



Core Curriculum Annual Assessment Report
2021-2022

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

July 2022

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Overview	4
Participation.....	4
Undergraduate College Competencies (UCC) Assessment.....	6
Core Foundation Assessment	9
English Composition (EC)	9
First Year Seminar (FYS)	13
Quantitative Literacy (QL).....	16
Global Languages (GL).....	19
Health & Wellness (HW)	23
Core Methods of Inquiry Assessment.....	25
Global Perspectives (GP).....	25
Historical Analysis (HA)	28
Literary Analysis (LA).....	31
Philosophical Inquiry (PI)	34
Scientific Thought (ST)	37
Social & Behavioral Analysis (SBA).....	40
Visual & Performing Arts (VPA).....	43
Appendix	47
CCAB Composition, Charge, and Procedures.....	47
Core SLO Alignments to UCCs	49

Executive Summary

This report represents the 2021-2022 assessment review of the Hood College Core Curriculum (Core). The report contains results relating to the Undergraduate College Competencies (UCCs) and the individual Core areas. Prior to this report, the most recent assessment review of the Core occurred in Fall 2020. The Fall 2020 report iterated the need to annually review Core assessment, but the COVID-19 pandemic and personnel changes in the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment (OIRA) disrupted its implementation. Core assessment will be reviewed on an annual basis moving forward.

A summary of the report findings follows. More detailed assessments for each Core area and recommendations for are included in the body of the report. OIRA compiled this report in conjunction with the Core Curriculum Assessment Board (CCAB).

SLOs

All Core areas have clearly defined student learning outcomes (SLOs), which are [published on the College's website](#). Several Core areas made SLO revisions in 2021-2022, including QL, HW, and GP. The SLOs were adjusted to better reflect the curriculum of the respective areas and tailor the outcomes to encompass the wide variety of courses.

Participation

Overall, the number of course sections that submitted assessment results has increased in the past three years. In 2021-2022, 68% of all Core sections submitted assessment results, compared to 55% in 2020-2021 and 62% in 2019-2020. CCAB and OIRA aim to receive assessment results from 100% of Core sections each semester. The Spring 2022 semester marked the first time that all HW courses were expected to submit assessment results.

Data Summary

All Core areas report that a majority of students earned proficient or higher on each of their SLOs for which data was collected. Among the 53 assessed Core area outcomes, 49 outcomes had at least 70% of students score proficient or advanced. CCAB and OIRA aim for all Core outcomes to have at least 70% of students score proficient or advanced. Out of eleven Core areas that collected data in 2020-2021, seven areas increased the overall percentage of students that scored proficient or advanced in their respective Core area outcomes in 2021-2022. Faculty discussed the relevance and functionality of the SLOs, how to improve the quality of the data in terms of validity and reliability, and how to improve the outcome results.

Strengths

With the addition of HW data collection in 2021-2022, all Core areas now follow a standard process of collecting student learning data and developing actions to improve student learning. All Core areas have developed SLOs and standard rubrics while fostering a culture of continuous improvement. The structure and collaboration of CCAB, area coordinators, and faculty allow for regular discussions and changes to improve student learning.

General Recommendations

The Core would benefit from a revised curriculum with thorough examination of alignment between the College's mission, vision, UCCs, and Core SLOs. In addition, data disaggregation would allow for assessment results to be broken down by student demographic information, promoting areas of improvement for student population groups. This disaggregation will be included in the 2022-2023 assessment report.

Core areas should continuously aim to improve validity and reliability issues, but areas should particularly increase their emphasis on improving SLOs that receive the lowest student achievement levels. Likewise, areas should consider their strengths to ensure their positive results continue in future semesters.

Overview

The current Core, approved by Hood faculty and implemented in 2013, follows a 44-50 credit distribution model. The model comprises of twelve areas across two parts: Foundation (EC, FYS, QL, GL, HW) and Methods of Inquiry (GP, HA, LA, PI, ST, SBA, and VPA).

Faculty began the process of assigning SLOs to the twelve Core areas in 2016. The nine UCCs, which map to each Core area's SLOs, did not originate from the faculty, but rather from a past Provost and past Director of Institutional Research and Assessment. These nine inherited College Competencies were rewritten by CCAB to better align with the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) VALUE Rubrics and approved by the faculty in Fall 2018.

The Core is assessed using a course-level approach. Each Core course instructor is expected to develop assignments to address the SLOs, assess student mastery levels with a common rubric, and report the findings to OIRA. Instructors are expected to refine their assessment tools and/or courses based on the summary assessment data provided by OIRA and report these changes to CCAB via assigned Area Coordinators.

CCAB, organized in 2017 as an ancillary of the Curriculum Committee, is charged with examining how well the Core is meeting its purpose, "to provide students with the basic skills needed to pursue a liberal arts education, to expose them to a variety of modes of inquiry to different disciplines, and to promote critical reflection about global perspectives" (2021-2022 Hood College Catalog). The Board is comprised of an appointed area coordinator for each Core area, a faculty chair of the Board, the Assistant Director of Institutional Assessment, and the Provost. Additional information regarding the Board's charge, composition, and procedures may be found in the Appendix.

Data was collected from August 1, 2021 to May 31, 2022 and was compiled in June and July 2022. The report was disseminated in Fall 2022. This annual report provides a summary of key findings and contains the following components:

- **SLOs** and their UCC alignment
- **Participation** status outlining Core courses for which data was collected
- **Data Summary** including the number of times an SLO was assessed (sum), mean score (average), median, and the percentage of student assessments identified as Novice (1), Emergent (2), Proficient (3), or Advanced (4)
- **Strengths** faculty and/or OIRA identify after analyzing the data and reviewing the assessment process
- **Actionable Items** to address areas for improvement in student abilities and/or the assessment process, based on the Core area data into action plans.

Course descriptions and Core area course lists can be found in the [2021-2022 Hood College Catalog](#). Participation data from courses that meet multiple Core areas is duplicated for their respective areas.

Participation

Hood College relies on instructors to submit assessment results at the conclusion of each Core course. The percentage of Core sections that submitted assessment results increased in 2021-2022 (68%) from 2020-2021 (55%) and 2019-2020 (62%). CCAB and OIRA aim to receive assessment results from 100% of Core sections each semester. Substantially more submissions in EC, HW, LA, and VPA raised the overall participation rate. QL and GP also had a larger percentage of sections that submitted results in 2021-2022 versus 2020-2021. FYS maintained its perfect submission rate of 100%.

Physical Education courses within the HW Core area submitted assessment results for the first time in 2021-2022. The HW and VPA assessment results were collected via Excel spreadsheets, rather than the traditional submission method in Chalk & Wire (C&W). The alternate Excel method enabled instructors to still collect data in courses where students do not submit artifacts online, a common practice in HW and VPA courses.

Other Core areas showed a decline in participation rates from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022. These areas include GL, HA, PI, ST, and SBA. In 2022-2023, further attention will be invested into areas with a declining participation rate by increasing communication and invitations for support from OIRA.

Participation Per Core Area (2021-2022)			
Core Area	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
English Composition (EC)	21	18	86%
First Year Seminar (FYS)	25	25	100%
Quantitative Literacy (QL)	16	14	88%
Global Languages (GL)	8	4	50%
Health & Wellness (HW)	37	15	41%
Global Perspectives (GP)	36	25	69%
Historical Analysis (HA)	11	7	64%
Literary Analysis (LA)	15	12	80%
Philosophical Inquiry (PI)	12	3	25%
Scientific Thought (ST)	42	34	81%
Social & Behavioral Analysis (SBA)	30	22	73%
Visual & Performing Arts (VPA)	26	15	58%
Total	279	194	70%

Participation Per Core Area (2020-2021)			
Core Area	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
English Composition (EC)	20	15	75%
First Year Seminar (FYS)	23	23	100%
Quantitative Literacy (QL)	17	2	12%
Global Languages (GL)	7	5	71%
Health & Wellness (HW)	40	0	0%
Global Perspectives (GP)	27	16	59%
Historical Analysis (HA)	11	8	73%
Literary Analysis (LA)	12	6	50%
Philosophical Inquiry (PI)	11	7	64%
Scientific Thought (ST)	42	38	90%
Social & Behavioral Analysis (SBA)	28	21	75%
Visual & Performing Arts (VPA)	26	4	15%
Total	264	145	55%

Participation Per Core Area (2019-2020)			
Core Area	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
English Composition (EC)	21	21	100%
First Year Seminar (FYS)	22	21	95%
Quantitative Literacy (QL)	19	12	63%
Global Languages (GL)	9	2	22%
Health & Wellness (HW)	37	1	3%
Global Perspectives (GP)	32	24	75%
Historical Analysis (HA)	16	14	88%
Literary Analysis (LA)	13	8	62%
Philosophical Inquiry (PI)	11	9	82%
Scientific Thought (ST)	43	41	95%
Social & Behavioral Analysis (SBA)	30	16	53%
Visual & Performing Arts (VPA)	27	5	19%
Total	280	174	62%

Undergraduate College Competencies (UCC) Assessment

UCC Descriptions

Core area SLOs are mapped to the various UCCs. The mapping can be found in the Core area SLO lists and also in the Appendix.


