**Team Focus/Goals 2018-19**

1. Expanding the CD&GC pilots Fall 2018 and Spring 2019
2. Identify additional OTM courses to meet the CDGC at a General Ed. Level
3. Assess assignments and rubrics for relevance/quality control Team’s Leader: Michelle Abreu

* Team Members: Deborah Atkinson, Dona Fletcher (retired 12/2018), Jamie Fries, Kathy Rowell (added 1/2019), Eric Smith, Anne Soltysiak, Steve Wendel, and Lori Zakel (added 1/2019)

# Actions for #1:

* PSY 1100: All online, face-to-face, and CCP courses running rubric/assignments for assessment of CDGC
* SOC 1101: All online and face-to-face (? CCP courses) courses running rubric/assignments for assessment of CDGC. Assignments are being located and reviewed.
* HUM 1125: All online courses running rubric/assignments for assessment of CDGC. Face-to- face courses only Jamie’s final exam assessing the rubric.

# Actions for #2:

* Using CMT to pull high enrollment OTM courses with the CDGC outcome listed: Anne spoke to Janeil and was told that, “gen eds cannot be accessed at the PROGRAM level, and in fact program outcomes are distinct from (although in some cases overlapping with) gen ed

outcomes. CMT cannot generate a list of gen ed outcomes at the program level, it can only generate gen eds at the course level.” Anne tried this out and generated a CMT report for all LCS courses that are attached to the Values citizenship /community rubric (the one that is listed in CMT because it has not been updated yet) and she got about 430 courses in the report.

* Anne reported that, “The problem is, in CMT you can only go with Division OR with Program to generate the reports, but you can’t pare it down to only programs WITHIN a particular

division. So, there are about 300 programs listed in CMT, and there is no way to pare that down to only the programs listed in LCS division. It would be a very ponderous job to go through each program in my division individually and run the report. And in any case, CMT can’t tell us anything about CDGC, because it’s not in there.”

* Therefore, the most relevant courses to assess the gen ed. was to start with Team 3’s work from last year. Janeil forwarded the report. Team 3’s work from 2017-18 attached for review. Reviewed emails from Chairs sent to Team 3, 2017 – 18.
* Debby reached out to Janeil for further information regarding CDGC outcomes:
  + **“**To follow up from our Assessment Committee meeting on Monday, Janeil responded that the information was reported by Chair’s in the annual updates/program reviews. This information was **not** pulled from CMT.”
  + We will not need to review master course syllabi for the Gen Ed listing of CDGC or Value Citizenship.
  + FYI – Janeil also reported “We are no longer going to ask at the course level in CMT what Gen Ed outcomes are being met. We will ask at the program level.” Moving forward, it appears we will need to reach out to those Chair’s that did not provide a response.”
* The Excel spreadsheet was reviewed further along with the emailed assignments. We followed up with Chairs who did not respond to Team #3 last year. Debby worked on page #1, Anne had page #2 and Dona followed up on page #3. We had very few updated responses.
* After the assessment committee meeting on 02/07/19, Deb followed up with a couple of chairs listed on page 1 of that Excel spreadsheet to determine if they were assessing CDGC in their courses.
  + Sue Raffee = DEH 2601 – Community Dental Health has a diversity component in the course, but they are not using the CDGC rubric to assess it.
  + David Clark = DIT 2305 Food, Culture & Cuisine with 2310 lab directed me to Nora Schaefer. Nora plans to assess CDGC in both DIT 1635 Community Nutrition and DIT 2305 Food, Culture and Cuisine. She plans to revise the CDGC rubric over summer semester and implement in those courses next fall – FA19.

