

REPORT ON AY2022-2023 ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

Submission date: 11/15/2023

Assessment Plan covered in the report: General Program AA

College: College of Arts and Sciences

Campuses where the program(s) is delivered: Anchorage KOD KPC MSC PWSC

Submitted by: Mark Fitch, mafitch@alaska.edu

After responding to the questions below, the program should email this form to the dean, with a copy to the appropriate community campus director(s) if the program is delivered on a community campus.

- 1. Please list and number the Program Student Learning Outcomes your program assessed in AY23. For each outcome, indicate one of the following: Exceeded faculty expectations, Met faculty expectations, or Did not meet faculty expectations.**

Example: 1. Communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and formats – Exceeded faculty expectations; 2. Adopt critical perspectives for understanding the forces of globalization and diversity – Met faculty expectations.

1 outcome: communicate effectively- met faculty expectations

- 2. Describe your assessment process in AY23 for these Program Student Learning Outcomes, including the collection of data, analysis of data, and faculty (and other, e.g., advisory board) conversations around the findings. (1000 words or less)**

Near the end of AY22, the UAA Faculty Senate created the General Education Council (GEC) and charged them with the coordination of general education efforts throughout the system. Over the summer of 2022, two faculty, who had both previously worked on general education, worked with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Institutional Effectiveness created an assessment schedule for AY23 and drafted communication to deans and faculty that would start the assessment process.

Following this schedule, emails were sent late in the summer term to the deans informing them of the plan and asking for their support if faculty asked to add assessment work to their work loads. After faculty contracts for fall 2022 began, emails were sent to all UAA faculty informing them that the SLOs focusing on oral and written communication would be assessed. The email to faculty included a copy of the previously established rubrics for both oral and written communication and requested

information on any courses and assignments relevant to the SLOs. The responses from faculty were collected in a Google form.

The returning members of the General Education Working Group, which had coordinated general education efforts for the previous two academic years, met once or twice a month throughout AY23 and were joined by the assessment sub-committee of the GEC after membership of that group was established in the fall of 2022. From here on in this report the full group of assessment faculty will be referred to as the “assessment team.” After the GEC was established, monthly reports from the assessment team were made to the full council.

The fall assessment team meetings included explanations and discussions to introduce new members to the existing general education assessment structure and processes, review of the information on assignments submitted by faculty, and discussions on processes for the rest of the academic year. The team concluded that artifacts from all faculty that responded and those who were individually contacted by the team to add depth and breadth. To assess the impact of general education from its introduction to its later use in both associates and baccalaureate degrees, the team requested, and received artifacts from all levels (100-400) and from both general education and non-general education courses.

In spring 2023, the assessment team used artifacts from previous assessment years to begin norming exercises in Oral and Written Communication. Communication about artifacts with faculty continued. Toward the end of the semester artifacts were collected from faculty. During the week after classes ended, the assessment team met over two days to finish norming with both rubrics this time using current artifacts and to divide up the individual scoring work that was left after the live meetings. Over the summer, the scoring was completed by faculty.

In fall 2023, descriptive statistics were calculated, graphs were created, and the assessment team met to discuss the results.

3. What are the findings and what do they tell the faculty about student learning in your program? (1000 words or less)

Oral Communication:

The Oral Communication Rubric contains four constructs: “Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization”, “Uses clear and suitable language”, “Includes appropriate verbal and non-verbal cues”, and “Develops relevant and adequate content”. Each artifact was assigned a score from 0 to 4 on any constructs relevant to that assignment. A score of 4 indicated “Mastery” in that construct, a score of 3 indicated “Proficiency”, a score of 2 indicated the artifact was “Developing” in that construct, a score of 1 indicated an artifact was at the “Beginning” level, and a score of zero indicated that artifact did not meet the descriptors for the “Beginning” level. The scores were compiled by course level and a median score was computed as the summary statistic for the ordinal Likert-scale data.

100 - level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 100 level course artifacts for the constructs "Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization" and "Uses clear and suitable language" was a score of 3 which is the "proficient" level on our rubric. This score is above our goal for this level of course which is a score of 2. This also is an increase from the developing level (median score of 2) in the two previous years this SLO was assessed using the same rubric. The median score on the construct "Includes appropriate verbal and non-verbal cues" was a 2 (developing) and for "Develops relevant and adequate content" the median score was a 3 (proficient). Both of these, were the same median scores as in previous years.

200-level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 200-level course artifacts for the constructs "Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization", and "Uses clear and suitable language", were at the proficient level (score of 3). The median scores for the constructs "Includes appropriate verbal and non-verbal cues" and "Develops relevant and adequate content" were both 2 ("Developing"). The median scores for all four constructs were the same as they had been in the two previous years this rubric was used to assess artifacts at this level.

300-level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 300-level course artifacts for all four constructs was a 3 ("Proficient"). This was the first time that median scores were computed for artifacts at this course level using this rubric, so this will be a baseline set of scores for future years when this SLO is assessed.

400-level courses

For AY 23, the median score for 400-level course artifacts for the construct "Demonstrates clear and appropriate organization" was a 4, which indicates a typical score at the "Mastery" level. The median score for the construct "Uses clear and suitable language" was a 2.5 which puts the typical score somewhere between the "Developing" and "Proficient" levels. The median score for the construct "Incorporates appropriate verbal and non-verbal cues" was a 2, which is at the "Developing" level. The median score for the construct "Develops relevant and adequate content" was a 3, which is at the "Proficient" level. This was the first time that median scores were computed for artifacts at this course level using this rubric, so this will be a baseline set of scores for future years when this SLO is assessed.

