General Education Assessment Report Template

Academic Year: 2015-2016

Course Name/Catalog Number: BUS 103

General Education Component: First-Year Seminar

UULO(s) assessed this year:
- ☐ Intellectual Breadth/Life-long Learning
- ☒ Inquiry/Critical Thinking
- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Global/Multicultural Knowledge and Awareness
- ☐ Citizenship & Ethics

Other learning outcomes assessed this year:

Process: Please provide a brief narrative of the assessment process for this course. Include a description of the type of student work assessed (e.g., research papers, exams, etc.), the number and roles of people involved in the process, any tools used for the assessment (e.g., checklists, rubrics, etc.), and how student learning was evaluated.

Please refer to attached evaluation summary and assessment rubric.

Results: Please provide a brief summary of the results of your assessment process. Include both what you learned about your students’ achievement of the specified learning outcomes and what you learned about the assessment process itself, if applicable.

Please refer to the attached evaluation summary.

Conclusions: Please describe how the results of this assessment process might be used to revise instruction in this course and/or refine the assessment process in future years.

In the future, the critical thinking rubric will be tailored to meet the overall goals of the assessment and instruction standards.

Appendices: Please attach any applicable assignment descriptions, rubrics, results tables, or graphic representations of results.

Attached: Assessment Report, 2015-2016
BUS 103 Assessment Summary
2015-2016 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Labels</th>
<th>Mean of Explanation</th>
<th>Mean of Evidence</th>
<th>Mean of Context / Assumptions</th>
<th>Mean of Position</th>
<th>Mean of Conclusion</th>
<th>Mean of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 2014</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2015</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2015</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2016</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process:
- The assessment committee was comprised of:
  - Patrick Griffis – UNLV Business Librarian
  - John Watts – UNLV Instruction Librarian
  - Beth Gersten – Assistant Dean, Undergraduate Programs; BUS 103 Instructor
  - Karen Seale - BUS 103 Coordinator and Instructor
- The assessment took place May 12, 2016.
- Five student papers originating from one assignment were submitted from four fall semester sections. Note: The instructor for all four sections was the same. Five student papers originating from a different assignment in the spring semester were submitted by a different instructor. In total, 24 papers were assessed by the committee.
- Each assignment targeted critical thinking.
- The assessment committee received the same written instructions given to students for each assignment. Ungraded student submissions for the corresponding assignment were identified only by NSHE number.
- Two fall semester papers in section 1005 were duplicates. One was discarded.
- Scoring was based on the critical thinking rubric circulated by Dr. Heavey. The rubric totaled twenty possible points resulting from a maximum of four points in five skill categories indicated in the above table. Each paper was scored by two different committee members.
- The means were reported by skills category and were totaled for each semester.
- The scores for the 2015-2016 academic year did NOT include a value of 0 or n/a, not applicable.

Results:
- The highest mean score in fall 2015 fell in “Evidence”.
- The highest mean score in spring 2016 fell in “Explanation of issues”.
- The fall 2015 semester’s lowest mean score fell in “Influence of context and assumptions”.
- The spring 2016 semester’s lowest mean score fell in “Student’s position”.
- The fall 2015 total mean score was statistically significant when compared to fall 2014.
- The spring 2016 total mean score was not statistically significant. This could be due to the fact that only one section of assignments was assessed.
- Using 0 to designate “n/a” in the fall 2014 data may have impacted these conclusions.
Factors:

- One committee member chose and evaluated her own assignments. This could have impacted the results.
- The two assignments (fall versus spring) evaluated were different. (Note: The committee agreed that each assignment assessed critical thinking.)
  - Lack of assignment standards – e.g., clarity of expectations; learning outcomes; instructions; degree of difficulty; research requirements differed between the two assignments.
- One committee member believed 0 or “n/a” should be an option.
  - Again, assigning 0 to designate “n/a” in the fall 2014 data may have impacted these conclusions.
- The spring 2016 assessment could have been impacted by minimal data.