# Actions for #3:

* It was discussed that we would ask Chairs if they would be willing to share their rubrics and assignments that they are using to meet the CDGC outcome to help other departments better understand the process. At that time, we will review the assignments and content and offer our help if the department wants to further refine assignments and rubrics.
* The team started by reviewing assignments and rubrics of PSY, SOC and HUM being used to meet the CDGC outcome so that the team could all get on the same page before reviewing other departments material. Anne passed out their PSY rubric and assignment outlines on 10/01/18. The team reviewed the outlines for PSY assignments and their rubric. The consensus is that the PSY assignments are meeting the CDGC General Education requirement.
* With the retirement of Dona Fletcher we ran into a snag finding the CDGC assignments being used in SOC 1101 so the team was unable to review. Kathy is working with Jacquie Housel the Interim Chair to figure out the SOC 1101 CDGC assessment methods and Rubric.
* 03/11/19, Kathy Rowell brought eight examples used in SOC 1145 to assess CDGC.
* Due to the large amount of CDGC assignment and rubric review that all team members needed access to for quality control, Anne Soltysiak suggested a Share Drive was created for CDGC Assessment Committee Members: Team One on 03/14/19.
* Mapping the Drive:
  1. Log on the network and click the Windows Start button
  2. Right-click "Computer" and select "Map Network drive"
  3. Choose a drive letter for the connection (select any blank letter that's not already in use - I through Z)
  4. In the Folder box, type the server name followed by the share name:
  5. \\Willow\CDGC Assessment Committee - Team One
  6. Click Finish
* Currently only PSY 1100 assignment outlines and CDGC rubric has been uploaded into the share drive by Anne.
  + Kathy is working with Jacquie Housel and Dana Johnson for SOC 1101 material. She will add SOC 1145 and CDGC rubrics.
  + Jamie is working on uploading the HUM 1125 online final project and CDGC rubric and the face-to-face final exam to assess CDGC.
* We discussed creating helpful tools in the drive to avoid dictating curriculum for possible sharing with others to help departments/instructors review the assessment material to help them create their own assignments to assess CDGC.
* 02/07/19: Discussed the wording “Personally and professionally recognizes the importance of respect for cultural diversity and global citizenship,” in the Awareness and Self-Awareness category.
* Wording change proposed as “Demonstrates the importance of respect for cultural diversity and global citizenship.”
* 02/14/19: I took the proposed change to the main assessment Coordinators who agreed to the new wording for this section. Charles Freeland will update the assessment rubric in the General Education Rubric Repository. Please let your faculty know that they must upload the new rubric wording into their courses. Anne it may be easier if the wording is changed by the instructors in your department rubrics since your department rewrote the inside portion.
* The goal is for the team is to get on the same page reviewing each other’s department material.
* Other Business
  + **10/01/18:** Issues with eLearn and grading rubrics you must choose a drop box or a graded item but not both. Anne has reported the issue to eLearn and Deborah Atkinson is checking into a solution for this issue.
    - How can we create a rubric that grades the assignment if certain Criterion are answered N/A with zero points attached, for example in PSY? It is very difficult to create a scale that reflects the student’s abilities using only one or two Criterion per assignment. How can we streamline grading?
    - Is there a way to assess students using an overall infusion of their course work to assess CDGC instead of basing it on specific assignments?
  + **11/05/18:** UPDATE: See attached issues with eLearn and grading rubrics. You must choose a dropbox or a graded item but not both. Angela Fernandez met with Vandana and was told that, “for non-eLearn assignments (presentations and other Face to Face work) and there is a way to attach a rubric to a grade item as long as that grade item is NOT attached to a drop- box or discussion board.” We are working on getting an instruction sheet together.
    - Also, there are two attached documents with directions for adding Gen. Ed. Rubrics to your eLearn shell that Cari Gigliotti updated and can also be found in the Gen.Ed. Rubric Repository.
  + **12/06/18:** Issues discussed with eLearn grading rubrics.
    - How can you deselect a rubric box if you accidentally start a rubric on a student who did not complete the assignment?
    - Concerns that divisions need a big picture regarding the Assessment vision so that they understand that they are on the right path. Possible Title: “7 Principales of General Education Surveys.” The Assessment Coordinators are considering this idea and the best way to communicate to Divisions.
    - Idea of a Terms Glossary for CDGC. We had one initially but the other General Education Rubrics do not have a glossary.
    - The team discussed revising wording in the main categories of the CDGC rubric:
      * I met with the assessment coordinators 01/17/19 to discuss this possibility. It was decided that we could look at the wording that keeps coming up in one area “recognizes the importance of respect for cultural diversity and global citizenship,” in the Awareness and Self-Awareness category. The coordinators stated that the wording is intended to determine that the students are demonstrating respect in what they are presenting and not for the instructor to determine what is in the students mind. If we can come up with clarification

wording the committee will discuss the changes and decided if updates will take place.

