

2020-21 Assessment Summary

Outcome 1

Communicate clearly.

Location of measure	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target
COMM 211	Exceeded	Approaching
Writing Across the Curriculum	No established standard; 98.5% passing. See p. 9 for details.	

Outcome 2

Examine diverse perspectives.

Location of measure	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target
Capstone	Exceeded	Exceeded
Cultural Awareness	Sixty-two courses satisfy the 3 required hours from the Cultural Awareness menu. In 2020- 21, assessment results were submitted for 10 of the 44 courses that were offered. The classes and their results appear in the table. Of the courses assessed, 90% of courses met or exceeded the acceptable target. See p. 18 for courses.	

Outcome 3

Gather and use information to address problems.

Location of measure	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target
CORE 110	Exceeded	Met
Math	Not met	Not met

Outcome 4

Engage Christian approaches to community and the Bible.

Location of measure	Acceptable Target	Ideal Target
100-level Bible	No established standard; increase between administrations. See p. 39 for details.	
BIBL 211	No established standard; increase from pre-test to post-test. See p. 41 for details.	

General Education Assessment Plan (2020-present)

Outcome	Internal Measurements	External Measurements
Communicate clearly.	1. Writing Across the Curriculum assessment 2. COMM 211 course-embedded assessment	NSSE
Examine diverse perspectives.	1. Cultural Awareness menu course-embedded assessment 2. Capstone paper assessment	NSSE
Gather and use information to address problems.	1. Cornerstone annotated bibliography assessment 2. Mathematics menu course-embedded assessment	NSSE
Engage Christian approaches to community and the Bible.	1. BIBL 101/102 course-embedded assessment	

Outcome 1

Report: Assessment Cycle Details for : Communication

Report Generated by Taskstream

Workspace: Department Assessment & Continuous Improvement

Assessment Plan: 2020-2021 Outcomes Assessment Report: Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings

Assessment Plan Template: Departmental Assessment Plan Template

Report Generated: Thursday, July 08, 2021

Measures and Findings

1. GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOME SET

The Department of Communication and Sociology will address General Education competencies associated with COMM 211.

1. Communication Genres/Styles

Communicate effectively in a variety of genres and styles appropriate to specific rhetorical situations.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

COMM 211 Speeches 1-3 (overall grade for each speech)

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

Speech 1 (Career Speech), Speech 2 (Social Justice Speech), and Speech 3 (Community Advocacy Speech) will be assessed to determine whether students can communicate effectively across multiple genres, styles, and rhetorical situations.

Level of Proficiency Target (Competency Target):

84% of students will earn a "C" or above on the assignments, indicating most students have met the standard.

Ideal Target:

90% of students will earn a "C" or above on the assignments, indicating almost all students have met the standard.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Data are collected each Fall and Spring semester.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructor, COMM 211 director, and department chair.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for COMM 211 Speeches 1-3 (overall grade for each speech)

Summary of Findings:

"Career Speech: 87.6% of students earned a "C" or above on this speech.

Social Justice Speech: 91% of students earned a "C" or above on this speech.

Community Advocacy Speech: 94.9% of students earned a "C" or above on this speech.

These data represent sections from Fall 2020 and Spring 2021."

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement :

Approaching

Substantiating Evidence:

2. Information

Access and use information ethically and legally.

Measure

COMM 211 Speech 4

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Mapped to:*No Mapping***Details/Description:**

The students' citation of supporting material in Speech 4 (Mastery Speech) will be assessed to determine whether they can ethically and legally incorporate data into their speech.

Level of Proficiency Target (Competency Target):

84% of students will earn a "C" or above on use of supporting material, indicating most students have met the standard.

Ideal Target:

90% of students will earn a "C" or above on use of supporting material, indicating almost all students have met the standard.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Data are collected each Fall and Spring semester.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructor, COMM 211 director, and department chair.

Supporting Attachments:***Findings***

for COMM 211 Speech 4

Summary of Findings:

This outcome was not assessed this year.

Acceptable Target Achievement:**Ideal Target Achievement :****Substantiating Evidence:****3. Information**

Communicate, organize and synthesize information from sources to achieve a specific purpose.

Mapped to:*No Mapping****Measure***

COMM 211, Final exam

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - EXAM**Details/Description:**

The final exam will be assessed to determine if students can effectively use and organize information to achieve a specific purpose. Students complete 5 open-ended questions in which they demonstrate their ability to produce all parts of an effective speech (e.g., develop an introduction, find/select/cite credible sources, adapt content to the audience, and a strategic plan for accomplishing the speaker's purpose).

Level of Proficiency Target (Competency Target):

84% of students will earn a "C" or above on the exam, indicating most students have met the standard.

Ideal Target:

90% of students will earn a "C" or above on the exam, indicating almost all students have met the standard.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Data are collected each Fall and Spring semester.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructor, COMM 211 director, and department chair.

Supporting Attachments:***Findings***

for COMM 211, Final exam

Summary of Findings:

94.9% of students earned a "C" or above on the final exam.