Upon graduation, undergraduate students will be able to:		
Number	Title	Description
UCC 1	Written Communications	Demonstrate an understanding of various writing contexts, purposes, and audiences. Develop and communicate ideas in clear, coherent, and persuasive writing. Demonstrate fluency in language, style, and source conventions.
UCC 2	Oral Communications	Demonstrate an understanding of various presentation contexts, purposes, and audiences, including interpersonal, group, and mass communications. Develop and communicate ideas clearly, coherently, and effectively using visual, verbal, and non-verbal modes. Demonstrate fluency in language, style, and source conventions.
UCC 3	Information Literacy	Access information and data sources appropriate to a research question. Critically evaluate sources for accuracy, currency, relevance, authority, and purpose. Use strategies to navigate the ethical and legal issues surrounding published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.
UCC 4	Quantitative Literacy	Use and interpret quantitative data arising in a variety of contexts and forms. Apply appropriate mathematical methods and technologies to address real-world problems. Develop data-supported arguments in tabular, graphic, numerical, and written form.
UCC 5	Critical Reasoning	Construct, analyze, or evaluate arguments using logical reasoning, sound evidence, and multiple perspectives.
UCC 6	Technological Skills	Use technologies to collect, manage, analyze, and/or communicate data/information. Navigate major legal, ethical, and security issues in information technology.
UCC 7	Values	Understand some of the ways in which values influence policies and practices across government, business, and society as well as some of the reasons used to defend existing cultural, societal, and personal values. Identify potential conflicts arising among different value systems and strategies for engaging in meaningful discussions about them.
UCC 8	Ethics	Recognize ethical issues in personal, professional, or societal contexts. Describe, apply, and evaluate different ethical perspectives and concepts.
UCC 9	Diversity and Global Awareness	Compare historical processes, cultural practices, ideological frameworks, and/or institutional structures across varying local or global communities. Recognize cultural practices, institutions, and ideologies that contribute to hierarchies and inequalities across groups/communities. Develop ways of thinking and behaving that recognize and respect persons of diverse backgrounds.

UCC Results From Core Courses (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
UCC	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
UCC 1	5,591	3.25	3	192	819	1,968	2,612	3%	15%	35%	47%
UCC 2	1,284	3.52	4	33	88	335	828	3%	7%	26%	64%
UCC 3	967	3.12	3	84	147	308	428	9%	15%	32%	44%
UCC 4	1,197	3.07	3	87	260	330	520	7%	22%	28%	43%
UCC 5	4,626	3.15	3	199	814	1,704	1,909	4%	18%	37%	41%
UCC 6	830	3.25	4	50	106	257	417	6%	13%	31%	50%
UCC 7	1,627	3.53	4	35	107	441	1,044	2%	7%	27%	64%
UCC 8	1,478	3.51	4	34	106	416	922	2%	7%	28%	62%
UCC 9	1,403	3.21	3	54	251	441	657	4%	18%	31%	47%
Total	19,003	3.27	3	768	2,698	6,200	9,337	4%	14%	33%	49%
				Prof. & Advanced		15,537		Prof. & Advanced		82%	


UCC Results From Core Courses (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
UCC	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
UCC 1	5,154	3.16	3	194	844	2,041	2,075	4%	16%	40%	40%
UCC 2	1,210	3.52	4	22	110	300	778	2%	9%	25%	64%
UCC 3	678	3.05	3	46	118	273	241	7%	17%	40%	36%
UCC 4	955	2.82	3	62	278	383	232	6%	29%	40%	24%
UCC 5	3,675	3.00	3	193	745	1,618	1,119	5%	20%	44%	30%
UCC 6	342	3.03	3	29	47	150	116	8%	14%	44%	34%
UCC 7	1,593	3.36	4	46	202	470	875	3%	13%	30%	55%
UCC 8	1,585	3.33	4	72	200	450	863	5%	13%	28%	54%
UCC 9	1,020	2.91	3	35	285	440	260	3%	28%	43%	25%
Total	16,212	3.14	3	699	2,829	6,125	6,559	4%	17%	38%	40%
				Prof. & Advanced		12,684		Prof. & Advanced		78%	

UCC Results From Core Courses (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
UCC	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
UCC 1	5,617	3.06	3	225	1,142	2,294	1,956	4%	20%	41%	35%
UCC 2	600	3.50	4	14	52	157	377	2%	9%	26%	63%
UCC 3	956	2.99	3	54	200	404	298	6%	21%	42%	31%
UCC 4	1,071	2.76	3	71	329	454	217	7%	31%	42%	20%
UCC 5	4,162	2.97	3	188	967	1,779	1,228	5%	23%	43%	30%
UCC 6	574	2.95	3	50	122	211	191	9%	21%	37%	33%
UCC 7	1,259	3.27	3	39	164	472	584	3%	13%	37%	46%
UCC 8	1,138	3.28	3	35	150	413	540	3%	13%	36%	47%
UCC 9	1,117	2.84	3	45	324	518	230	4%	29%	46%	21%
Total	16,494	3.04	3	721	3,450	6,702	5,621	4%	21%	41%	34%
				Prof. & Advanced		12,323		Prof. & Advanced		75%	

UCC Results From Core Courses (2021-2022)



UCC Results From Core Courses (2021-2022)



Strengths

More Undergraduate College Competency (UCC) assessment results were collected in 2021-2022 than 2020-2021 and 2019-2020 in Core courses. UCC 1 (Written Communications) and UCC 5 (Critical Reasoning) received the highest number of measurements due to the standard assignments in FYS, taken by all first year students.

A higher percentage of students achieved proficient or advanced in 2021-2022 (82%) versus the previous year (78%) among all UCCs. The overall improvement in UCC achievement can be attributed to strong outcome improvements in particular outcomes: UCC 9 (Diversity and Global Awareness), UCC 8 (Ethics), UCC 4 (Quantitative Literacy), and UCC 7 (Values). The percentage of UCC 9 assessments that scored proficient or advanced increased from 68% in 2020-2021 to 78% in 2021-2022.

An increased emphasis on issues of social responsibility from the College and instructors in 2021-2022, given current events and the emergence out of the pandemic, may have increased performance on several competencies, including UCCs 7, 8, and 9.

Validity & Reliability

Most Core areas have aligned their respective Core outcomes with the UCCs. Instructors assess student achievement based on standard rubrics for Core outcomes, and the data is funneled into its respective UCC alignment. Thus, it should be noted that UCC results are aggregate and broad-level data.

Actionable Items

As a result of the 2021-2022 UCC data, the College should aim to improve UCC 4 (Quantitative Analysis) in the future, which received the lowest percentage of students that scored proficient or advanced (71%). Only QL outcome #2 and ST outcome #3b currently align with UCC 4. The low performance results for UCC 4 reflect a curriculum that has minimal area outcome alignments to the competency.

Increased intentionality must be placed on aligning Core area outcomes with the UCCs as the College continues to explore a revised Core. The vast majority of the Core area outcomes currently align with UCC 1 or UCC 5. A revised Core should feature a balanced distribution of UCC alignments to ensure students receive multiple opportunities to achieve all competencies.

The College should also aim to improve student achievement on UCC 3 (Information Literacy). Faculty conversations have arisen regarding the current challenges that students face with information literacy. Continued faculty discussions, workshops, and library involvement will be needed to address UCC 3.

Core Foundation Assessment

English Composition (EC)

SLOs

Students will be able to write with clarity in English	
Number	Description
EC 1 (UCC 1, 5)	Develop an effective thesis and support it well with evidence
EC 2 (UCC 1, 5)	Formulate well-organized and coherent essays
EC 3 (UCC 1)	Write with clarity and precision using appropriate tone and diction
EC 4 (UCC 1)	Apply conventions of standard U.S. English concerning grammar, syntax, spelling, punctuation, and mechanics
EC 5 (UCC 3)	Cite sources accurately and in current MLA style

Participation

EC improved on its historically strong assessment reporting in 2021-2022. Instructors have assessed at least 75% of EC sections in each of the past three years.

English Composition Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	21	18	86%
2020-2021	20	15	75%
2019-2020	21	21	100%


Data Summary

The overall percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced across all SLOs has remained consistent over the past three years, scoring between 80% and 83% each year. EC 1, EC 2, and EC 3 showed a slight decrease in student performance from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022. EC 4 and EC 5 showed a slight increase in year-to-year student performance.


