Academic Year: 2016-2017

Course Name/Catalog Number: COE 202

General Education Component: Second-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:
1. Prepare students to succeed in other general education courses
2. Give students a stronger sense of community and purpose
3. Provide students with both direct contact with university faculty and small-group interaction with peers

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.

COE 202 learning outcomes were assessed directly and indirectly. The Communication UULO was directly assessed by analyzing student writing samples with rubrics. The writing samples were position papers focused on communication and critical thinking (See Appendix 2). To assess this UULO, one random paper per fall 2016 COE 202 section was collected, with two sections collecting one additional paper (N = 14). 9 COE FYS/SYS instructors and one FYS/SYS coordinator scored the sample papers using a modified AAC&U Information Literacy rubric and the AAC&U Critical Thinking rubric (See Appendix 3).

The COE FYS/SYS instructors and FYS/SYS coordinator met on March 10, 2017, normed the AAC&U rubrics, scored the samples, and debriefed as a group. See Appendix 4 for data and averages for each section of the rubrics. The coordinator reviewed the rubrics and determined the rubrics appeared to be scored similarly by the instructors. The results were shared with the instructors and discussed as a group on April 25, 2017 and May 12, 2017.

The remaining four UULOs and three additional COE 202 learning outcomes were assessed indirectly by online Learning Outcomes Surveys in Fall 2016 (39.8% response rate) (See Appendix 1). Student surveys were sent via email to students with reminder emails if necessary.
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.

The results of our direct assessment appeared to evidence students performing at a second-year level for information literacy slightly above a second-year level for critical thinking (See Appendix 4). Although skills and competencies may vary by class, fall 2016 assessment results were slightly higher than fall 2015 (See Appendix 5). Therefore, this gain may also be attributed to our instructors targeting these skills and competencies since our assessment and subsequent discussion of these skills the previous year. The instructors were very positive about the direct assessment experience and engaged when we discussed the results as a team.

The results of our indirect assessment indicated that students perceived they improved moderately to much on their skills, knowledge, and awareness of UULOs (Table 2, Appendix 1). These results also indicated that students perceived a moderate to great amount of intellectual, personal, and social growth (Table 3, Appendix 1), had a stronger sense of community and purpose (Table 4, Appendix 1), and were neutral to satisfied with faculty respect for students and their classroom instruction (Table 5, Appendix 1). In relation to the assessment process, we learned that we will need to encourage our second-year seminar instructors to allow in-class time for this indirect assessment survey to bolster our response rate. The SYS Coordinator also plans to coordinate the SYS Learning Outcomes survey administered in the College of Education with the FYS Learning Outcomes Survey administered across campus. This coordination will allow the surveys to better match their scales (see Tables 4 and 5, Appendix 1).

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.

The results of our SYS direct assessment were shared and discussed with our first and second-year instructors at the same time that we discussed the results of our FYS direct assessment. This discussion produced a helpful comparison between these seminars that sparked ideas about potentially revising instruction in SYS. These ideas included: (1) revising our syllabi learning outcomes for writing in consultation with the UNLV English Department (e.g., creating outcomes that complement students having already completed ENG 102 and 102), (2) considering a different revising textbook to fit our new learning outcomes, and (3) adding in-class time for student-instructor individualized meetings to focus on the writing process. While our instructors were very positive about the direct assessment process, we discussed alternative forms of assessment for the next year with either different rubrics or different forms of direct assessment of these outcomes.

The results of our indirect assessment process indicated that our SYS program is thriving and our students are learning the skills and knowledge necessary to promote academic success and retention. The College of Education FYS/SYS Coordinator is currently working with Dr. Bernacki from the Department of
Educational Psychology and Higher Education to assess the UULO’s using computer software that analyses student writing samples. We hope this work will bolster our SYS assessment next year.

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