These data represent sections from Fall 2020 and Spring 2021.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement :

Exceeded

Substantiating Evidence:**4. Civic**

Demonstrate understanding of community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

COMM 211 Stock Issues Plan Assignment

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT**Details/Description:**

Stock Issue Plan Assignment will be assessed to determine whether students understand how to assess and adapt a message to a civic audience, creating arguments appropriate for advocating a change in a particular community.

Level of Proficiency Target (Competency Target):

84% of students will earn a "C" or above on the assignment, indicating most students have met the standard.

Ideal Target:

90% of students will earn a "C" or above on the assignment, indicating almost all students have met the standard.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Data are collected each Fall and Spring semester.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructor, COMM 211 director, and department chair.

Supporting Attachments:***Findings***

for COMM 211 Stock Issues Plan Assignment

Summary of Findings:

97.9% of students earned a "C" or above on the stock issues plan.

These data represent sections from Fall 2020 and Spring 2021.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Exceeded

Ideal Target Achievement :

Exceeded

Substantiating Evidence:

Writing Across the Curriculum Assessment 2020-21

A total of 65 papers were assessed; two reviewers scored each paper, and their scores were averaged for each paper.

Organization and Content

Reviewers rated each paper as excellent, pass, or fail. The equivalent score for each rating is 10 for excellent, 8 for pass, and 6 for fail.

The average score in this category was 8.87. Of the 65 papers, 96.9% (N=63) were excellent or passing, and 3.1% (N=2) were failing.

This represented a rise of 0.51 in the average score for this category from the 2019-20 mean.

Diction and Style

Reviewers rated each paper as excellent, pass, or fail. The equivalent score for each rating is 5 for excellent, 3 for pass, and 1 for fail.

The average score in this category was 3.51. Of the 65 papers, 96.9% (N=63) were excellent or passing, and 3.1% (N=2) were failing.

This represented a rise of 0.17 in the average score for this category from the 2019-20 mean.

Language Use and Mechanics

Reviewers rated each paper as excellent, pass, or fail. The equivalent score for each rating is 5 for excellent, 3 for pass, and 1 for fail.

The average score in this category was 3.49. Of the 65 papers, 90.8% (N=59) were excellent or passing, and 9.2% (N=6) were failing.

This represented a drop of 0.15 in the average score for this category from the 2019-20 mean.

Total

The sum of the three preceding categories created the total score. A score of 19-20 is exceptional, 14-18.99 is passing, 10.01-13.99 is marginally passing, and 10 or below is failing.

The average total score was 15.72 with 98.5% of papers achieving a marginal pass or better. The score breakdown was:

- Excellent, 7.7% (N=5)
- Pass, 83.1% (N=54)
- Marginal Pass, 7.7% (N=5)
- Fail, 1.5% (N=1)

The total average mean rose 0.51 points compared to the 2019-20 mean.

Outcome 2

Capstone Assessment 2020-21 Report

Dr. Dana Mayhall
Dr. Jessica Smith

Background

This report communicates the results from the 2020-2021 assessment of Capstone papers.

The assessment team consisted of five faculty members: Rodney Ashlock (Bible, Missions and Ministry), Deb Williams (Language and Literature), Kendra Jernigan (Environmental Sciences), Dana Mayhall (Teacher Education), and Don Pope (Management Sciences) assessed the Capstone papers.

Due to the Covid pandemic of 2020-2021, Capstone paper assessment was not completed in the past two years. The Office of the Provost worked to gather papers from each department that had sections that completed Capstone papers to be assessed. There were 85 sections of Capstone classes in 2020-2021. The office did not receive any papers from 44 of the sections. At least one paper from all 41 sections that did submit papers was sampled. A total of 566 Capstone papers were received in 2020-2021 with 251 in fall 2020 and 305 in spring 2021. A simple random sample of 60 papers was selected for assessment.

The number of sections that didn't submit papers is a concern, but there are a couple of factors. Covid was an obstacle in two ways; it was late in the semester when papers were requested from faculty and instructions were provided about how to do it, and many faculty were overwhelmed by the additional demands of the year. We also have a number of departments that have a "Capstone experience" that includes two classes instead of a single Capstone class. For these programs, both classes show up as Capstone even though students only complete the paper in one of the classes. This artificially inflates the total. We removed a couple of these where faculty reminded us, but the ones that we didn't cull skew the numbers. The return to normal operations this year (2021-2022) and the ongoing update to general education standards give us an opportunity to emphasize participation and clean up our records.

Two members of the assessment team rated each paper. The individual scores were submitted using a Google form for each paper. There was an error in creating this form, therefore, the category of Mechanics was omitted from the form. This was not discovered until all scorers had completed their work and the report was being written.

The scores from the first and second raters were averaged for each paper in the sample. These scores were used to calculate the average score for each Student Learn Outcome (SLO) objective, the number of papers meeting the acceptable and ideal targets for each SLO objective, and the composite score for each SLO.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessed

- 2.1.A Students will demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through writing.
- 2.1.B Students will apply information to planning and creation of a product or performance.
- 2.1.C Students will demonstrate critical thinking as they develop, produce, and evaluate product or performance.

The assessment team used a rubric with five categories to assess these learning outcomes with two categories for each learning outcome:

- Use of Sources to Answer Question (2.1.A)
- Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources (2.1.A)
- Organization or Structure (2.1.B)
- Purpose of Project (2.1.C)
- Integrative Learning (2.1.C)

Due to a mistake in the creation of the Google form to report individual scores, the Mechanics (2.1.B) category was omitted from the report.