English Composition Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
EC 1	152	3.25	4	9	24	39	80	6%	16%	26%	53%
EC 2	152	3.28	3	2	26	52	72	1%	17%	34%	47%
EC 3	152	3.32	3	2	20	57	73	1%	13%	38%	48%
EC 4	152	3.34	3	1	16	65	70	1%	11%	43%	46%
EC 5	152	2.94	3	14	29	61	48	9%	19%	40%	32%
Total	760	3.23	3	28	115	274	343	4%	15%	36%	45%
				Prof. & Advanced		617		Prof. & Advanced		81%	

English Composition Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
EC 1	128	3.23	3	7	16	46	59	5%	13%	36%	46%
EC 2	128	3.38	4	3	14	43	68	2%	11%	34%	53%
EC 3	128	3.36	3	2	11	54	61	2%	9%	42%	48%
EC 4	128	3.30	3	2	16	52	58	2%	13%	41%	45%
EC 5	128	2.97	3	15	23	41	49	12%	18%	32%	38%
Total	640	3.25	3	29	80	236	295	5%	13%	37%	46%
				Prof. & Advanced		531		Prof. & Advanced		83%	

English Composition Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
EC 1	179	3.16	3	12	33	48	86	7%	18%	27%	48%
EC 2	179	3.45	4	3	20	50	106	2%	11%	28%	59%
EC 3	179	3.33	4	3	27	57	92	2%	15%	32%	51%
EC 4	179	3.18	3	0	31	85	63	0%	17%	47%	35%
EC 5	179	3.01	3	15	33	66	65	8%	18%	37%	36%
Total	895	3.23	3	33	144	306	412	4%	16%	34%	46%
				Prof. & Advanced		718		Prof. & Advanced		80%	



English Composition Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

In 2021-2022, students received highest percentage of proficient or advanced scores in EC 3 (86%) and EC 4 (89%). EC 1 received 78% of students score proficient or advanced and EC 2 received 82%. These also values have shown consistency in previous years.

EC faculty attribute the strong and consistent performance to the stylistically common, research-based essay capstone course assignment. Scored independently of course grades, the assignment uses a standard four-point rubric based on the Core and course outcomes.

Validity & Reliability

EC courses administer a researched-based essay capstone assignment each semester, which has been reviewed for alignment with the SLOs. Scoring variations exist across instructors, given the large percentage of adjunct EC instructors. However, the standard rubric minimizes reliability issues by detailing performance and scoring expectations.

Actionable Items

EC 5 received the lowest percentage of students that scored proficient or advanced (72%) in 2021-2022, which continues a low and inconsistent scoring trend from previous years. To improve on EC 5, instructors have added rigorous MLA instruction in every section, covering the rationale for documentation, practice exercises with documentation styles and formats, and the application of in-text and works cited documentation for all major course writings. EC 5, in addition to EC 1, received the highest percentage of students that scored Novice. Early in the semester, instructors should identify and provide support for students who are at pace for Novice achievement levels in EC 1 and EC 5. The Library will continue to support MLA instruction with information sessions for each English Composition section.

First Year Seminar (FYS)

SLOs

Number	Title	Description
FYS 1	FYS: Pre and Post Writing Assignments	Students will demonstrate an ability to develop and present a logically convincing written argument, accurately utilizing source material as persuasive evidence to support their thesis. They will present their ideas clearly, employ an assigned citation style (MLA, APA, Chicago, etc.) and follow the conventions of standard written English usage and mechanics.
FYS 1.1 (UCC 5)	Accuracy	Accurately utilize source material as persuasive evidence to support their thesis.
FYS 1.2 (UCC 5)	Argument	Demonstrate an ability to develop and present a logically convincing written argument.
FYS 1.3 (UCC 1)	Clarity	Present ideas clearly.
FYS 1.4 (UCC 1)	Presentation	Employ an assigned citation style and follow the conventions of standard written English usage and mechanics.
FYS 2	Research Skills Assignment	Students will be able to develop a research question; to identify potential sources; to evaluate the selected sources for currency, relevance, authority, and purpose relative to the research question; to provide citations using appropriate style and mechanics.
FYS 2.1	Research Question	Develop a research question.
FYS 2.2 (UCC 3)	Potential Sources	Identify potential sources.
FYS 2.3 (UCC 3)	Evaluate Sources	Evaluate the selected sources for currency, relevance, authority, and purpose relative to the research question.
FYS 2.4	Citations and Mechanics	Provide citations using appropriate style and mechanics

Participation

All 2021-2022 FYS sections submitted assessment results continue its 100% reporting for the second consecutive year.

First Year Seminar Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	25	25	100%
2020-2021	23	23	100%
2019-2020	22	21	95%

Data Summary


FYS showed a slight drop in the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced in 2021-2022 (73%) versus the previous year (76%) among all outcomes. However, the overall percentage of students who scored advanced increased from 29% to 35%.

First Year Seminar Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
FYS 1.1	495	3.17	3	12	87	202	194	2%	18%	41%	39%
FYS 1.2	495	3.02	3	21	112	196	166	4%	23%	40%	34%
FYS 1.3	495	3.11	3	20	97	189	189	4%	20%	38%	38%
FYS 1.4	495	2.94	3	36	119	181	159	7%	24%	37%	32%
FYS 2.1	239	3.11	3	15	39	90	95	6%	16%	38%	40%
FYS 2.2	239	2.95	3	26	43	86	84	11%	18%	36%	35%
FYS 2.3	239	2.97	3	22	42	95	80	9%	18%	40%	33%
FYS 2.4	239	2.74	3	41	50	78	70	17%	21%	33%	29%
Total	2,936	3.02	3	193	589	1,117	1,037	7%	20%	38%	35%
				Prof. & Advanced		2,154		Prof. & Advanced		73%	


First Year Seminar Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
FYS 1.1	449	3.03	3	14	76	241	118	3%	17%	54%	26%
FYS 1.2	449	2.96	3	18	101	210	120	4%	22%	47%	27%
FYS 1.3	449	3.01	3	11	95	221	122	2%	21%	49%	27%
FYS 1.4	449	2.93	3	13	107	228	101	3%	24%	51%	22%
FYS 2.1	195	3.15	3	3	37	83	72	2%	19%	43%	37%
FYS 2.2	195	3.18	3	13	27	67	88	7%	14%	34%	45%
FYS 2.3	195	3.10	3	8	36	80	71	4%	18%	41%	36%
FYS 2.4	195	2.94	3	17	39	78	61	9%	20%	40%	31%
Total	2,576	3.02	3	97	518	1,208	753	4%	20%	47%	29%
				Prof. & Advanced		1,961		Prof. & Advanced		76%	

First Year Seminar Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
FYS 1.1	533	2.90	3	25	128	255	125	5%	24%	48%	23%
FYS 1.2	533	2.82	3	26	151	247	109	5%	28%	46%	20%
FYS 1.3	533	2.88	3	18	147	251	117	3%	28%	47%	22%
FYS 1.4	533	2.68	3	36	186	222	89	7%	35%	42%	17%
FYS 2.1	232	2.97	3	14	44	108	66	6%	19%	47%	28%
FYS 2.2	232	2.85	3	15	60	102	55	6%	26%	44%	24%
FYS 2.3	232	2.88	3	10	58	114	50	4%	25%	49%	22%
FYS 2.4	232	2.66	3	35	52	101	44	15%	22%	44%	19%
Total	3,060	2.83	3	179	826	1,400	655	6%	27%	46%	21%
				Prof. & Advanced		2,055		Prof. & Advanced		67%	

First Year Seminar Outcome Results (2021-2022)



First Year Seminar Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

FYS, taken by all first year students, administers three assessed assignments each year and consistently collects a high number of FYS measurements. The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on FYS 1.1 (80%) and FYS 2.1 (77%) in 2021-2022.

Validity & Reliability

FYS assessment includes a pre- and post-writing assignment to review changes in student learning throughout each course, in addition to a research assignment. The pre/post assessment method provides a standard method for assessing students and their learning as a result of the course. However, due to the large quantity of staff teaching FYS sections, large variations in learning and performance expectations exist across sections. FYS is revising their SLOs, assessed assignments, and rubrics to address the validity and reliability concerns.

Actionable Items

As previously mentioned in the Validity & Reliability section, FYS is revising their SLOs, assessed assignments, and rubrics to address the validity and reliability concerns. FYS instructors have acknowledged that FYS students and the program itself have changed over time, but the outcomes have not been revised. Revised outcomes will allow clear curriculum and performance expectations for FYS. In addition to the SLO revisions, FYS will create more calibration training for instructors, ensuring that students are receiving a consistent education across the various sections.

Quantitative Literacy (QL)

SLOs

Students will be able to interpret and manipulate quantitative data arising in a variety of contexts using elementary mathematical tools and communicate arguments in many ways – using tables, graphs, mathematical expressions, and words.		
Number	Title	Description
QL 1 (UCC 5)	Interpret Quantitative Data	Interpret quantitative data arising in a variety of contexts
QL 2 (UCC 4)	Demonstrate Computational Fluency	Demonstrate computational fluency, including the use of technology as appropriate.
QL 3 (UCC 6)	Communicate Arguments: Tools	Communicate arguments using quantitative tools such as tables, graphs, and mathematical expressions.
QL 4 (UCC 1, 5)	Communicate Arguments: Narrative	Communicate arguments through the narrative analysis

NOTE: QL removed an outcome in 2021-2022 (QL 3 Create Arguments: Create arguments using data). QL faculty removed the outcome due to its difficulty to assess and its similarity with current outcomes QL 3 and QL 4.

