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| **Subcommittee Information** |
| General Education Category: | Non-Western/World Civilizations |
| Subcommittee Chair: | Name: Steven Fabian | Dept: History |
| Subcommittee Members: | Name: Eric Meringer | Dept: History |
|  | Name: Iclal Vanwesenbeeck | Dept.: English |
|  | Name:  | Dept:  |
|  | Name: | Dept:  |
| Semester(s) In Which Data were Collected: | Spring 2013 |
| Report Written By: | Steven Fabian |
| Report Date: | June 14, 2013 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Course Information** |
| **Please provide the following information for each of the courses that are part of the curriculum for this outcome during the semester(s) of data collection:** |
| Department | Subject Code | Course Number | Faculty Name | # of Students Enrolled | Were assessment data collected in this course? |
| English | ENGL | 306 | Iclal Vanwesenbeeck | 19 | YES |
| History | HIST | 101 | Markus Vink | 61 |  NO |
| History | HIST | 102 | Eric Meringer | 25 |  YES |
| History | HIST | 102 | Steven Fabian | 49 |  YES |
| History | HIST | 135 | Peter McCord | 222 |  YES |
| History | HIST | 135 | Perry Beardsley | 80 |  YES |
| History | HIST  | 250 | John Staples | 30 |  YES |
| History | HIST | 283 | Eric Meringer | 57 |  YES |
| Honors | HONR | 230 | Iclal Vanwesenbeeck | 12 |  YES |
| Music | MUS | 333 | Thomas Bingham | 95 |  YES |
| Political Science | POLI | 241 | Alex Caviedes | 43 |  YES |
| Psychology | PSY | 370 | Cheryl Drout | 31 |  NO |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment of Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Outcome 1:**  | **Students will demonstrate knowledge of a broad outline of world history** |
| Assessment Method | Given the diversity of courses which fell under this category, the subcommittee agreed that it would be more effective to assess data based on methods devised by the professors teaching the CCC Non-Western/World Civilization courses themselves*.* Professors were encouraged to embed assessment tools in their syllabi at the beginning of the year so as not to create additional work for themselves or their students. The professors were given flexibility in the types of methods they employed, so long as they directly addressed the SUNY mandated student learning outcomes (SLOs). Since professors are expected to teach these outcomes to students, this approach is appropriate. Professors were encouraged to consult with the subcommittee for assistance in devising their methods. Therefore, assessment included a wide range of methods: multiple choice tests, analytical questions, and essay writing. Assessment tools were reviewed by the subcommittee members to ensure relevance in assessing student learning outcomes. The subcommittee agreed this was more efficient since it would be difficult to create a *general* assessment tool which would not favor one academic discipline over another and therefore place students at a disadvantage. |
| Evaluation Process | Each participating professor sent the subcommittee a description of the assessment tool; how it addressed the CCC Non-Western/World Civ category SLOs; and the quantitative results of student work using percentages or letter grades. Professors graded their own assignments.Professors sent their data to members of the assessment subcommittee (each subcommittee member was responsible for three or four members to facilitate communication). This data was then passed on to the chair of the assessment subcommittee for the purposes of creating the final report.To achieve consistency in evaluation, the subcommittee agreed upon the following rubric in December 2012. Considering there is general agreement among faculty that ‘C’ equates to an ‘average’ performance, the subcommittee agreed that 74%-85% would represent the ‘meets standards’ category. Everything scoring above this range would ‘exceed standards’ while those scoring in the 64%-73% range would ‘approach standards’. Everything below 64% would ‘not meet standards’. The data sent by professors was then translated into this rubric (participating professors were not informed about this rubric). Subcommittee members reviewed the chair’s final report and made comments before the final report was edited and sent to the chair of the GenEd Committee. |
| Timing | During the fall 2012 semester, as well as in January 2013, several emails were sent to professors teaching CCC Non-Western/World Civilizations courses in the spring 2013 semester. These emails informed professors what was required of them in terms of assessing SLOs. Data was then collected over the course of the Spring 2013 semester and shortly after final exams. |
| Student Participation | A total of 724 students (majors and non-majors) were enrolled in CCC Non-Western/World Civilizations category courses for the Spring 2013 semester. Each professor teaching these courses was asked to select a 20% random sample of the total class enrollment. Data was not drawn from students who were not taking a CCC Non-Western/World Civ category course during the Spring 2013 semester. We therefore drew our assessment from 145 students taking English, History, Honors, Music, Political Science, and Psychology. However, two professors did not provide data, representing a total of 92 students. To make up for the 20% sample that was unaccounted for (18 students), we included a further eighteen students from the HIST 102 and HIST 135 freshmen survey courses, since these courses represented over half of the total Non-Western/World Civ category enrollment. So, while Psychology is not represented in this report, an accurate sample number has been provided for the category overall. |