Written Communication:

The Written Communication Rubric contains four constructs: "Responds effectively to the assignment", "Demonstrates effective organization", "Develops content adequately", and "Controls syntax and mechanics". Each artifact was assigned a score from 0 to a 4 on any constructs relevant to that assignment. A score of 4 indicated "Mastery" in that construct, a score of 3 indicated "Proficiency", a score of 2 indicated the artifact was "Developing" in that construct, a score of 1 indicated an artifact was at the "Beginning" level, and a score of zero indicated that artifact did not meet the descriptors for the "Beginning" level. The scores were compiled by course level and a median score was computed as the summary statistic for the ordinal Likert-scale data.

100-level courses:

For AY23, the median score for 100 level course artifacts for the constructs "Responds effectively to the assignment" was a score of 3 which is the "proficient" level on our rubric. This score is above our goal for this level of course which is a score of 2. This is consistent with historical data which showed either a median score of 2.75 or 3 for the three academic years this SLO had been assessed using these methods. The 100-level courses had a median score of 2.5 for the construct "Develops content adequately" and median scores of 2 for the constructs "Demonstrates effective organization" and "Controls syntax and mechanics".

200-level courses:

In AY23, the artifacts scored from 200-level courses received a median score of 3 or "proficient" for three of the constructs: "Responds effectively to the assignment", "Demonstrates effective organization", and "Develops content adequately". The artifacts from 200-level courses have a median score of 2 or "Developing" for the construct "Controls syntax and mechanics". These median scores were greater than or equal to the median scores for the previous years this SLO was assessed.

300 – level courses:

For AY23, the 300-level course artifacts had a median score of 3 or at the "proficient" level in all four constructs on the Written Communication Rubric. The median scores for all four constructs were equal to or very similar to the median scores from the two previous years this rubric was used to assess artifacts at this level.

400-level courses:

For AY23, the 400-level course artifacts had a median score of 3 or at the "proficient" level in all four constructs on the Written Communication Rubric. The median scores for all four constructs were the same as they had been in the two previous years this rubric was used to assess artifacts at this level.

Due to the limited number of courses from which artifacts were received, no generalized conclusions can be made with certainty for either of these SLOs. This resulted in most of our

recommendations being about process rather than about general education quality.

4. Based on the findings, did the faculty make any recommendations for changes to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Yes

- i. **Please describe the recommended action(s), what improvements in student learning the program hopes to see, the proposed timeline, and how the program will know if the change(s) has worked. If no recommendations for changes were made, please explain that decision. (1000 words or less)**

Because the General Program has no major like requirement, it is extra important for students to be aware of how they benefit from the program which is primarily the value they obtain from a general education. This need is compounded in an era when the value of general education is less accepted or understood by students as noted in national news sources. Thus, the following recommendation of the GEC is considered important.

The General Education Assessment Working Group along with the General Education Council recommend that instructors the connection to general education outcomes and the value of those to their lives more explicit in teaching. This may include adding general education student learning outcomes to their course syllabi, including GER SLOs in assignments with an explanation of how it is achieved (TILT like) when they are applicable, and taking time to help students recognize what the lasting benefit of an assignment is.

5. In the past academic year, how did your program use the results of previous assessment cycles to make changes intended to improve student achievement of the Program Student Learning Outcomes? Please check all that apply.

- Course curriculum changes
- Course prerequisite changes
- Changes in teaching methods
- Changes in advising
- Degree requirement changes
- Degree course sequencing
- Course enrollment changes (e.g., course capacity, grading structure [pass/fail, A-F])
- Changes in program policies/procedures
- Changes to Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)
- College-wide initiatives (e.g., High-Impact Practices)
- Faculty, staff, student development
- Other
- No changes were implemented in AY23. *(If no options above were selected)*

If you checked "Other" above, please describe. (100 words or less)

Catalog copy was revised to increase clarity. A new assessment plan was created, but not yet

implemented.

6. Do you have any information about how well these or other past improvements are working? Are they achieving their intended goals? Please include any data or assessment results that help you demonstrate this. (1000 words or less)

Insufficient time to check the impact of the catalog copy change.

By aligning the work of the General Education Assessment Working Group with the newly established Faculty Senate General Education Council we continue to have a consistent assessment team infused with new members which includes content area experts in each of the general education areas. Through our work and planning in AY23 we have established the following list to help guide our future work:

- a. continue to work on a systematic approach with depth and breadth to get student artifacts from across the system
- b. recognize broad faculty support is needed to ensure content area expertise in all gen ed areas
- c. spread the assessment efforts out (specifically to lighten the load from the May assessment efforts)
- d. look into the potential to collect student data along with the artifacts to aid us in conversations around achievement gaps
- e. explore the idea of key assignments that can be used across sections, course levels, and possibly programs
- f. ask instructors who submit artifacts where/how the SLO constructs are present in the assignment

DEAN SECTION (Due to the program on January 15)

After completing the Dean Section and signing it, the dean should email this form to the program, and copy uag_oaa@alaska.edu for posting. If the program is delivered on one or more community campus, the dean should consult with the appropriate community campus director(s) on the response and copy the appropriate community campus director(s) when emailing the response to the program.

1. Based on the program's responses above, what guidance and support do you have for the program moving forward? (200 words or less)

I agree with the recommendation to better articulate the goals of our general education program; this is something CAS has been working on and will continue to work on in our curriculum to careers initiative. The program is encouraged to consider ways in which students in the AA degree program

can be assessed directly, perhaps through an exit exam? Additionally, the program may wish to investigate ways to simplify the assessment process so that it is more sustainable in the future.

- 2. Discuss what the program is doing particularly well in terms of its processes for the assessment and improvement of student learning, for example, the use of a common rubric or prompt, a signature assignment, etc. (200 words or less)**

The assessment is detailed, thoughtful and mirrors that of the gen eds. The assessment committee is commended for their thorough work.

Dean's signature: Jenny McNulty

Date: 1/12/2024