Participation

Assessment reporting for QL rebounded in 2021-2022 following a dip in 2020-2021.

Quantitative Literacy Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	16	14	88%
2020-2021	17	2	12%
2019-2020	19	12	63%

Data Summary


QL showed a strong increase in the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced in 2021-2022 (78%) versus the previous year (67%) among all outcomes. QL collected substantially more data following the launch of a new standard assessment instrument in MATH 112 and MATH 201 in Fall 2021.

Quantitative Literacy Outcome Results (2021-2022)															
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent							
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced				
QL 1	254	3.09	3	20	49	72	113	8%	19%	28%	44%				
QL 2	254	3.35	4	20	28	48	158	8%	11%	19%	62%				
QL 3	255	3.38	4	12	29	63	151	5%	11%	25%	59%				
QL 4	255	3.05	3	23	45	84	103	9%	18%	33%	40%				
Total	1,018	3.22	4	75	151	267	525	7%	15%	26%	52%				
				Prof. & Advanced				792							
								Prof. & Advanced				78%			


Quantitative Literacy Outcome Results (2020-2021)															
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent							
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced				
QL 1	37	2.97	3	3	10	9	15	8%	27%	24%	41%				
QL 2	37	3.08	3	3	9	7	18	8%	24%	19%	49%				
QL 3	43	3.30	4	1	10	7	25	2%	23%	16%	58%				
QL 4	43	2.79	3	6	11	12	14	14%	26%	28%	33%				
Total	160	3.04	3	13	40	35	72	8%	25%	22%	45%				
				Prof. & Advanced				107							
								Prof. & Advanced				67%			

Quantitative Literacy Outcome Results (2019-2020)															
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent							
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced				
QL 1	187	3.10	3	13	33	63	78	7%	18%	34%	42%				
QL 2	171	2.96	3	20	36	46	69	12%	21%	27%	40%				
QL 3	159	2.83	3	15	45	51	48	9%	28%	32%	30%				
QL 4	197	2.86	3	20	48	68	61	10%	24%	35%	31%				
Total	714	2.94	3	68	162	228	256	10%	23%	32%	36%				
				Prof. & Advanced				484							
								Prof. & Advanced				68%			

Quantitative Literacy Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Quantitative Literacy Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on QL 2 (81%) and QL 3 (84%) in 2021-2022, which also held the highest outcome scores in 2020-2021. The overall percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced in 2021-2022 (78%) represents a strong increase from 2020-2021 (67%) and 2019-2020 (68%). QL 2 showed an especially strong year-to-year improvement, increasing from 68% in 2020-2021 to 81% in 2021-2022.

Validity & Reliability

QL instructors collectively select and review assessed assignments, and they individually score student submissions using a standard rubric. However, QL instructors have still identified scoring variations across sections, indicating a need to address validity (assessment tools) and reliability (rater consistency).

Actionable Items

The lowest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on QL 1 (73%) and QL 4 (73%) in 2021-2022. QL 4 also received the lowest percentage in 2020-2021 (60%). QL instructors will focus on improving QL 4 reducing scoring variations between sections in the upcoming year. The Core area will review the current assignments, examine the functionality of the existing rubric, and conduct at least one calibration session to norm scoring across sections.

Global Languages (GL)

SLOs

Students will be able to function successfully using the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) of a foreign language and develop awareness of a foreign culture.		
Number	Title	Description
GL 1	Listening Comprehension	Students are able to understand some information from sentence-length speech in basic personal and social contexts.
GL 2	Spoken Communication	
GL 2.1	Making Basic Spoken Statements	Students are able to handle a limited number of uncomplicated communicative tasks by creating with the language in straightforward social situations (including but not limited to basic personal information and basic needs).
GL 2.2 (UCC 2)	Answering Questions	Students can answer direct questions or request for information with some difficulty.
GL 3	Written Communication	
GL 3.1	Creating Questions	Students can formulate questions based upon familiar material.
GL 3.2 (UCC 1)	Writing Simple Sentences	Students can write short and simple sentences on topics tied to highly predictable content areas and personal information.
GL 4	Reading	
GL 4.1	Understand Text	Students can understand simple facts and information presented in short, uncomplicated texts.
GL 4.2	Comprehend Vocabulary	Students can understand key words, cognates, and formulaic phrases in contextualized texts.

Participation

The following participation numbers represent the Core assessment of GL 102 courses. The GL 101 courses are not expected to submit assessment data due to the sequential nature of the GL requirement. Half of GL 102 sections submitted assessment data in 2021-2022, a decline from the previous year.

Global Languages Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	8	4	50%
2020-2021	7	5	71%
2019-2020	9	2	22%

Data Summary

GL alternates its annual assessment collection between GL 1 (listening) and GL 2 (speaking) versus GL 3 (writing) and GL 4 (reading). Students scored proficient or advanced in 74% of GL 3 and GL 4 assessments in 2021-2022.


Global Languages Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
GL 1	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 2.1	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 2.2	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 3.1	71	2.93	3	3	22	23	23	4%	31%	32%	32%
GL 3.2	71	3.07	3	3	20	17	31	4%	28%	24%	44%
GL 4.1	71	3.18	3	0	15	28	28	0%	21%	39%	39%
GL 4.2	71	3.23	3	0	12	31	28	0%	17%	44%	39%
Total	284	3.10	3	6	69	99	110	2%	24%	35%	39%
				Prof. & Advanced		209		Prof. & Advanced		74%	


Global Languages Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
GL 1	113	3.38	4	1	14	39	59	1%	12%	35%	52%
GL 2.1	113	3.63	4	1	9	21	82	1%	8%	19%	73%
GL 2.2	113	3.40	4	1	13	39	60	1%	12%	35%	53%
GL 3.1	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 3.2	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 4.1	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 4.2	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	339	3.47	4	3	36	99	201	1%	11%	29%	59%
				Prof. & Advanced		300		Prof. & Advanced		88%	

Global Languages Outcome Results (2019-2020)

Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
GL 1	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 2.1	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 2.2	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GL 3.1	21	3.33	3	0	3	8	10	0%	14%	38%	48%
GL 3.2	21	3.24	3	0	5	6	10	0%	24%	29%	48%
GL 4.1	21	3.10	3	1	4	8	8	5%	19%	38%	38%
GL 4.2	21	3.24	3	1	3	7	10	5%	14%	33%	48%
Total	84	3.23	3	2	15	29	38	2%	18%	35%	45%
				Prof. & Advanced		67		Prof. & Advanced		80%	

Global Languages Outcome Results (2021-2022)





Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on GL 4.1 (79%) and GL 4.2 (83%) in 2021-2022, which are the reading SLOs.

Validity & Reliability

GL instructors use a standard rubric to ensure consistent scoring of student submissions. However, large year-to-year variations occur because of the alternating outcome collections and low reporting rates. Instructors individually decide which assignment(s) should be designated for assessment in alignment with the GL outcomes.

Actionable Items

GL should ensure that more sections submit assessment data in 2022-2023 to increase data reliability. The lowest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on GL 3.1 (65%) and GL 3.2 (68%) in 2021-2022, which are the writing SLOs. Discussions among GL faculty should occur to address these outcome results. A data into action plan, which was not submitted in Fall 2021, should be completed to develop more specific actions for the Core area.

Health & Wellness (HW)

SLOs

Number	Description
HW 1 (UCC 3)	Identify and evaluate credible sources for researching topics on health, wellness, and physical activities.
HW 2 (UCC 2)	Communicate or demonstrate knowledge of best practices regarding topics on health, wellness, and physical activity.
HW 3 (UCC 7)	Assess their own habits and abilities in relation to best practices for achieving health and wellness and/or a physical activity.
HW 4 (UCC 5)	Develop a plan for continuous improvement of health and wellness habits and/or a physical activity.

Participation

All HW instructors were expected to submit outcome achievement results for the first time in Spring 2022, resulting in a sharp increase in reporting for 2021-2022. Instructors submitted data via Excel spreadsheets in Spring 2022, allowing student learning to be captured in Physical Education sections where students must demonstrate physical competency and do not submit online artifacts.


Health & Wellness Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	37	15	41%
2020-2021	40	0	0%
2019-2020	37	1	3%

Data Summary


HW outcomes were revised for Spring 2022, and instructors submitted assessment data for the first time in Spring 2022. Thus, the information below only shows data from 2021-2022. Students scored proficient or advanced on 96% of HW measurements.