* + - * + If you have ideas for changing the wording listed above, please bring it to the next meeting and we will discuss as a team.
* The committee would also like to look at the SOC and HUM assignments being used to assess CDGC for ideas when reviewing for quality control.
* Anne shared that PSY is looking at changing their assignments with the goal to use fewer assignments to assess the CDGC rubric in PSY.
* **2/07/19:** The team discussed the challenges with addressing the global portion of the CDGC rubric. We discussed the possibility of dropping the global component from the rubric. The team decided that global would have to stay because of Sinclair mission and vision. However, are there ways that we can help departments address the global component of the rubric?
  + Kathy suggested that the Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education has material and modules that we could possibly use for internationalization of curriculum to assess the global portion of the rubric. The website is as follows: <http://www.miiie.org/>
  + Could our teamwork together to create a module for all departments to use in assessing the global portion of the rubric? Could we work on it over the summer and pilot fall 2019?
  + Could a pre-test and post-test be developed to assess global?
  + Lori suggested that we look to see what other community colleges like Valencia are using to assess CDGC to determine possible changes.
  + Anne posed the question, do we need to consider rewriting the global portion of the rubric?
* **3/11/19:** The team discussed the challenges with addressing the global portion of the CDGC rubric, as well as, adjuncts using the rubric to grade CDGC.
* Are there ways that we can help departments address the global component of the rubric?
* We are still discussing the possibility of working together to create a module for all departments to use in assessing the global portion of the rubric.
* 03/11/19: Kathy also brought self-assessment material for Cross Cultural assessment, as well as, the Global Awareness Profile (GAPtest).
* Could a pre-test and post-test be developed to assess the rubric with scenarios to eliminate instructor bias to move away from the CDGC rubric? Thus, linking the post-test to the rubric in eLearn for automatic grading of the rubric.

# Team Focus for Next Year 2019-20:

* Continue assessing assignments and rubrics for relevance/quality control using the share drive.
* Continue creating helpful tools in the share drive to help departments/instructors review the assessment material to help them create their own assignments to assess CDGC.
* Create a scenario based post-test that links to all areas of the CDGC rubric fall 2019 to Pilot Spring 2020.

# Resources Needed:

* Several of the following questions remain:
  + What will be our final process to review courses that may meet the CDGC outcomes? (Course syllabus, project rubrics, etc.)
  + How will we train faculty on the use of the final CD&GC rubric in courses that we identify which could meet the outcome?
    - Q&A tool for use?
* CTL Workshops?

**General Education Assessment Committee: Team 2**

The Team 2 sub-committee was given two charges for AY2018-19.

Charge #1: Continue running new Critical Thinking rubric pilots. Expand the pilot into Intro. Level courses Charge #2: Generate a rationale, possible outcomes and rubric for Problem Solving/Quantitative Reasoning

The decision was made by the Team 2 Team Leader that two separate groups would be convened to address the different charges. The results of the work done by the two groups are detailed below.

**Charge #1: "Critical Thinking Team" Final Report AY2018-19**

**Background/Rationale for the Charge:**

In AY2017-18, a committee was created to review the existing Critical Thinking rubric to determine if the rubric does address Critical Thinking. The committee (Anne Soltysiak, Reece Newman, and Cari Gigliotti) concluded that the existing Critical Thinking rubric employed by the College for Gen Ed Assessment does not truly address Critical Thinking as it is defined by the AACU in the VALUE rubrics. As written, the existing Critical Thinking rubric mirrors a problem-solving outcome rather than a critical thinking outcome.