Results

SLO Objective 2.1.A – Students will demonstrate effective use of information literacy skills through writing.

Use of Sources to Answer Question

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers score at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers score at or above 2.5 for this objective. . In the 2020-21 assessment, 83.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 48.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 46.6% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 5.2% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2020-21	QEP Year 8 2018-19	QEP Year 7 2017-18	QEP Year 6 2016-17	QEP Year 5 2015-16
Use of Sources to Answer Question	Score $\geq$ 2.5	83.3	80.0%	68.3%	90.0%	78.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching	Approaching	Not Met	Met	Approaching
	Average of Samples	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.4	2.9

Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers score at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers score at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2020-21 assessment, 81.7% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was good for this objective with 43.1% of the papers receiving the same score, 48.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 6.9% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2020-21	QEP Year 8 2018-19	QEP Year 7 2017-18	QEP Year 6 2016-17	QEP Year 5 2015-16
Ethical and Appropriate Use of Sources	Score $\geq$ 2.5	81.7%	80.0%	66.7%	90.0%	76.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Approaching	Approaching	Not Met	Met	Approaching
	Average of Samples	3.1	2.9	2.7	3.2	2.9

SLO Objective 2.1.B – Students will apply information to planning and creation of a product or performance.

Organization or Structure

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers score at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers score at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2020-21 assessment, 88.3% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was excellent for this objective with 60.3% of the papers receiving the same score, 34.5% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 3.4% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2020-21	QEP Year 8 2018-19	QEP Year 7 2017-18	QEP Year 6 2016-17	QEP Year 5 2015-16
Organization or Structure	Score $\geq$ 2.5	88.3%	93.3	93.3%	93.3%	88.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
	Average of Samples	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.11

Mechanics

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers score at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers score at or above 2.5 for this objective. However, in the 2020-21 assessment rubric, the Mechanics category was inadvertently left off the reporting form. Therefore, there are no scores for this category this year.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2020-21	QEP Year 8 2018-19	QEP Year 7 2017-18	QEP Year 6 2016-17	QEP Year 5 2015-16
Mechanics	Score $\geq$ 2.5	NA	86.7%	91.7%	95.0%	88.3%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	NA	Met	Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	NA	Met	Met	Met	Met
	Average of Samples	NA	3.9	3.1	3.2	2.96

SLO Objective 2.1.C – Students will demonstrate critical thinking as they develop, produce, and evaluate product or performance.

Purpose of Project

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers score at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers score at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2020-21 assessment, 91.7% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was very good for this objective with 58.6% of the papers receiving the same score, 34.5% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 5.2% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2020-21	QEP Year 8 2018-19	QEP Year 7 2017-18	QEP Year 6 2016-17	QEP Year 5 2015-16
Purpose of Project	Score $\geq$ 2.5	91.7%	96.7%	90.0%	96.7%	91.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
	Average of Samples	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.12

Integrative Learning

The QEP report calls for an acceptable target of 73% of the sample papers score at or above 2.5 and an ideal target of 85% of sample papers score at or above 2.5 for this objective. In the 2020-21 assessment, 85.0% of the sample papers scored at or above 2.5. The inter-rater reliability was very good for this objective with 58.6% of the papers receiving the same score, 29.3% of the papers receiving scores within one point of each other, and 10.3% of the papers receiving scores that differ by two points.

Rubric	Capstone Experience	2020-21	QEP Year 8 2018-19	QEP Year 7 2017-18	QEP Year 6 2016-17	QEP Year 5 2015-16
Integrative Learning	Score $\geq$ 2.5	85.0%	85.0%	73.3%	95%	71.7%
	Acceptable Target (73%)	Met	Met	Met	Met	Not met
	Ideal Target (85%)	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Not met
	Average of Samples	3.1	3.0	2.7	3.2	2.69

Commendations and Recommendations

1. Departments and Capstone faculty are to be commended for their work with students.
2. The Capstone committee are to be commended for inter-rater reliability which was improved from past years.
3. Capstone faculty need to continue to emphasize to their students what is meant by Integrative Learning, one of the outcomes for the Capstone Experience. This outcome states that students should demonstrate habits of mind that foster integrative thinking between the liberal arts core curriculum and their major field of study.
4. Capstone faculty need to continue to emphasize that students are to include proper citation of a minimum of five appropriate sources that support the research presented in the Capstone paper. The two categories on use of sources have improved from last year, but more work needs to be done. There were a few papers that had no sources or citations at all.
5. The assessment team would like clarification about papers that do not use the minimum number of outside resources. Do such papers automatically fail? Do instructors/ departments need to revise their prompts?
6. The assessment team thinks that this is an appropriate time to reassess the rubric and the outcomes with respect to future assessment needs now that we making general education curriculum updates.

2020-21 Cultural Awareness Menu

Outcome 2: Examine diverse perspectives.

Sixty-two courses satisfy the 3 required hours from the Cultural Awareness menu. In 2020-21, assessment results were submitted for 10 of the 44 courses that were offered. The classes and their results appear in the table. Of the courses assessed, 90% of courses met or exceeded the acceptable target.