Health & Wellness Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
HW 1	110	3.39	4	0	19	29	62	0%	17%	26%	56%
HW 2	161	3.45	3	0	4	80	77	0%	2%	50%	48%
HW 3	149	3.61	4	0	1	56	92	0%	1%	38%	62%
HW 4	149	3.60	4	0	0	60	89	0%	0%	40%	60%
Total	569	3.52	4	0	24	225	320	0%	4%	40%	56%
				Prof. & Advanced		545		Prof. & Advanced		96%	

Health & Wellness Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Health & Wellness Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on HW 2 (98%), HW 3 (99%), and HW 4 (100%) in 2021-2022. Instructors submitted Spring 2022 data for 15 out of 18 sections, a strong submission rate for the first semester of data collection.

Validity & Reliability

HW instructors launched new outcomes and a standard rubric in Spring 2022. The new outcomes and rubric aimed to standardize learning expectations for both Physical Education courses and traditional classroom courses. Instructors individually selected assignments to best align with the SLOs. CCAB and OIRA hosted HW workshops to familiarize instructors with the outcomes, rubric, and assessment expectations. The rubric may require revisions to clarify the various achievement levels and improve reliability.

Actionable Items

HW will continue amassing data to identify learning trends in the future. The lowest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on HW 1 (83%) in 2021-2022. The Core area should examine the HW 1 achievement level next year to determine whether the lower value in 2021-2022 was an abnormality or part of a larger trend.

Core Methods of Inquiry Assessment

Global Perspectives (GP)

SLOs

Number	Title	Description
GP 1.1 (UCC 9)	Examine Global Significance	Critically examines a text, discourse, artifact, or institution of global significance in its historical, cultural, economic, and/or political context.
GP 1.2 (UCC 7, 8)	Analyze for Impact: Across Boundaries	Analyze a cultural, ideological, or institutional process and/or impact that transcends two or more boundaries in space and/or time.
GP 2.1 (UCC 1)	Clear Communications	Writes about global issues and processes with clarity.
GP 2.2 (UCC 1)	Thesis	Develops a thesis statement that responds to global issues and problems.
GP 2.3 (UCC 1)	Citations	Utilizes appropriate citation format.

NOTE: GP removed an outcome in 2021-2022 (GP 3c Visual Communication: Uses appropriate visual communication to convey information about global studies). GP faculty removed the outcome due to its difficulty to assess and its relative lack of curricular importance in comparison to the other outcomes. The GP outcome numbers were subsequently adjusted.

Participation

GP typically runs among the most course sections of any Core area per year and has the greatest number of overall core course options, most of which span multiple departments. The percentage of assessed sections was higher in 2021-2022 (69%) than 2020-2021 (59%) but was lower than 2019-2020 (75%).

Global Perspectives Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	36	25	69%
2020-2021	27	16	59%
2019-2020	32	24	75%

Data Summary


GP continued its growth in the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced among all outcomes in 2021-2022 (90%), compared with 2020-2021 (85%) and 2019-2020 (72%).

Global Perspectives Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
GP 1.1	215	3.49	4	1	16	75	123	0%	7%	35%	57%
GP 1.2	199	3.42	3	1	13	86	99	1%	7%	43%	50%
GP 2.1	187	3.37	4	4	19	67	97	2%	10%	36%	52%
GP 2.2	126	3.48	4	1	7	48	70	1%	6%	38%	56%
GP 2.3	181	3.33	4	13	16	50	102	7%	9%	28%	56%
Total	908	3.42	4	20	71	326	491	2%	8%	36%	54%
				Prof. & Advanced				Prof. & Advanced			
				817				90%			


Global Perspectives Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
GP 1.1	225	3.16	3	2	42	98	83	1%	19%	44%	37%
GP 1.2	170	3.27	3	1	20	81	68	1%	12%	48%	40%
GP 2.1	199	3.25	3	2	32	80	85	1%	16%	40%	43%
GP 2.2	107	3.29	3	1	15	43	48	1%	14%	40%	45%
GP 2.3	177	3.50	4	1	18	50	108	1%	10%	28%	61%
Total	878	3.29	3	7	127	352	392	1%	14%	40%	45%
				Prof. & Advanced				Prof. & Advanced			
				744				85%			

Global Perspectives Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
GP 1.1	375	2.81	3	31	92	171	81	8%	25%	46%	22%
GP 1.2	287	2.94	3	11	60	150	66	4%	21%	52%	23%
GP 2.1	326	2.94	3	22	72	135	97	7%	22%	41%	30%
GP 2.2	180	2.94	3	4	47	84	45	2%	26%	47%	25%
GP 2.3	260	3.08	3	10	51	107	92	4%	20%	41%	35%
Total	1,428	2.93	3	78	322	647	381	5%	23%	45%	27%
				Prof. & Advanced				Prof. & Advanced			
				1,028				72%			

Global Perspectives Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Global Perspectives Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on GP 1.1 (92%), GP 1.2 (93%), and GP 2.2 (94%) in 2021-2022. Each of these outcomes received strong achievement increases versus the previous year.

Validity & Reliability

GP instructors focused on improving validity and reliability in 2021-2022 by holding score norming sessions and discussions regarding the key assignments. Faculty have questioned the validity of GP 2.1, GP 2.2, and GP 2.3, arguing that the outcomes resemble detailed competencies rather than outcomes. Given the wide diversity of content between GP courses, the Core area still received notable variability in scores between sections.

Actionable Items

The lowest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on GP 2.3 (84%) in 2021-2022. The Core area will consult with the librarians for collaboration opportunities and will launch workshops for information literacy in GP courses. GP will also incorporate more low-stakes assessments moving forward, rather than only using a final research paper. Lastly, the Core area will determine whether to revise the outcomes and standard rubric. The revised outcomes and rubric would allow faculty to more effectively discern between proficient and advanced while addressing the problematic skills-based outcomes.

Historical Analysis (HA)

SLOs

Historical Analysis courses introduce students to an analysis of human affairs that goes beyond the mere narration of historical facts by acquainting students with the methods historians use to describe, explain and reconstruct the past. Upon satisfactory completion of this requirement, students will be able to make use of historical information found in primary source materials; place significant works in their proper historical and cultural context; assess the complex relationship between historical events and the human condition; and chronologically order and explain the significance of major events and the development of key social and political institutions for at least one period of history.

Number	Description
HA 1 (UCC 5)	Appropriately identify and analyze primary sources
HA 2	Place significant works in their proper historical and cultural context
HA 3 (UCC 5)	Assess the complex relationship between historical events and the human condition
HA 4	Chronologically order major events and the development of key social and political institutions for at least one period of history
HA 5 (UCC 1)	Explain the significance of major events and the development of key social and political institutions for at least one period of history

Participation

HA assessment reporting declined in each of the past three academic years.

Historical Analysis Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	11	7	64%
2020-2021	11	8	73%
2019-2020	16	14	88%

Data Summary


HA continued its slight growth in the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced among all outcomes in 2021-2022 (79%), compared with 2020-2021 (78%) and 2019-2020 (75%). The total number of measurements has declined in recent years, and HA 4 has not been assessed in any of the past three years.

Historical Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
HA 1	109	3.01	3	3	26	47	33	3%	24%	43%	30%
HA 2	107	3.17	3	1	18	50	38	1%	17%	47%	36%
HA 3	107	3.19	3	1	17	50	39	1%	16%	47%	36%
HA 4	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
HA 5	70	2.99	3	1	17	34	18	1%	24%	49%	26%
Total	393	3.10	3	6	78	181	128	2%	20%	46%	33%
				Prof. & Advanced		309		Prof. & Advanced		79%	


Historical Analysis Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
HA 1	125	2.90	3	4	31	64	26	3%	25%	51%	21%
HA 2	125	2.99	3	2	23	74	26	2%	18%	59%	21%
HA 3	125	3.05	3	2	22	69	32	2%	18%	55%	26%
HA 4	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
HA 5	125	3.07	3	2	22	66	35	2%	18%	53%	28%
Total	500	3.00	3	10	98	273	119	2%	20%	55%	24%
				Prof. & Advanced		392		Prof. & Advanced		78%	

Historical Analysis Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
HA 1	257	3.06	3	6	55	114	82	2%	21%	44%	32%
HA 2	198	2.98	3	10	40	92	56	5%	20%	46%	28%
HA 3	198	3.02	3	10	45	75	68	5%	23%	38%	34%
HA 4	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
HA 5	158	3.08	3	8	29	64	57	5%	18%	41%	36%
Total	811	3.03	3	34	169	345	263	4%	21%	43%	32%
				Prof. & Advanced		608		Prof. & Advanced		75%	

Historical Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Historical Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on HA 2 (82%) and HA 3 (83%) in 2021-2022. These outcomes also received strong performances in 2020-2021.

Validity & Reliability

Individual instructors determine which assignments best align with the HA outcomes. The assignments have not been collectively reviewed. A standard rubric exists but has not been used for all assessed assignments. No formal calibration training has occurred with the standard rubric.

Actionable Items

HA faculty will discuss whether HA 4 is a desirable and viable outcome for the Core area, and the faculty will determine whether another SLO should replace it. Rubrics will be examined to decide if the mechanisms cause rating variations across sections. New faculty should be formally familiarized with Core assessment expectations and procedures. Given that lowest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on HA 1 (73%) and HA 5 (74%) in 2021-2022, the Core area should also focus on improving these outcomes.