Critical Thinking Criteria from the Version Prior to AY2017-18:

Criterion 1: Identify and fully define a problem and its various constituents

Criterion 2: Through the use of charts, graphs, diagrams, sketches, etc., clearly represents the problem audibly or visually.

Criterion 3: Approach the problem in different and appropriate ways Criterion 4: Develop a solution to the problem

Criterion 5: Interpret, assess and evaluate the solution to the problem.

As such, the committee, revised the rubric in Fall 2017 and mini-piloted the revised rubric in their own courses in Spring 2018. Mini-pilots were carried out in three course sections in CHE, PSY, and CIS. Feedback was noted that some of the wording utilized was too subjective and could be interpreted in a few different ways which could lead to inconsistency issues. Thus, the charge was carried over to AY2019-2020 to have additional faculty review the rubric to make changes and then pilot the revised rubric on a larger scale.

**AY2018-19 Update:**

"Critical Thinking" Team 2 members: Greg Dudash, Bill Kamil, Jennifer Romero, Anne Soltysiak, and Cari Gigliotti (Team Lead- SME Division Assessment Coordinator)

* In Fall 2018, the Critical Thinking Team was provided with the version of the Critical Thinking Rubric that was employed in the Spring 2018 mini-pilots as well as the Critical Thinking VALUE rubric. The Team was also provided with the feedback and assessment data from the faculty participating in the mini-pilot. The Team revised the rubric to address any aspects that were deemed subjective or too verbose. While the revisions made were not extensive, they represent a significant improvement over the Spring 2018 rubric which speaks to the value of having fresh sets of eyes evaluate the product.

Fall 2018 Revised Critical Thinking Criteria:

Criterion 1: Objectively identifies and articulates the parameters of a problem or issue Criterion 2: Examines and critically evaluates the assumptions and perspectives that

influence arguments made by self and others

Criterion 3: Critically assesses the quality, accuracy, and relevancy of data or evidence used to support an argument or position

Criterion 4: Draws logical conclusions and inferences based on valid evidence and well- supported reasoning

* The Team then designed a larger-scale pilot where the revised rubric is to be employed in classes across the College in different divisions. Each team member was asked to reach out to Chairs within their Division to find faculty volunteers willing to pilot the revised Critical Thinking rubric in a Spring 2019 course.

The following faculty generously agreed to participate in the Spring 2019 pilot project: BPS Division: April Carpenter

HS Division: Gwen Helton, Sheryl Gould, Kathy Elson SME Division: Amanda Duselis

LCS Division: Bridgette Bogle; Anne Soltysiak&PSY1100 faculty

* The Spring 2019 Critical Thinking Pilot data will be available for review in Summer 2019. At that time, a determination will be made if the rubric is ready to be presented to Instructional Council.

**Charge #2: "Gen Ed Math Team" Final Report AY2018-19**

**Background/Rationale for the Charge:**

At the Division Assessment Coordinators Summer Retreat in 2018, a discussion occurred where it was brought up that programs at Sinclair require mathematics within the curriculum which suggests that it is an aspect of a student’s general education. At this time, Sinclair does not have a general education outcome that is specific to assessing a student’s competency level in mathematics. The Division Assessment Coordinators decided to create a charge to investigate the idea of potentially adding a mathematics-based general education outcome.

**AY2018-19 Update:**

"Gen Ed Math" Team 2 members: Jessica McKinley, Erica Mersfelder, David Stott, and Cari Gigliotti (Team Lead- SME Division Assessment Coordinator)

* In Fall 2018, the Gen Ed Math Team was provided with the Quantitative Reasoning and the Problem-Solving VALUE rubrics. Individually, the team members researched other 2-year and 4- year institutions to determine what types of mathematics-based rubrics are being employed elsewhere. The team compiled and discussed their findings and created an initial version of a mathematics outcome rubric combining aspects of quantitative reasoning and problem-solving.
* The team consensus is that mathematics general education competency assessment for the institution would be performed by and housed within the Mathematics Department at Sinclair. That is, the rubric could be used in a variety of math courses to capture data on a large number of students institution-wide since all degree programs at Sinclair require at least one mathematics course. The rubric was created in such a way as to allow it to be applicable in a wide variety of math courses.
* The initial version of the rubric was then sent to Karl Hess, Chair of the Mathematics Department. Karl and David Stott worked to revise the rubric to allow the rubric wider applicability. Initially, the title for the proposed new math outcome was Quantitative Reasoning and Problem-Solving, but because there is a course called Quantitative Reasoning at Sinclair, to avoid confusion, the name was changed to: Mathematical Reasoning and Problem-Solving.