	Acceptable Target			Ideal Target		
	Not Met	Met	Exceeded	Moving Away	Approaching	Exceeded
ART 101		X		X		
ART 221		X		X		
ART 222		X			X	
DSGN 221			X	X		
DSGN 222	X				X	
COMM 345			X			X
HIST 250			X			X
GEOG 345	X			X		
MUSM 230			X			X
THEA 220			X		X	

Courses that did not submit assessment results include:

1. FIN 419 (Spring 2021)
2. BMIS 345 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
3. BMIS 371 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
4. BMIS 391 (Spring 2021)
5. BMIS 420 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
6. ANTH 101 (Fall 2020)
7. SOCI 442 (Spring 2021)
8. COMM 310 (Fall 2020)
9. HIST 117 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
10. HIST 118 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
11. HIST 131 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
12. HIST 250 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
13. ENGL 470 (Spring 2021)
14. FREN 111 (Fall 2020)
15. FREN 112 (Spring 2021)
16. FREN 221 (Fall 2020)
17. FREN 222 (Spring 2021)
18. GER 111 (Fall 2020)
19. GER 112 (Spring 2021)
20. GER 221 (Fall 2020)
21. GER 222 (Spring 2021)
22. SPAN 111 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)

23. SPAN 112 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
24. SPAN 221 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
25. SPAN 222 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
26. BUSA 419 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
27. MUSM 131 (Spring 2021)
28. MUSM 132 (Fall 2020)
29. MUSM 233 (Fall 2020)
30. PHIL 379 (Spring 2021)
31. PHIL 380 (Fall 2020)
32. SOCW 329 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
33. EDUC 211 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)
34. EDUC 476 (Fall 2020, Spring 2021)

Courses that were not offered in 2020-21 and therefore were not assessed include:

1. BIOL/CHEM/CSD/NURS 308
2. GLST 120
3. GLST 212
4. GLST 214
5. GLST 217
6. HIST 330
7. HIST 332
8. ECON 438
9. MGMT 419
10. MKTG 419
11. MUSM 231
12. MUSM 232
13. MUSM 234
14. PHIL 451
15. PSYC 345

Outcome 3

CORE 110 Assessment 2020-2021 Report

Dr. Laura Carroll, Assessment Director

Background

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A¹, 1.1B², and 1.1C³ from the QEP document, the Cornerstone (CORE 110) research artifact – annotated bibliography -- was collected. A stratified sample was used to select 100 papers for assessment.

This year's assessment team consisted of both experienced -- -- Dr. Laura Carroll, (Language and Literature/Adams Center), Dr. Houston Heflin (Bible, Missions, and Ministry), Dawne Swearingen Meeks (Theatre) – and new – Dr. Kim Hardin (Teacher Education), Sheila Ritchie (Communications and Sociology) – team members

¹ Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed.

² Access the needed information effectively and efficiently

³ Students will use information ethically and legally.

Results

Outcome 1.1.A

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher, and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2020-2021, 80% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; **the ideal target for 1.1.A was met this year.**

Obj. 1.1.A	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
Determine Information Needed	Score $\geq$ 2.5	61%	56%	61.1%	84.8%	74.4%	89.1%	66.0%	84%	82%	80%
	Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	MET	Not Met	MET	MET	MET
	Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	MET	Not met	MET	Not Met	MET	MET	MET
	Average of all samples	2.45	2.55	2.69	2.96	2.87	3.05	2.69	3.04	3.03	2.92

Outcome 1.1.B

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher, and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2020-2021, 82% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; **the idea target for 1.1.B was met this year.**

Obj. 1.1.B	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
Access and Use Information	Score $\geq$ 2.5	No assessment	67%	70.5%	84.8%	81.1%	78.3%	65%	76%	88%	82%
	Acceptable Target (70%)	No assessment	Minimally Met	MET	MET	MET	MET	Not Met	MET	MET	MET
	Ideal Target (80%)	No assessment	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	MET	MET
	Average of all samples	No assessment	2.52	2.62	2.89	2.77	2.85	2.56	2.88	3.07	3.05

Outcome 1.1.C

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher, and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2020-2021, 87% of samples scored 2.5 or higher; **the ideal target for 1.1.C was met this year.**

Obj. 1.1.C	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
Information Use Strategies	Score $\geq$ 2.5	40%	55%	80%	90.9%	91.1%	76.09%	74%	80%	84%	87%
	Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	MET	MET	MET	MET	MET	MET
	Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	MET	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	MET
	Average of all samples	2.01	2.49	2.82	3.04	3.06	2.84	2.78	3.05	3.07	3.08

Composite

The composite score, while not prescribed in the original QEP, was calculated to provide an overview of the Cornerstone assessment. To be consistent with the language for individual outcomes, an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 7.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples. In 2020-2021, 80% of samples scored 7.5 or higher; **the ideal target for the composite was met this year.**

Obj. 1.1	CORE 110	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
	Score ≥ 7.5	56% (5)	50.51%	66.32%	83.8%	80%	74.73	79.2	79%	80%	80%
	Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	Minimally met	MET	MET	MET	MET	MET	MET	MET
	Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	MET	MET	Not met	Not met	Not Met	MET	MET
	Average of all samples	3.76 (5)	7.72	8.121	8.89	8.7	8.63	8.07	8.9	9.16	9.05

Recommendations and Findings

The CORE 110 assignment, rubric and assessment are working well to teach and assess students' understandings of information literacy. Over ten years, we have worked to (1) revise the assignment, (2) refine the rubric, and (3) train teachers.