Literary Analysis (LA)

SLOs

Students will be able to i) read with perception the literature they have studied; ii) analyze significant aspects of this literature; and iii) intelligently discuss relationships between the literature and human experience.		
Number	Title	Description
LA 1 (UCC 1, 5, 9)	Read and Comprehend Literary works	Read with perception the literature they have studied.
LA 2 (UCC 1, 5, 9)	Analyze Significant Aspects of Literature	Analyze significant aspects of literature.
LA 3 (UCC 1, 5, 9)	Discuss Relationships Between Literature and Human Experience	Intelligently discuss relationships between the literature and human experience.

Participation

LA received a strong increase in the percentage of sections that submitted data in 2021-2022 versus previous years.

Literary Analysis Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	15	12	80%
2020-2021	12	6	50%
2019-2020	13	8	62%

Data Summary


LA continued its steady growth in the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced among all outcomes in 2021-2022 (88%), compared with 2020-2021 (85%) and 2019-2020 (79%). More measurements were also collected in 2021-2022 (516) than in previous years.

Literary Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
LA 1	172	3.47	4	2	14	58	98	1%	8%	34%	57%
LA 2	172	3.28	3	2	29	59	82	1%	17%	34%	48%
LA 3	172	3.53	4	2	11	52	107	1%	6%	30%	62%
Total	516	3.43	4	6	54	169	287	1%	10%	33%	56%
				Prof. & Advanced		456		Prof. & Advanced		88%	


Literary Analysis Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
LA 1	81	3.35	4	2	9	29	41	2%	11%	36%	51%
LA 2	81	3.19	3	2	15	30	34	2%	19%	37%	42%
LA 3	81	3.33	3	2	6	36	37	2%	7%	44%	46%
Total	243	3.29	3	6	30	95	112	2%	12%	39%	46%
				Prof. & Advanced		207		Prof. & Advanced		85%	

Literary Analysis Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
LA 1	128	3.21	3	4	16	57	51	3%	13%	45%	40%
LA 2	128	3.04	3	3	30	54	41	2%	23%	42%	32%
LA 3	128	3.03	3	5	23	63	37	4%	18%	49%	29%
Total	384	3.09	3	12	69	174	129	3%	18%	45%	34%
				Prof. & Advanced		303		Prof. & Advanced		79%	

Literary Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on LA 1 (91%) and LA 3 (92%) in 2021-2022. These outcomes also received strong performances in 2020-2021. LA 3 received the highest percentage of students who scored advanced in 2021-2022 (62%).

Validity & Reliability

LA instructors use a standard rubric to assess student achievement, but variations do occur between sections. Calibration training has not been held.

Actionable Items

The lowest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on LA 2 (82%), which also held the lowest percentage in 2020-2021 (79%). The Core area should focus on improving LA 2 by examining assignments used for the outcome and emphasizing the outcome in the curriculum. LA should also consider calibration training to enhance scoring reliability between course sections.

Philosophical Inquiry (PI)

SLOs

Data for each sub-outcome is grouped other with its outcome area (e.g. PI 1 data includes PI 1.1, PI 1.2, and PI 1.3).

Students will be able to i) analyze, in a preliminary way, questions about reality, meaning or value; ii) discuss some of the traditional views on such questions; and iii) develop criteria to arbitrate differences between conflicting normative claims about thought or behavior.		
Number	Title	Description
PI 1 (UCC 1, 5, 7)	Salient Features	Accurately describe the salient features of either (a) some major (e.g., historically significant) ethical values or (b) some major theories of ethical value.
PI 1.1 (UCC 1, 5, 7)	Issues	Comprehends central issues
PI 1.2 (UCC 1, 5, 7)	Terms	Uses disciplinary terms appropriately
PI 1.3 (UCC 1, 5, 7)	Reasoning	Appreciates intentional/explicit reasoning
PI 2 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Persuasively Analyzes	Persuasively analyze either (a) how some major ethical values are informed or not informed by some major theories of ethical value or (b) how some major ethical values recommend or do not recommend certain individual behaviors, societal norms, and/or states of affairs.
PI 2.1 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Background	Provides context or background for the Issue
PI 2.2 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Commentary	Provides critical commentary
PI 2.3 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Understanding	Careful reading of source material
PI 2.4 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Cohesiveness	Analytical organization/cohesiveness
PI 3 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Constructing Arguments	Offer rationally constructed arguments about the strengths and/or weaknesses of either (a) how some major ethical values are informed by or not sufficiently informed by some major theories of ethical value or (b) how some major ethical values recommend or do not recommend enough certain individual behaviors, societal norms, and/or states of affairs.
PI 3.1 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Thesis	Thesis statement and organization plan
PI 3.2 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Premises	Plausible argument
PI 3.3 (UCC 1, 5, 8)	Scope	Limitations of the argument
PI 4 (UCC 1, 5, 7, 8)	Mechanics	Writing style, sources, and citations
PI 4.1 (UCC 1, 5, 7, 8)	Clarity	Writes with clarity
PI 4.2 (UCC 1, 5, 7, 8)	Sources	Uses sources appropriately
PI 4.3 (UCC 1, 5, 7, 8)	Citations	Uses appropriate citations

Participation

Assessment reporting for PI sharply declined in 2021-2022.

Philosophical Inquiry Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	12	3	25%
2020-2021	11	7	64%
2019-2020	11	9	82%

Data Summary


Students scored proficient or advanced on 96% of PI measurements in 2021-2022. The value represents a strong increase from 2020-2021, when 73% of students score proficient or advanced. The 605 measurements in 2021-2022 represent a decline from 1,373 measurements in 2020-2021.

Philosophical Inquiry Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
PI 1	141	3.71	4	3	1	30	107	2%	1%	21%	76%
PI 2	133	3.50	4	4	1	53	75	3%	1%	40%	56%
PI 3	91	3.37	3	1	4	46	40	1%	4%	51%	44%
PI 4	240	3.41	3	3	9	114	114	1%	4%	48%	48%
Total	605	3.49	4	11	15	243	336	2%	2%	40%	56%
				Prof. & Advanced		579		Prof. & Advanced		96%	


Philosophical Inquiry Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
PI 1	331	3.05	3	13	62	153	103	4%	19%	46%	31%
PI 2	319	3.08	3	12	54	148	105	4%	17%	46%	33%
PI 3	252	2.87	3	30	47	102	73	12%	19%	40%	29%
PI 4	471	2.81	3	58	101	186	126	12%	21%	39%	27%
Total	1,373	2.94	3	113	264	589	407	8%	19%	43%	30%
				Prof. & Advanced		996		Prof. & Advanced		73%	

Philosophical Inquiry Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
PI 1	370	3.18	3	6	50	184	130	2%	14%	50%	35%
PI 2	415	3.19	3	6	80	159	170	1%	19%	38%	41%
PI 3	221	2.97	3	6	54	101	60	3%	24%	46%	27%
PI 4	280	3.06	3	15	53	112	100	5%	19%	40%	36%
Total	1,286	3.12	3	33	237	556	460	3%	18%	43%	36%
				Prof. & Advanced		1,016		Prof. & Advanced		79%	

Philosophical Inquiry Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Philosophical Inquiry Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

Each outcome received at least 95% of students that scored proficient or advanced in 2021-2022. PI 4 received the most measurements in 2021-2022 (240) and also received the most measurements in 2020-2021 (471).

Validity & Reliability

Individual instructors determine which assignments best align with the PI outcomes. Some instructors assess argumentative position papers while others use written reflections on the course material. PI instructors revised the standard rubric in Spring 2021 to align with the AAC&U rubrics that address ethics and values.

Actionable Items

Instructors will submit the assignments they use for PI assessment for collective review, in addition to other exemplary assignments. PI instructors will collectively review the assignments to discuss the effectiveness of the assessments. The Core area will also consider holding a calibration session to improve scoring reliability.

Scientific Thought (ST)

SLOs

Students will be able to i) understand from a nonprofessional perspective the scientific concepts, laws, and principles that affect current societal issues and assess the impact of scientific or technological matters on society and the environment; and ii) use scientific tools and techniques to measure and analyze the systems under study.	
Number	Description
ST 1 (UCC 1)	The student shows proficiency in understanding and appreciation of fundamental concepts in a scientific discipline.
ST 2 (UCC 7, 8)	Non-Lab - The student describes the importance of science and technology on society.
ST 3	Lab - Hands-on laboratory experience using the scientific approach to problem solving
ST 3.a (UCC 6)	Lab - Shows proficiency in using tools and techniques in the scientific approach to problem solving
ST 3.b (UCC 4, 5)	Lab - Shows proficiency in analyzing data and in drawing the appropriate conclusions in the scientific approach to problem solving

Participation

ST assessment reporting declined in each of the past three academic years but still assessed 81% of sections in 2021-2022.