Mathematical Reasoning and Problem-Solving Criteria:

Criterion 1: Accurately interprets information given and develops an appropriate mathematical model/approach for a real-world application

Criterion 2: Correctly analyzes and performs computations to solve the mathematical model/problem

Criterion 3: Critically assesses, interprets, and communicates the mathematical solution in the real-world context

* The Team then designed a mini-pilot where the new rubric is to be employed in two MAT classes in Spring 2019.

The following MAT faculty generously agreed to participate in the Spring 2019 mini-pilot project: Brian Cafarella

Olga Stephens

* The Spring 2019 Pilot data will be available for review in Summer 2019. At that time, a determination will be made if the outcome & rubric are ready to be presented to Instructional Council.

**General Education Assessment Committee: Team 3**

Assessment Committee, Team 3 Report, Academic Year 2018-2019

Team 3 Charge – Examine current General Education outcomes for the purpose of revising / elimination. Generate rationale for changes to suggest at Instructional Council level.

Active Members: Angela Fernandez, Laura Walker, Janeil Bernheisel, Michelle Cox, Scott Yancy, Vandana Rola, Chuck Freeland

Team 3 met several times fall of 2018 to examine all General Education outcomes and came to the consensus that Computer Literacy was misplaced and more properly belonged as a program outcome than a Gen. Ed. Rationale for this recommendation were generated as follows:

Rationale:

1. Benchmarking reveals no schools in the area still assess computer literacy by itself. It has either been rolled in with Information Literacy or moved out of the Gen. Ed. area altogether (if it was ever there in the first place).
2. The AAC&P Value rubrics do not include one for computer literacy.
3. When altering the comp. lit. rubric to fit the wide variety of computer practices / needs between disciplines, programs are already treating the outcome as a program level outcome.
4. Computer Literacy, unlike our other Gen. Ed. outcomes, was never truly Gen. Ed. in nature in that it not a “soft skill” originating within a liberal arts discipline.
5. Arguments about a student in class who does not know how to turn on a computer or use it in the most basic of ways are anecdotal, at best, and would require the college to create and focus its Gen Ed curriculum on outliers.

To test our hypothesis that most of our students are computer literate at a basic level when they arrive at Sinclair, Team 3 conducted a mini- pilot Spring semester 2019. The directions for both faculty and students were as follows:

Non-Technical directions for faculty:

Feel free to address confusion about the directions, but do not assist anyone in completing the assignment.

In order to complete the desktop portion of the rubric, ask students to show you the file when it has been downloaded to the desktop (step # 1).

Because students who can not meet the competencies will very likely not complete the assignment, PLEASE REACH OUT TO ANY STUDENT WHO DID NOT SUBMIT ANYTHING AT ALL BY THE DEADLINE. ENCOURAGE THEM TO BE HONEST IN TELLING YOU WHY THEY DID NOT COMPLETE THE ASSIGNMENT. IF:

1. They say they couldn’t do the assignment, fill out a rubric with ‘DOES NOT MEET” for all portions.
2. If they give any other reason (i.e. “Didn’t get around to it”), fill out a rubric with “Not Observed” for all portions.

The quality of the outside info. students use to complete the assignment is not of interest here (that is assessed through the Information Literacy rubric).

If you have any questions or difficulty, please don’t hesitate to email me. The student directions are listed below.