| Assessment Results | 145 students were assessed out of 724.OVERALL (145 students)Exceeds standards = 55 (39%)Meets standards = 59 (40%)Approaches standards = 22 (15%)Does Not Meet Standards = 9 (6%)WORLD (1st SLO) (111 students)Exceeds standards = 38 (34%)Meets standards = 47 (41%)Approaches standards = 18 (16%)Does Not Meet Standards = 8 (7%)REGIONAL (2nd SLO) (34 students)Exceeds standards = 17 (50%)Meets standards = 12 (35%)Approaches standards = 4 (12%)Does Not Meet Standards = 1 (3%) |
| Level of Attainment | The results for the 2012-2013 assessment of the overall CCC Non-Western Civilization category are very positive. Almost 80% of our students met or exceeded standards; 15% approached standards; and 6% of students did not meet standards. The breakdown of the overall results into the two SLOs also reveals positive outcomes, although the second SLO is higher than the first. This may be related to the fact that courses which specifically address the second SLO are 200-400 level and have fewer non-majors. The courses which address the first SLO tend to be freshmen level survey courses.Considering there is general agreement among faculty that ‘C’ equates to an ‘average’ performance, the subcommittee agreed that 74%-85% would represent the ‘meets standards’ category. Everything scoring above this range would ‘exceed standards’ while those scoring in the 64%-73% range would ‘approach standards’. Everything below 64% would ‘not meet standards’. |
| Comparison to Previous Results | There were multiple differences between this assessment and the previous assessment.The previous report, written in 2010, assessed a 20% sample of 1700 students, totaling 369. The reason for the discrepancy in numbers between these reports is that the previous assessment took its sample from two semesters (Fall 2009 and Spring 2010), whereas the trend in recent years for assessment is to use only the Spring semester. This method provides the time necessary during the fall semester to form a subcommittee and provide professors with adequate time to prepare and imbed a relevant assessment tool for their courses.The previous report also used a different method to achieve its 20% sample. Instead of asking every professor teaching a Non-Western Civilization course to provide a 20% sample of their students, the subcommittee calculated that data would be required from 369 students (the 20% of that year’s total enrollment in Non-Western GenEd courses) and then used data from handpicked classes in their entirety. Consequently, while the sample was accurate numerically, the data did not accurately reflect the variety of courses offered that academic year. Furthermore, professors provided their final grades as data instead of using one particular assessment instrument. While this perhaps represents a more rounded reflection of student achievement, since it is the sum of the progress of a student, the final grade also reflects aspects of a course which do not address the SLOs of the category, such as attendance and participation.Finally, the previous subcommittee used a different assessment rubric than this one:Exceeds Expectations (90-100%)Meets Expectations (80-89%)Approaches (70-79%)Fails Expectations (0-69%)Consequently, the results of this cycle’s assessment show a great improvement in all levels over the previous cycle. Whereas the percentage of students exceeding and meeting expectations overall was calculated at above 50% in 2010, this year that figure almost reaches 80%. We believe the new rubric more accurately represents the four categories of achievement and recommend it be used for future assessments. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment of Learning Outcome 2** |
| **Outcome 2:**  | **Students will demonstrate knowledge of the distinctive features of the history, institutions, economy, society, culture, etc., of one non-Western civilization**. |
| Assessment Method | See Outcome 1 above. |
| Evaluation Process | See Outcome 1 above. |
| Timing | See Outcome 1 above. |
| Student Participation | 161 students were enrolled in courses which addressed this SLO specifically. 20% of this number = 34. |
| Assessment Results | See Outcome 1 above. |
| Level of Attainment | REGIONAL (2nd SLO) (34 students)Exceeds standards = 17 (50%)Meets standards = 12 (35%)Approaches standards = 4 (12%)Does Not Meet Standards = 1 (3%) |
| Comparison to Previous Results | See Outcome 1 above. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusions** |
| What are the three most important conclusions drawn from your data about attainment of student learning outcomes within the category? | 1. Professors are, overall, doing an excellent job of teaching the SLOs in their courses.
2. More students are enrolled in courses which emphasize the first SLO over the second.
3. Students who were assessed based on written exercises (essays, essay questions, analytical presentations, etc.) performed better than students who were assessed using multiple choice questions.
 |
| What factors make it difficult to draw conclusions about student learning in this category? | Apathy among professors to participate. |
| What are your recommendations for improving the process of assessment of student learning in this category? | Perhaps incentives for professors who participate. These would be similar to what the Bookstore does to encourage professors to submit their course book requests in a timely fashion: Fredonia giftcards. |
| What are your recommendations for improving student learning in this category? | None based on the positive data collected. |
| Please share any other comments the subcommittee may have. | It is difficult to separate courses based on the two SLOs listed for this category; both of them are incorporated in almost all the courses. We divided courses into the two categories based on which SLO they ***emphasized***. As written in the GenEd manual, the two SLOs are divided by an ‘or’ which implies that perhaps it might not be necessary to even separate them. It may make it easier to assess this category if the distinction wasn’t addressed. |