The 2017-2018 school year saw lower scores in all areas, while still meeting acceptable targets for the composite score. The assessment director, Director of Faculty Development, and Cornerstone director met to assess possible reasons for the lower- incoming students, number of new faculty to the course, etc. – and plan for Fall faculty development of CORE 110 teachers. Over the past three fall semesters, we committed to that faculty development and, even in the midst of the pandemic, scores continued to meet and exceed the ideal (80%) target.

In Fall 2018, Fall 2019, and Fall 2020, members of the assessment team spent a lunch session equipping faculty to teach the annotated bibliography, focusing on crafting research questions and evaluating sources.

We focus on the following teaching strategies:

1. Encourage students to ask a specific question that can be answered by academic sources.
2. Address the target audience in the introduction to the bibliography.
3. Refine and revise the research question based on the student's findings.
4. Emphasize changes in citation styles
5. Ensure the students address questions rather than making arguments

Among other factors, this intervention seemed to help scores and we will plan on creating similar equipping sessions for Fall 21.

Department of Mathematics

173 Onstead Science Center, ACU Box 28012, Abilene, Texas 79699-8012
325-674-2007



General Education Assessments for Mathematics

Attached are documents relating to the General Education Assessment for mathematics for the 2020–21 academic year. We collected data from the following mathematics courses in both the fall and spring semesters:

- MATH 120, 123, 124, 130, 185, and 238 and
- MATW 120, 123, and 130.

We collected data from MATH 131 during the spring 2021 semester only because it is a once-a-year course. In addition, we collected data from MATH 120 and MATH 123 during the summer 2020 semesters. For our general education classes, all sections of all courses submitted assessment data.

This is our first year to collect general education assessments from MATH 238.

In 2016-17, we began having more than one assessment question for each course. During the 2019-20 year, we continued to work on the assessment questions for each course. In the past we often changed assessment questions midyear. This made comparisons and analysis more difficult. This year we have consistency in assessment questions among the sections of our courses and between semesters. Our assessment questions are chosen to measure how our students are doing in mastering the two or three major objectives in each general education course.

This assessment cycle is unique as many of our MATH 120 and MATH 123 classes went to online formats. We typically have a two online classes during the fall and none during the spring. This year we had 10: seven in the fall and three in the spring. This is also the first year that we have had an online MATH 123 course. This course was developed in 2019-20 and offered for the first time during summer 2020.

The department is troubled by the multi-year downward trend in MATH 120 for all three assessments. The assessment questions did not change this year, but the results are moving in the wrong direction. We also notice that MATH 123 also shows a downward trend. Part of this may be explained by having more sections online. The results for MATH 124, 130, 131, and 185 are mixed. Some results are better, some are worse, and some are about the same.

Part of the lower performance is due to COVID-19. Many of our classes were split classes and many students were required to quarantine and attend class via Zoom. How much of an effect COVID-19 had on student learning is unknown. I think we'll have a better idea after we collect our 2021-22 assessment data.

Summary of Results

- **MATH 120/MATW 120:** Overall, the percentage of students scoring at least 7 out of 10, continued to drop. We did have a slight improvement in the finance assessment as compared to 2019-20. The fall semester was particularly rough.
- **MATH 123/MATW 123:** Overall, the percentage of students scoring at least 7 out of 10, dropped from 2019-20. Part of this may be due to having five sections online during the fall and spring semesters.
- **MATH 124:** This course had improvement in two of the three assessments and a slight drop in one assessment.
- **MATH 130/MATW 130:** Students in MATW 130 continue do much worse than students in MATH 130. There is a noticeable difference from fall to spring. Part of this is due to a change in faculty for the spring.
- **MATH 131:** Students did worse on the optimization assessment but did slightly better on the antiderivative assessment. We are pleased that last year's improvement in the antiderivative assessment continued this year.
- **MATH 185:** The limit/tangent assessment result dropped but the application assessment improved and the optimization assessment stayed about the same.
- **MATH 238:** This is our first year to assess MATH 238 as part of the general education assessment plan. The results are not where we want them to be, but we have data that we can use to make improvements.

Use of Results

- **MATH 120/MATW 120:** While we will be working on improving the results on all the assessments during the 2021-22 year, the department will primarily focus on improving the results on the probability assessment.
- **MATH 123/MATW 123:** While we will be working on improving the results on all the assessments during the 2021-22 year, the department will focus on improving the results on the probability assessment.
- **MATH 124:** While we will be working on improving the results on all the assessments during the 2021-22 year, the department will continue to focus on improving the results on the modeling assessment.
- **MATH 130/MATW 130:** While we will be working on improving the results on all the assessments during the 2021-22 year, the department will continue to focus on improving the results on the mathematics of finance assessment.
- **MATH 131:** While we will be working on improving the results on all the assessments during the 2021-22 year, the department will continue to focus on improving the results on the optimization/ derivative assessment.
- **MATH 185:** While we will be working on improving the results on all the assessments during the 2021-22 year, the department will focus on improving the results on the optimization assessment.
- **MATH 238:** While we will be working on improving the results on all the assessments during the 2021-22 year, the department will primarily focus on improving the results on the multiple representations of ratios to solve proportionality problems assessment.