Instructions for students:

1. Download the file entitled “Assessment Start” to your desktop.
2. Write your full name in the top left corner of the page.
3. Copy and paste a paragraph from the website “How to Write a Research Paper: A Research Guide for Students” into the file. (www.aresearchguide.com)
4. Rename the file “Computer Literacy Assessment One” and save.
5. Open a second blank Word file.
6. Write the following (be sure to include all italics, bold face and bullet points):

I plan to complete my degree *in a timely manner* by:

* + Working closely with my **academic advisor**
  + Attending class regularly and speaking with my **professors**

1. Find general information about Gun Control on at least two websites or electronic databases.
2. Create links to the websites in the second Word file.
3. Save the file as “Computer Literacy Assessment Two”.
4. Attach both files to an email.
5. Send the email, with attachments, to me. You may use any email account you wish. If you are using elearn email, send it from this course shell. If you are using an outside email account, send it to [**Faculty** -- **add outside email of your choosing**].
6. Submit one or both files in the drop box entitled “Computer Lit Assessment”.

Results: While there is some concern among Team 3 members with African American scores on the word processing portion of the mini-pilot (see highlighted line below) which the college-wide assessment committee will examine in much greater detail in the future, data from the pilot strongly confirmed Team 3’s working hypothesis. Data and disaggregated data were as follows:

Data:

Spring 19 Computer Lit Mini-Pilot Overview

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CriterionName** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Level 1: Does Not Meet** | **Level 2:**  **Meets** | **Not Observed** | **TOTAL**  **(excludes not observed)** | **% Meets (exludes not observed)** |
| Basic Email Skills | All | 17 | 138 | 3 | 155 | 89.0% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | All | 2 | 144 | 11 | 146 | 98.6% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | All | 5 | 147 | 6 | 152 | 96.7% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | All | 8 | 142 | 6 | 150 | 94.7% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | All | 13 | 138 | 7 | 151 | 91.4% |

Term / Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CriterionName** | **TERMS ATTENDED** | **Level 1: Does Not Meet** | **Level 2:**  **Meets** | **Not Observed** | **TOTAL**  **(excludes not observed)** | **% Meets (exludes not observed)** |
| Basic Email Skills | FIRST-TERM STUDENT (19/SP START) |  | 16 |  | 16 | 100.0% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | FIRST-TERM STUDENT (19/SP START) |  | 15 | 1 | 15 | 100.0% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | FIRST-TERM STUDENT (19/SP START) |  | 16 |  | 16 | 100.0% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | FIRST-TERM STUDENT (19/SP START) |  | 16 |  | 16 | 100.0% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | FIRST-TERM STUDENT (19/SP START) | 1 | 15 |  | 16 | 93.8% |
| Basic Email Skills | SECOND-TERM STUDENT (18/FA START) | 7 | 51 |  | 58 | 87.9% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | SECOND-TERM STUDENT (18/FA START) | 1 | 57 |  | 58 | 98.3% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | SECOND-TERM STUDENT (18/FA START) | 3 | 55 |  | 58 | 94.8% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | SECOND-TERM STUDENT (18/FA START) | 5 | 52 |  | 57 | 91.2% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | SECOND-TERM STUDENT (18/FA START) | 8 | 50 |  | 58 | 86.2% |
| Basic Email Skills | STUDENT STARTED BEFORE 18/FA | 10 | 71 | 3 | 81 | 87.7% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | STUDENT STARTED BEFORE 18/FA | 1 | 72 | 10 | 73 | 98.6% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | STUDENT STARTED BEFORE 18/FA | 2 | 76 | 6 | 78 | 97.4% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | STUDENT STARTED BEFORE 18/FA | 3 | 74 | 6 | 77 | 96.1% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | STUDENT STARTED BEFORE 18/FA | 4 | 73 | 7 | 77 | 94.8% |