Scientific Thought Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	42	34	81%
2020-2021	42	38	90%
2019-2020	43	41	95%

Data Summary


ST has received over 1,500 measurements in each of the past three years. Lab and non-lab courses both assess ST 1, resulting in the most measurements among the outcomes. ST continued its slight growth in the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced among all outcomes in 2021-2022 (77%), compared with 2020-2021 (75%) and 2019-2020 (74%).

Scientific Thought Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
ST 1	595	3.07	3	28	118	235	214	5%	20%	39%	36%
ST 2	196	3.27	3	8	28	64	96	4%	14%	33%	49%
ST 3a	399	3.17	3	21	60	147	171	5%	15%	37%	43%
ST 3b	383	3.09	3	20	74	140	149	5%	19%	37%	39%
Total	1,573	3.12	3	77	280	586	630	5%	18%	37%	40%
				Prof. & Advanced		1,216		Prof. & Advanced		77%	


Scientific Thought Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
ST 1	615	3.08	3	49	90	241	235	8%	15%	39%	38%
ST 2	278	3.16	3	14	52	88	124	5%	19%	32%	45%
ST 3a	279	2.94	3	28	44	123	84	10%	16%	44%	30%
ST 3b	337	2.98	3	31	69	114	123	9%	20%	34%	36%
Total	1,509	3.04	3	122	255	566	566	8%	17%	38%	38%
				Prof. & Advanced		1,132		Prof. & Advanced		75%	

Scientific Thought Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
ST 1	617	3.02	3	43	113	248	213	7%	18%	40%	35%
ST 2	252	3.12	3	10	41	111	90	4%	16%	44%	36%
ST 3a	340	2.96	3	36	64	118	122	11%	19%	35%	36%
ST 3b	352	2.94	3	26	72	151	103	7%	20%	43%	29%
Total	1,561	3.01	3	115	290	628	528	7%	19%	40%	34%
				Prof. & Advanced		1,156		Prof. & Advanced		74%	

Scientific Thought Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Scientific Thought Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on ST 2 (82%), and LA 3a (80%) in 2021-2022. ST 2 has consistently received strong student performance in recent years, and ST 3a has improved nine percentage points within the past three years.

Validity & Reliability

Individual instructors determine which assignments best align with the PI outcomes. Core area instructors meet at the beginning of each semester to discuss their assessed assignments and review assessment procedures. ST uses a standard rubric for all assessed assignments.

Actionable Items

The lowest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on ST 1 (75%), and ST 3b (75%) in 2021-2022. Students have historically struggled on ST 3b, but performance did improve in 2021-2022 from previous years. This improvement is attributed to faculty discussions and increased attention to class activities involving ST 3b. ST faculty will continue to review ST 3b assessments and begin routine data sharing conversations.

Social & Behavioral Analysis (SBA)

SLOs

Data for each sub-outcome is grouped other with its outcome area (e.g. SBA 1 data includes SBA 1a and SBA 1b).

Social and Behavioral Analysis courses introduce students to the study of human behavior and/or the structures of society by acquainting students with the methods used for solving problems in the social or behavioral sciences. Upon satisfactory completion of this requirement, students will be able to identify the essential features of society and culture or the major factors of human behavior, either in general or as they apply to particular social, political or economic issues; describe the structures and functions of some major social institution or analyze the effect of social structures on their own and others' attitudes and behavior; analyze and synthesize information that deals with social or behavioral issues, distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information and lines of reasoning and form appropriate conclusions.		
Number	Title	Description
SBA 1	Identify	Identify the essential features of society/culture, or the major factors of human behavior, either in general or as they apply to particular social, political or economic issues.
SBA 1a	Identify Features/Society	Identify the essential features of society/culture either in general or as they apply to particular social, political or economic issues.
SBA 1b	Identify Factors/Behaviors	Identify the major factors of human behavior, either in general or as they apply to particular social, political or economic issues.
SBA 2	Analyze	Analyze the structures/functions of some major social institution, or the effect of social structures on individuals' attitudes and behaviors.
SBA 2a	Analyze Institutions	Analyze the structures/functions of some major social institution.
SBA 2a.1 (UCC 5)	Understands Concepts	Demonstrates an understanding of disciplinary concepts associated with a major institution.
SBA 2a.2 (UCC 5)	Applies Concepts	Appropriately applies disciplinary concepts associated with a major institution.
SBA 2b	Analyze Human Behaviors	Analyze the effect of social structures on individuals' attitudes and behaviors.
SBA 2b.1 (UCC 5)	Understands Concepts	Demonstrates an understanding of disciplinary concepts associated with behaviors.
SBA 2b.2 (UCC 5)	Applies Concepts	Appropriately applies disciplinary concepts associated with behaviors.
SBA 3	Identify Methods	Identify the methods used to address questions related to structures of society and/or human behavior.

Participation

SBA generally maintained its year-to-year data reporting performance and received data from 73% of sections in 2021-2022.

Social & Behavioral Analysis Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	30	22	73%
2020-2021	28	21	75%
2019-2020	30	16	53%

Data Summary


SBA received considerably more measurements in 2021-2022 (1,745) than 2020-2021 (1,350). The Core area continued its steady growth in the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced among all outcomes in 2021-2022 (81%), compared with 2020-2021 (78%) and 2019-2020 (74%).

Social & Behavioral Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
SBA 1	515	3.30	4	19	84	134	278	4%	16%	26%	54%
SBA 2	795	3.25	3	17	121	302	355	2%	15%	38%	45%
SBA 3	435	3.31	4	12	75	112	236	3%	17%	26%	54%
Total	1,745	3.28	3	48	280	548	869	3%	16%	31%	50%
				Prof. & Advanced		1,417		Prof. & Advanced		81%	


Social & Behavioral Analysis Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
SBA 1	297	3.30	4	6	71	49	171	2%	24%	16%	58%
SBA 2	722	3.21	3	25	123	252	322	3%	17%	35%	45%
SBA 3	331	3.26	3	7	62	100	162	2%	19%	30%	49%
Total	1,350	3.24	3	38	256	401	655	3%	19%	30%	49%
				Prof. & Advanced		1,056		Prof. & Advanced		78%	

Social & Behavioral Analysis Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
SBA 1	257	3.21	4	11	55	60	131	4%	21%	23%	51%
SBA 2	444	3.03	3	23	93	176	152	5%	21%	40%	34%
SBA 3	235	3.16	3	15	48	57	115	6%	20%	24%	49%
Total	936	3.11	3	49	196	293	398	5%	21%	31%	43%
				Prof. & Advanced		691		Prof. & Advanced		74%	

Social & Behavioral Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Social & Behavioral Analysis Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on SBA 2 in 2021-2022 (83%). SBA 2 also received the highest percentage scoring proficient or advanced in 2020-2021 (80%). The highest percentage of students scored advanced on SBA 1 (54%) and SBA 3 (54%) in 2021-2022, continuing a trend from the previous year. SBA 2 received the most measurements in each of the past three years.

Validity & Reliability

Individual instructors determine which assignments best align with the SBA outcomes. SBA instructors use a standard rubric to assess outcome achievement, but scoring variations do exist between sections.

Actionable Items

SBA instructors will explore appropriate sources of information to inform possible revisions of the SLOs. The Core area will continue to meet to improve the assessment process and review the key assignments used for assessment.

Visual & Performing Arts (VPA)

SLOs

Allow students to explore the creation of art from a variety of perspectives (expectation of behavior needed). As delineated in the catalog, courses in this area of the core primarily fit into one of two categories: **Analytical** and **Practicum**. Thus, the numbering is slightly different for this section.

Number	Description
VPA 1a	Analyze a work/piece/site in terms of its cultural role, content, meaning, significance, and/or influence
VPA 2a	Analyze a particular figure and/or their work(s) in terms of their cultural role, content, meaning, significance, and/or influence
VPA 3a	Demonstrate the ability to use and appropriately apply methods and/or vocabulary appropriate to the discipline
VPA 1p	Demonstrate technical skill(s), including an understanding of the fundamental techniques and/or tools of the discipline
VPA 2p	Demonstrate the ability to communicate original ideas in creative, discipline-specific ways
VPA 3p	Demonstrate the ability to use and appropriately apply methods of work and/or vocabulary appropriate to the discipline

Participation

The VPA reporting rate sharply increased in 2021-2022 (58%) from 2020-2021 (15%). OIRA provided Excel spreadsheets to all VPA sections in Spring 2022 to improve in the data collection process, assisting courses that do not submit online artifacts. This alternate assessment method increased VPA reporting rates.

Visual & Performing Arts Reporting			
Year	Total Number of Sections Offered	Number of Assessed Sections	Percent of Assessed Sections
2021-2022	26	15	58%
2020-2021	26	4	15%
2019-2020	27	5	19%

Data Summary


VPA received considerably more measurements in 2021-2022 (654) than 2020-2021 (51). The percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced among all outcomes decreased in 2021-2022 (78%) from 2020-2021 (96%). The performance decrease could be attributed to the small sample size in 2020-2021.