General Education Assessment

Department of Mathematics
Summer 2020, Fall 2020, and Spring 2021

The given percentage is the percentage of students that scored 7 out of 10 or higher on the assessment question. The *Ideal* target is 85% of the students scored 7 out of 10 or higher, and the *Met* target is our acceptable target and is at least 70% of the students scored 7 out of 10.

Course	Term	Number of Students	Assessment Question					
			Probability		Statistics		Finance	
			%	Result	%	Result	%	Result
MATH 120-W1	Summer	22	64%	Not Met	77%	Met	59%	Not Met
MATH 120-W2	Summer	4	50%	Not Met	50%	Not Met	50%	Not Met
MATH 120-01	Fall	33	24%	Not Met	30%	Not Met	70%	Met
MATH 120-W2	Fall	19	47%	Not Met	58%	Not Met	47%	Not Met
MATH 120-W3	Fall	18	56%	Not Met	50%	Not Met	61%	Not Met
MATW 120-01	Fall	12	50%	Not Met	83%	Met	50%	Not Met
MATW 120-02	Fall	11	73%	Met	73%	Met	82%	Met
MATW 120-03	Fall	9	89%	Ideal	33%	Not Met	56%	Not Met
MATW 120-11	Fall	3	33%	Not Met	33%	Not Met	0%	Not Met
MATH 120-02	Spring	16	13%	Not Met	63%	Not Met	69%	Not Met
MATH 120-W1	Spring	28	61%	Not Met	54%	Not Met	75%	Met
MATW 120-01	Spring	16	25%	Not Met	69%	Not Met	56%	Not Met
MATW 120-02	Spring	17	94%	Ideal	56%	Not Met	61%	Not Met
MATH 120/MATW 120	summer	26	62%		73%		58%	
MATH 120/MATW 120	fall	105	48%		49%		60%	
MATH 120/MATW 120	spring	77	51%		59%		67%	
MATH 120/MATW 120	2020-21	208	51%		56%		62%	
MATH 120/MATW 120	2019-20	244	58%		62%		55%	
MATH 120/MATW 120	2018-19	219	78%		91%		80%	

Course	Term	Number of Students	Assessment Question					
			Descriptive		Probability		Inferential	
			%	Result	%	Result	%	Result
MATH 123-W1	Summer	21	95%	Ideal	38%	Not Met	24%	Not Met
MATH 123-W2	Summer	16	94%	Ideal	38%	Not Met	75%	Met
MATH 123-W1	Fall	40	95%	Ideal	83%	Met	75%	Met
MATH 123-W2	Fall	44	91%	Ideal	80%	Met	64%	Not Met
MATH 123-W3A	Fall	20	85%	Ideal	65%	Not Met	75%	Met
MATW 123-01	Fall	24	21%	Not Met	17%	Not Met	42%	Not Met
MATW 123-02	Fall	11	64%	Not Met	55%	Not Met	27%	Not Met
MATW 123-11	Fall	6	33%	Not Met	33%	Not Met	67%	Not Met
MATW 123-12	Fall	2	50%	Not Met	100%	Ideal	50%	Not Met
MATH 123-W1	Spring	37	92%	Ideal	73%	Met	68%	Not Met
MATH 123-W2	Spring	36	89%	Ideal	78%	Met	67%	Not Met
MATW 123-01	Spring	19	26%	Not Met	16%	Not Met	26%	Not Met
MATH 123/MATW 123	summer	37	95%		38%		46%	
MATH 123/MATW 123	fall	147	75%		65%		62%	
MATH 123/MATW 123	spring	92	77%		63%		59%	
MATH 123/MATW 123	2020-21	276	78%		61%		59%	
MATH 123/MATW 123	2019-20	239	93%		66%		69%	
MATH 123/MATW 123	2018-19	253	80%		80%		59%	

Course	Term	Number of Students	Assessment Question					
			Modeling		Application		Induction	
			%	Result	%	Result	%	Result
MATH 124-01	Fall	23	57%	Not Met	87%	Ideal	78%	Met
MATH 124-02	Fall	18	39%	Not Met	94%	Ideal	83%	Met
MATH 124-01	Spring	7	86%	Ideal	86%	Ideal	86%	Ideal
MATH 124-02	Spring	10	80%	Met	100%	Ideal	70%	Met
MATH 124	fall	41	49%		90%		80%	
MATH 124	spring	17	82%		94%		77%	
MATH 124	2020-21	58	59%		91%		79%	
MATH 124	2019-20	106	67%		69%		52%	
MATH 124	2018-19	83	93%		71%		23%	