Minority / Non-Minority

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CriterionName** | **Race/Ethnicity** | **Level 1: Does Not Meet** | **Level 2:**  **Meets** | **Not Observed** | **TOTAL**  **(excludes not observed)** | **% Meets (exludes not observed)** |
| Basic Email Skills | African-American | 1 | 12 |  | 13 | 92.3% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | African-American | 1 | 10 | 2 | 11 | 90.9% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | African-American | 1 | 12 |  | 13 | 92.3% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | African-American | 2 | 11 |  | 13 | 84.6% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | African-American | 3 | 10 |  | 13 | 76.9% |
| Basic Email Skills | Asian | 3 | 8 |  | 11 | 72.7% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | Asian |  | 9 | 2 | 9 | 100.0% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | Asian | 1 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 90.0% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | Asian | 1 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 90.0% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | Asian | 2 | 8 | 1 | 10 | 80.0% |
| Basic Email Skills | Hispanic | 1 | 8 |  | 9 | 88.9% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | Hispanic | 1 | 8 |  | 9 | 88.9% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | Hispanic | 1 | 8 |  | 9 | 88.9% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | Hispanic | 1 | 8 |  | 9 | 88.9% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | Hispanic | 1 | 8 |  | 9 | 88.9% |
| Basic Email Skills | Other | 2 | 14 | 1 | 16 | 87.5% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | Other |  | 16 | 1 | 16 | 100.0% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | Other |  | 16 | 1 | 16 | 100.0% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | Other | 1 | 15 | 1 | 16 | 93.8% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | Other | 1 | 15 | 1 | 16 | 93.8% |
| Basic Email Skills | White | 10 | 96 | 2 | 106 | 90.6% |
| Basic File Skills (Two) | White |  | 101 | 6 | 101 | 100.0% |
| Basic File Skills (one) | White | 2 | 102 | 4 | 104 | 98.1% |
| Basic Internet Navigation | White | 3 | 99 | 4 | 102 | 97.1% |
| Basic Word Processing Skills | White | 6 | 97 | 5 | 103 | 94.2% |

Approval time-line:

Members of Team 3 informed faculty at the Faculty Assembly held March 13th of the planned proposal to move Computer Literacy from the Gen Ed to the program level.

The proposal was brought to Curriculum Committee April 15th where it passed after discussion.

The proposal was brought to Instructional Council April 19th where it passed after discussion and was adopted.

Assessment coordinators will work in the coming academic year with deans to communicate the change and assist programs in declaring what computer skills their graduates will require, where in their programs they will acquire these skills, and how they will be assessed.

**General Education Assessment Committee: Team 4**

**Members:** Dawn Allen, Sean Frost, Emily Garber, Reece Newman, Derek Petrey, Lead: Heidi McGrew

**Charge:** Communicate Information Literacy expectations to the chairs and other departmental assessment personal. Expand use of the Information Literacy rubric.

**General Education Outcome Information Literacy:**

* Pose valid research or discovery questions based on need and formulate thesis idea and purpose connected to research
* Organize and integrate information and use information ethically
* Select sources to support an idea that are appropriate, credible, and relevant to the idea being presented.

The team meet to discuss the best ways to disseminate information to the chairs concerning the usage of the Information Literacy rubrics. Emily Garber volunteered to take the information to the Department Chairs Council. Emily shared the Information Literacy rubrics with DCC and asked the chairs to take the rubrics and additional information back to their departments to determine to what extent their courses were incorporating the Information Literacy rubrics into their course assignments.

Chairs were asked to send a list of the courses in which they felt they were assessing Information Literacy or had assignments that could be assessed using the Information Literacy rubrics. The following courses were identified as such:

**VIS COM**

**Interior Design**

IND 2130 - Non-Residential Design

**Visual Communications**

VIS 1110 - Design Drawing VIS 1140 - Design Processes 1

VIS 2160 - Design Applications 2

**SOC**

Soc. 1101 Introduction to Sociology (Final project and annotated bibliography) Soc. 1145 Cultural Anthropology

**HIM**

HIM 1110 Health Information Processing (Assignment(s) utilized to assess all three criteria associated with the outcome: Research paper on Healthcare Delivery)

**PAR/CJS**

PAR 1201: Legal Research and Writing: Assignment – Legal Memos PAR 1202: Advanced Legal Tech: Assignment – Legal Memo

