodology must submit proposed methodology to the GER committee by the fifth week of the semester before their assessment cycle begins.
  - o The GER committee will review and provide feedback for revision, and if necessary request a meeting with the GER coordinator. They will provide feedback within six weeks.
  - o Resubmission of the revised methodology must occur by the last day of the semester prior to the assessment cycle the methodology will be used in.
  - o If the methodology does not comply with the needs of the campus and SUNY standards, the previous methodology will be employed for the assessment cycle.

GER 7: Findings Summary 2018

CRN	Course Title	N=#of students enrolled	AN=# of students assessed	Percent Assessed	Exceeds Standards	Meets Standards	Does Not Meet Standards
10768	ENGL 109	22	22	100%	10%	85%	5%
10769	ENGL 304	10	10	100%	0%	70%	30%
10926	ENGL 264	3	3	100%	100%	0%	0%
10554	GMMD 101	23	23	100%	13%	61%	26%
10238	ENGL 216	21	21	100%	30%	50%	20%
10684	ENGL 307	21	21	100%	95%	5%	0%
TOTAL							
		100	**100**	**100%**	**40%**	**45%**	**15%**

performance percentages calculated by percent assessed, not percent enrolled
*** percentages rounded up to nearest 10th*

GER 7: Findings Summary 2014/2015: Objective A* **

CRN	Course Title	N=#of students enrolled	AN=# of students assessed	Percent Assessed	Exceeds Standards	Meets Standards	Approaches Standards	Does Not Meet Standards
20542	ENGL 209	28	27	96%	26%	49%	18%	7%
20901	ENGL 208	9	8	89%	50%	50%	0	0
20334	ENGL 209	26	24	92%	12%	42%	42%	4%
20614	ARTS 201	30	21	70%	46%	13%	7%	7%
20904	ENGL 209	26	25	96%	28%	60%	12%	0
20615	ARTS 202	27	22	81%	55%	19%	24%	2%
20721	ENGL 306	16	15	94%	33%	47%	7%	13%
20592	ENGL 264	23	20	87%	55%	25%	10%	10%
20499	GMMD 101	25	24	96%	46%	54%	0	0
20041	ENGL 216	30	30	100%	0%	56%	0%	44%
20907	ENGL 307	17	15	56%	60%	20%	13%	7%
TOTAL								
		257	**231**	**87%**	**41%**	**39%**	**12%**	**8%**

*performance percentages calculated by percent assessed, not percent enrolled
** percentages rounded up to nearest 10th

GER 7: Findings Summary 2014/2015: Objective B* **

CRN	Course Title	N=#of students enrolled	AN=# of students assessed	Percent Assessed	Exceeds Standards	Meets Standards	Approaches Standards	Does Not Meet Standards
20542	ENGL 209	28	27	96%	26%	41%	26%	7%
20901	ENGL 208	9	8	89%	50%	13%	37%	0
20334	ENGL 209	26	24	92%	13%	50%	33%	4%
20614	ARTS 201	30	21	70%	50%	17%	13%	7%
20904	ENGL 209	26	25	96%	20%	32%	48%	0
20615	ARTS 202	27	22	81%	55%	18%	23%	5%
20721	ENGL 306	16	15	94%	20%	53%	7%	20%
20592	ENGL 264	23	20	87%	30%	50%	20%	0
20499	GMMD 101	25	24	96%	46%	34%	0	20%
20041	ENGL 216	30	30	100%	0%	73%	0%	27%
20907	ENGL 307	17	15	56%	20%	67%	7%	6%
TOTAL								
		257	**231**	**87%**	**31%**	**41%**	**19%**	**9%**

*performance percentages calculated by percent assessed, not percent enrolled
** percentages rounded up to nearest 10th

Comparative Analysis

Primary Disparities:

From our 2014-2015 study:

Students exceeding raised 4% when compared to an aggregate figure from the previous two-objective system.

Students meeting raised 5% when compared to an aggregate figure from the previous two-objective system.

Approaching has been removed as a variable due to our new configuration to align with Taskstream.

This may account for why our "Does Not Meet" has jumped 6% since our last study.

Meaning:

No marked trends to interpret beyond the capacity in which they are interpreted above.

Individual instructors have determined independent courses of action to rectify their issues if necessary.

Course of Action:

Included at the top of the report.