Course	Term	Number of Students	Assessment Question					
			Finance		Probability		Modeling	
			%	Result	%	Result	%	Result
MATH 130-W1	Fall	35	86%	Ideal	89%	Ideal	89%	Ideal
MATH 130-W2	Fall	34	65%	Not Met	91%	Ideal	94%	Ideal
MATW 130-01	Fall	18	11%	Not Met	44%	Not Met	39%	Not Met
MATH 130-01	Spring	14	64%	Not Met	43%	Not Met	14%	Not Met
MATH 130-02	Spring	15	67%	Not Met	73%	Met	60%	Not Met
MATW 130-01	Spring	15	40%	Not Met	47%	Not Met	7%	Not Met
MATH 130/MATW 130	fall	87	62%		80%		81%	
MATH 130/MATW 130	spring	44	57%		55%		27%	
MATH 130/MATW 130	2020-21	131	60%		72%		63%	
MATH 130/MATW 130	2019-20	190	70%		78%		76%	
MATH 130/MATW 130	2018-19	181	63%		84%		78%	

Course	Term	Number of Students	Assessment Question			
			Optimization		Antiderivative	
			%	Result	%	Result
MATH 131-01	Spring	19	53%	Not Met	74%	Met
MATH 131	2020-21	19	53%		74%	
MATH 131	2019-20	36	67%		69%	
MATH 131	2018-19	26	69%		38%	

Course	Term	Number of Students	Assessment Question					
			Limit/Tangent		Application		Optimization	
			%	Result	%	Result	%	Result
MATH 185-01	fall	19	68%	Not Met	74%	Met	84%	Met
MATH 185-02	fall	17	47%	Not Met	59%	Not Met	47%	Not Met
MATH 185-01	spring	27	70%	Met	48%	Not Met	15%	Not Met
MATH 185	fall	36	58%		67%		67%	
MATH 185	spring	27	70%		48%		15%	
MATH 185	2020-21	63	63%		59%		44%	
MATH 185	2019-20	71	73%		38%		49%	
MATH 185	2018-19	57	77%		56%		46%	

Course	Term	Number of Students	Assessment Question					
			Triangle/Angles		Ratio		Area	
			%	Result	%	Result	%	Result
MATH 238-01	fall	11	73%	Met	36%	Not Met	64%	Not Met
MATH 238-01	spring	17	47%	Not Met	47%	Not Met	76%	Met
MATH 238	2020-21	28	57%		43%		71%	

General Education Assessment

Name of Course:

MATH 120/MATW 120 -- Quantitative Reasoning

General Education Menu:

Mathematics

Which general education SLO does your assessment address?

Quantitative Reasoning

Describe the assessment:

Beginning with the 2016-17 year, the department is using three questions. One question is from each of the three major topics of the course: statistics, probability, and mathematics of finance.

Acceptable:

70% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Ideal Target:

85% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Implementation Plan:

We will collect data from the course in summer, fall, and spring. We will evaluate responses at the end of each semester.

Responsible Personnel:

Department chair and instructors of the course

General Education Assessment

Name of Course:

MATH 123/MATW 123 -- Elementary Statistics

General Education Menu:

Mathematics

Which general education SLO does your assessment address?

Quantitative Reasoning

Describe the assessment:

Beginning with the 2018-19 year, the department is using three questions. One question is from each of the three major topics of the course: descriptive statistics, probability, and inferential statistics.

Acceptable:

70% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Ideal Target:

85% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Implementation Plan:

We will collect data from the course in summer, fall, and spring. We will evaluate responses at the end of each semester.

Responsible Personnel:

Department chair and instructors of the course

General Education Assessment

Name of Course:

MATH 124 -- Precalculus II

General Education Menu:

Mathematics

Which general education SLO does your assessment address?

Quantitative Reasoning

Describe the assessment:

Beginning with the 2016-17 year, the questions will address forming and using a function to model a physical application (exponential, logarithmic, or sinusoidal), solving an application (exponential, logarithmic, or sinusoidal), and proof (induction).

Acceptable:

70% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Ideal Target:

85% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Implementation Plan:

We will collect data from the course in fall and spring. We will evaluate responses at the end of each semester.

Responsible Personnel:

Department chair and instructors of the course

General Education Assessment

Name of Course:

MATH 130 / MATW 130 -- Finite Math for Applications

General Education Menu:

Mathematics

Which general education SLO does your assessment address?

Quantitative Reasoning

Describe the assessment:

Beginning with the 2016-17 year, the department is using three questions. One question is from each of the three major topics of the course: modeling, probability, and mathematics of finance.

Acceptable:

70% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Ideal Target:

85% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Implementation Plan:

We will collect data from the course in fall and spring. We will evaluate responses at the end of each semester.

Responsible Personnel:

Department chair and instructors of the course

General Education Assessment

Name of Course:

MATH 131 -- Calculus for Applications

General Education Menu:

Mathematics

Which general education SLO does your assessment address?

Quantitative Reasoning

Describe the assessment:

Beginning with the 2016-17 year, the department is using two questions. One question is from each of the two major topics of the course: differentiation and integration.

Acceptable:

70% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Ideal Target:

85% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Implementation Plan:

We will collect data from the course in spring. We will evaluate responses at the end of each semester.

Responsible Personnel:

Department chair and instructors of the course

General Education Assessment

Name of Course:

MATH 185 -- Calculus I

General Education Menu:

Mathematics

Which general education SLO does your assessment address?