PAR 2301: Advanced Legal Research and Writing: Assignment – Legal Memo/Trial Brief PAR 2511: Online Legal Research: Assignment – Legal Memo

CJS 1101: Introduction to Criminal Justice (The paper is one of a couple options so not required for everyone but it is an option they can pick)

CJS 1110: Interrogation, Documentation, and Testimony

CJS 2295: Criminal Justice Capstone: Assignment – Research Topic of their choice

**COM**

COM 2201: Mass Communication COM 2211 Effective Public Speaking **ALH**

ALH 1101 Information Literacy assignments are being redesigned in order to incorporate the General Education Information Literacy Rubric. Target completion is Fall 2018.

**CIS**

CIS 1140 - INFO SYS ANAL & DESIGN

**RES**

RES 1101 Real Estate Principles (Research paper/Research Assignment)

**Future Goals:**

The team will need to continue to encourage chairs and faculty involved in Information Literacy assessment to incorporate and standardize assignments so that this general education outcome may be assessed at both the program and college-wide level. The team was working toward identifying courses that could be noted as a course that would gather these data for other departments.

**General Education Assessment Committee: Team 5**

**Committee Members:** Dair Arnold, David Bodary, Jared Cutler, Chuck Freeland, Dawayne Kirkman, Matt Massie (Chair), AJ Owen, Tanya Scheper, De’Shawna Yamini

**2018 – 2019 Charge:**

* Establish a definition of co-curricular engagement that fits the institution and student population.
* Collect baseline data in areas that meet the definition of co-curricular engagement.

**Background/Rationale for the Charge:**

During Sinclair’s most recent Higher Learning Commission accreditation visit (February 2018), an increased interest and importance surrounding co-curricular engagement was expressed. While the college routinely provides a wide variety of co-curricular experiences, there has been little done to document these activities or report student participation/learning. As such, an opportunity for improvement was realized to more effectively track and assess co-curricular engagement at our institution.

**Actions Completed:**

* During Fall 2018 an inventory of student focused and highly engaged faculty and staff members who could add value to the conversation on co-curricular engagement and assessment was completed.
* Invitations to participate were sent to identified faculty and staff members and an initial meeting was scheduled
* Faculty and staff who shared the vision for this project and agreed to serve on the committee were tasked with benchmarking other institutions from around the country.
  + How do institutions define co-curricular engagement/learning
  + How do institutions measure/assess co-curricular engagement/learning
* Upon completion of the benchmarking process the team identified three significant trends within institutions across the country
  + No formal definition for co-curricular engagement existed
  + A very narrow definition of co-curricular engagement existed, that connected out-of-class learning with in-class learning
  + A broad definition that included a wider range of activities that students may engage and learn from existed.
* A discussion on findings occurred and the decision was made that a broader definition of co-curricular engagement was more appropriate for our student population.
* Based on this decision a smaller sub-group was formed to draft a definition of co-curricular engagement for our institution.
* After the draft definition was reviewed by the committee it was then shared with stakeholders in Student Affairs and others for feedback.
* Several rounds of revisions occurred and a draft definition was presented to instructional council. Feedback wan collected and revisions implemented.

**Draft Definition of Co-Curricular Engagement and Assessment:**

**Co –Curricular Engagement:**

Co-Curricular engagement is learning that occurs outside the classroom through participation in leadership opportunities, academic support, student employment, or student development activities, such as clubs, organizations, athletics, service learning, and many other student engagement activities.

**Co-Curricular Assessment:**

Co-Curricular assessment is measuring student learning through Co-Curricular engagement.

**Next Steps:**

Final approval of the proposed definitions are needed. Once obtained they will be communicated with campus stakeholders and adopt as institutional policy. Two surveys to collect baseline data have been developed and are currently being vetted and revised. Once finalized a mini-pilot will be initiated and data collected from several offices. Offices will include PTK/Honors, Service Learning, International Education, and select Student Affairs offices. Based on the results any changes to the instruments will be made and a larger campus population will be surveyed allowing for the completion of baseline data collection. Additional tasks will be undertaken during the AY2019-20 time period.