Visual & Performing Arts Outcome Results (2021-2022)											
Aug. 1, 2021-May 31, 2022				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
VPA 1a	179	3.00	3	12	31	81	55	7%	17%	45%	31%
VPA 2a	77	3.13	3	4	9	37	27	5%	12%	48%	35%
VPA 3a	109	3.01	3	9	15	51	34	8%	14%	47%	31%
VPA 1p	107	3.08	3	4	19	48	36	4%	18%	45%	34%
VPA 2p	91	3.20	3	4	12	37	38	4%	13%	41%	42%
VPA 3p	91	3.08	3	4	18	36	33	4%	20%	40%	36%
Total	654	3.07	3	37	104	290	223	6%	16%	44%	34%
				Prof. & Advanced		513		Prof. & Advanced		78%	


Visual & Performing Arts Outcome Results (2020-2021)											
Aug. 1, 2020-May 31, 2021				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
VPA 1a	21	3.05	3	0	0	20	1	0%	0%	95%	5%
VPA 2a	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
VPA 3a	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
VPA 1p	20	3.40	3	0	1	10	9	0%	5%	50%	45%
VPA 2p	10	3.40	3.5	0	1	4	5	0%	10%	40%	50%
VPA 3p	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	51	3.25	3	0	2	34	15	0%	4%	67%	29%
				Prof. & Advanced		49		Prof. & Advanced		96%	

Visual & Performing Arts Outcome Results (2019-2020)											
Aug. 1, 2019-May 31, 2020				Count				Percent			
Outcome	Sum	Mean	Median	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced	Novice	Emergent	Proficient	Advanced
VPA 1a	61	3.00	3	5	5	36	15	8%	8%	59%	25%
VPA 2a	19	2.42	3	5	4	7	3	26%	21%	37%	16%
VPA 3a	23	2.70	3	5	4	7	7	22%	17%	30%	30%
VPA 1p	8	3.63	4	0	1	1	6	0%	13%	13%	75%
VPA 2p	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
VPA 3p	0	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	111	2.88	3	15	14	51	31	14%	13%	46%	28%
				Prof. & Advanced		82		Prof. & Advanced		74%	

Visual & Performing Arts Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Visual & Performing Arts Outcome Results (2021-2022)



Strengths

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on VPA 2a (83%) and VPA 2p (82%) in 2021-2022. The Core area requires additional data collection in future semesters to determine whether the positive values for VPA 2a and VPA 2p in 2021-2022 are a trend or an abnormality. The strong increase in reporting for 2021-2022 will allow the Core area to make more data-informed decisions in the future.

Validity & Reliability

Individual instructors determine which assignments best align with the VPA outcomes. VPA instructors use a standard rubric to assess outcome achievement, but scoring variations do exist between sections.

Actionable Items

The highest percentage of students scored proficient or advanced on VPA 1a (76%) in 2021-2022. The Core area requires additional data collection in future semesters to determine whether the performance on VPA 1a in 2021-2022 is a trend or an abnormality. VPA instructors should still aim to improve VPA 1a in 2022-2023. A data into action plan, which was not submitted in Fall 2021, should be completed to develop more specific actions for the Core area.

Appendix

CCAB Composition, Charge, and Procedures

Composition and Charge

Composition: One coordinator appointed for each of the twelve Core areas (for a two-year term), the faculty assessment liaison (chair), the Assistant Director of Institutional Assessment and the Provost.

Charge: The board examines how well the Core Curriculum is meeting its stated purpose “to provide students with the basic skills needed to pursue a liberal arts education, to expose them to a variety of modes of inquiry to different disciplines, and to promote critical reflection about global perspectives” (Hood College Catalog).

Area coordinators will examine assessment reports for a designated Core area, identify possible impediments to student learning, and make recommendations for improvement in collaboration with faculty responsible for these courses. Coordinators will also review assessment reports and make recommendations to improve cohesion across courses and/or Core areas related to the nine College Competencies. Coordinators will serve as a point of contact for assessment inquiries related to their designated area throughout their term.

Recommendations requiring formal changes to the Core Curriculum (such as catalog descriptions, learning outcomes, prerequisites, and course offerings) will be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee as a request for implementation. Informal recommendations (such as modifications to courses, assignments, or rubrics) will be documented in a summary submitted to the OIRA for institutional record. A summary report of the board’s findings and recommendations will be provided to the faculty annually.

Core Area Review Schedule: Three to four areas a semester on a two-year rotation (may shift to a three or four-year rotation).

Potential Coordinator Summary Content: faculty discussions; strengths and weaknesses related to students’ ability to meet learning outcomes; goals set; modifications to courses, assignments, or rubrics based on assessment findings; changes in assessment plan; cohesion across courses to meet SLOs; cohesion across courses/areas to meet college competencies; formal changes/recommendations.

Core Areas: English Composition (EC), First Year Seminar (FYS), Quantitative Literacy (QL), Global Languages (GL), Health and Wellness (HW), Global Perspectives (GP), Historical Analysis (HA), Literary Analysis (LA), Philosophical Inquiry (PI), Scientific Thought (ST), Social and Behavioral Analysis (SBA), Visual and Performing Arts (VPA)

Suggested Core Area Review Timeline

Week One – AC identifies CPARs and forwards names to OIRA.

Week Two - OIRA provides *Area Assessment Data Reports* to Area Coordinator (AC). AC meets with OIRA and Chair if needed.

Week Three – AC submits *Area Coordinator Reflections Report* to Chair for feedback.

Weeks Four through Six - AC forwards *Program-level Assessment Data Reports* and *Area Coordinator Reflections Report* to appropriate CPARs. AC coordinates meeting date/time with CPARs, OIRA, and Chair to review *Area Assessment Data Reports* and *AC Reflections Report*.

Week Seven – AC submits *Meeting Notes (with Action Items)* to Chair.

Weeks Eight and Nine– Chair summarizes *AC Meeting Notes with Action Items* into first draft of *Core Curriculum Assessment Report* and forwards to CCAB.

***Week Ten** – CCAB meets to review Chair’s *Core Curriculum Assessment Report* draft.

Weeks Eleven and Twelve – Revised *Core Curriculum Assessment Report* forwarded to CCAB for feedback.

Week Thirteen – CCAB Chair submits final *Core Curriculum Assessment Report* to the Curriculum Committee.

*Estimate we will need one CCAB meeting a semester.

Reports Timeline:

OIRA Area Assessment Data Reports (OIRA → AC/Week Two)

Area Coordinator Reflections Report (AC → Chair/Week Three)

Meeting Notes with Action Items (AC → Chair/Week Seven)

Core Curriculum Assessment Report Draft (Chair → CCAB/Week Nine) [Format TBD]

Core Curriculum Assessment Report Final (Chair → CC/Week Thirteen)

AC – Area Coordinator

CC- Curriculum Committee

CCAB – Core Curriculum Assessment Board

Chair – CCAB Chair

CPAR – Core Program Area Representative(s)

OIRA – Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

Core SLO Alignments to UCCs

Core Area	SLO	UCC	UCC 1	UCC 2	UCC 3	UCC 4	UCC 5	UCC 6	UCC 7	UCC 8	UCC 9	None
EC	1	1,5	X				X					
	2	1,5	X				X					
	3	1	X									
	4	1	X									
	5	3			X							
FYS	1.1	5					X					
	1.2	5					X					
	1.3	1	X									
	1.4	1	X									
	2.1											X
	2.2	3			X							
	2.3	3			X							
	2.4											X
QL	1	5					X					
	2	4				X						
	3	6						X				
	4	1,5	X				X					
GL	1.1											X
	2.1											X
	2.2	2		X								
	3.1											X
	3.2	1	X									
	4.1											X
	4.2											X
HW	1	3			X							
	2	2		X								
	3	7							X			
	4	5					X					
GP	1.1	9									X	
	1.2	7,8							X	X		
	2.1	1	X									
	2.2	1	X									
	2.3	1	X									
HA	1	5					X					
	2											X
	3	5					X					
	4											X
	5	1	X									
LA	1	1,5,9	X				X				X	
	2	1,5,9	X				X				X	
	3	1,5,9	X				X				X	

Core Area	SLO	UCC	UCC 1	UCC 2	UCC 3	UCC 4	UCC 5	UCC 6	UCC 7	UCC 8	UCC 9	None
PI	1.1	7							X			
	1.2											X
	1.3	5					X					
	2.1	5					X					
	2.2	5					X					
	2.3	3			X							
	2.4	1	X									
	3.1	1	X									
	3.2	5					X					
	3.3	5					X					
	4.1	1	X									
	4.2	3			X							
	4.3	3			X							
ST	1	1	X									
	2	7,8							X	X		
	3.a	6						X				
	3.b	4,5				X	X					
SBA	1.a											X
	1.b											X
	2.a.1	5					X					
	2.a.2	5					X					
	2.b.1	5					X					
	2.b.2	5					X					
	3											X
VPA	1.a											X
	2.a											X
	3.a											X
	1.p											X
	2.p											X
	3.p											X
Total Alignments			19	2	7	2	22	2	4	2	4	19