Quantitative Reasoning

Describe the assessment:

Beginning with the 2016-17 year, the department is using three questions from the course that address applications of limits, continuity, and the derivative.

Acceptable:

70% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Ideal Target:

85% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Implementation Plan:

We will collect data from the course in fall and spring. We will evaluate responses at the end of each semester.

Responsible Personnel:

Department chair and instructors of the course

General Education Assessment

Name of Course:

MATH 238 -- Geometry and Measurement

General Education Menu:

Mathematics

Which general education SLO does your assessment address?

Quantitative Reasoning

Describe the assessment:

Beginning with the 2020-21 year, the questions will address development and understanding of geometric properties of triangles (sum of the angles is 180° , formula for area, etc.) and will address the use multiple representations of ratio types (with multiplication and division) to represent proportional relationships.

Acceptable:

70% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Ideal Target:

85% of the students will have an acceptable score on each question (70% or higher).

Implementation Plan:

We will collect data from the course in fall and spring. We will evaluate responses at the end of each semester.

Responsible Personnel:

Department chair and instructors of the course

Outcome 4

100-Level Bible Knowledge Survey Assessment Data

Due to user error on the part of the survey builder, we do not have unlimited access to data from both the fall and spring semesters. However, here are some of the things we do know:

- Our pilot section actually declined in its performance, from 76% success in the fall (*n* of 22) to 63.6% success in the spring (*n* of 21). We have not yet looked at the individual students involved to be able to compare the students who completed it both times.
- As an entire group, the fall cohort (mostly BIBL 101, with the pilot section in BIBL 100, one section of BIBL 102, and two sections of BIBL 103) completed the survey at a 60% success rate, with an *n* of 696.
- As an entire group, the spring cohort (mostly BIBL 102, with the pilot section in BIBL 103, and one additional section each of BIBL 101 and BIBL 103) completed the survey at a 71% success rate, with an *n* of 434.
- Some further information:

Fall 2020 (*n* of 696)

0-20% correct (0-6 questions right): 28 students (4.02%) (4 students got 0%)
21-40% correct (7-13 questions right): 97 students (13.9%)
41-60% correct (13-19 questions right): 188 students (27.0%)
61-80% correct (20-26 questions right): 267 students (38.4%)
81-100% correct (27-33 questions right): 116 students (16.7%) (2 students got 100%)

0-20% (1st quintile): 0-14 questions right
21-40% (2nd quintile): 14-18 questions right
41-60% (3rd quintile): 18-22 questions right
61-80% (4th quintile): 22-25 questions right
81-100% (5th quintile): 25-33 questions right

Spring 2021 (*n* of 434)

0-20% correct (0-6 questions right): 0 students (0%)
21-40% correct (7-13 questions right): 17 students (3.9%)
41-60% correct (13-19 questions right): 72 students (16.6%)
61-80% correct (20-26 questions right): 210 students (48.4%)
81-100% correct (27-33 questions right): 135 students (31.1%) (7 students got 100%)

0-20% (1st quintile): 0-19 questions right
21-40% (2nd quintile): 19-22 questions right
41-60% (3rd quintile): 22-25 questions right
61-80% (4th quintile): 25-28 questions right
81-100% (5th quintile): 28-33 questions right

In other words, the average across the sections improved appreciably, but not as much as we might like. We don't have the ability to analyze things at a more granular level, so as to

catch the students who completed BOTH surveys. But the quintile information is telling, in that many of the lower performances on the first administration dropped away, so that the scores that made up the first AND second quintile comprised ONLY the first quintile on the second. And the top quintile on the first administration has to be split into the fourth and fifth on the second administration. In other words, there is a general move "upward," in terms of scoring.

BIBL 211 Assessment Data

Fall 2020

BIBL 211

	Entrance Survey Overall Class Average on Multiple Choice	Exit Survey Overall Class Average on Multiple Choice	Overall Average Improvement	Total students	Total improvement percentage points
Ashlock M1	59%	77.26%	18%	42	756
Ashlock H1	64%	84.00%	20%	30	600
Peeler Abroad	62%	83%	21%	15	315
DeBoer (2)	58%	63.89%	6%	18	108
Cha 05	59%	70.91%	12%	33	396
Cha 01	56%	74.89%	19%	44	836
Webb	55%	71.76%	17%	17	289
Hare 04	54%	66.44%	13%	45	585
Hare 03	52%	71.86%	20%	35	700
				279	4585

57.23% Across all sections

73.55% Across all sections

16.32% Across all sections

Spring 2021

BIBL 211

	Entrance Survey Overall Class Average on Multiple Choice	Exit Survey Overall Class Average on Multiple Choice	Overall Average Improvement	Total students	Total improvement percentage points
DeBoer (2)	51%	79.07%	29%	27	783
Hare 05	50%	66.09%	16%	32	512
Hare 06	50%	70.93%	21%	27	567
Webb	49%	65.56%	17%	18	306
Austin	53%	73.44%	20%	32	640
Walters Sum 2	59%	84.00%	25%	30	750
Parrish Sum 2	62%	77.26%	15%	42	630
Sheasby Sum 2	62%	83.00%	21%	15	315
				223	4503

54.75% Across all sections

74.91% Across all sections

20.16% Across all sections