

Academic Program Assessment Report

Liberal Arts

Spring 2011-Spring 2012

Academic Program

Assessment Period Covered

() Formative Assessment

10/12/2012

(X) Summative Assessment

Date Submitted

Academic Evaluation Question (Use a different form for each evaluation question):

First Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan):

Ia. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

Data was collected from the Liberal Arts non-English courses that were offered during the year, namely Health science, psychology and sociology. Overall, the division collected 283 total number of writing samples from all of the non-English Liberal Arts core classes, with 116 samples coming from the sociology courses offered, 96 from the psychology courses and 71 from the Health science courses. Because the writing samples collected from the students were blind samples (with no names recorded to identify students), an analysis of the writing samples by gender was not possible and further gender analysis could not be done to compare with last year's assessment data by gender. As a result, what was done this year was that the assessment data looked at was based on the three courses from which the data came from. From this data, the writing samples could then provide the division with a general view of how well our students are doing in these specific courses while also providing data to compare to students' performance in the upper-level English courses from last year. By looking at both English and non-English courses, an overall assessment on how well students are meeting the PLOs of the program can be determined. After the samples were collected, the liberal arts coordinator, along with instructors who taught the three courses was provided with a COMET rubric and a randomly selected set of writing samples. They looked at and analyzed 25% of the collected sample which came out to be 72 writing samples—with 29 from the sociology courses, 24 from the psychology courses and 19 from the health science courses. The overall conclusion from the data showed that only 64% of the students assessed were able to write well enough at the level that they supposedly had to be at when entering college (scores of 4 and 5). The remaining 36% had writing abilities that were below entrance levels. For the individual class samples, 26% of the students in the Health sciences class sample were writing at a passing rate, 50% for the psychology sample and 79% in the sociology group. In each of the categories that the writing samples were assessed (syntax, vocabulary, organization, cohesion and content), the highest quantity of scores were concentrated at different levels. For example, in the psychology class sample, a majority of the students scored at a 4 in three of the five categories (46% in syntax and vocabulary and 62% in cohesion) while in the content category, 46% of the students scored at 3 and 42% scored a 5 in organization. For the health science students, in the categories of syntax and vocabulary, the majority of the students scored a 5 (53% for syntax and 58% for vocabulary) while in the other three categories, most of the students scored a 4 (58% in organization, 63% in cohesion and the same number for scores 4 & 5 in content—37%). The students in the sociology sample appeared to perform the best as 69% of the sample scored at a 5 in syntax, vocabulary, organization and content while only 66% scored a 5 in cohesion. On the other side of the scoring range, none of the students did so bad as to earn a 1 or a 0. The lowest scores earned were scores of 2 in the

organization, cohesion and content categories across the class samples while a scattering of 3s were found across all of the categories in each of the class samples.

1a: Use of Results to Improve Unit Services:

The data from this assessment shows similar results to the 2010-2011 assessments which showed that the skills or rather lack of skills of students in the higher level English are similar to those of the students in the non-English classes that were assessed. It appears that students in both the non-English classes and the upper-level English classes are facing similar comprehension skills while also having a hard time transferring what they read into writing. It is apparent that our students need more practice in writing since the students are lacking in writing skills and perhaps comprehension of texts.

Second Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan):

1b. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

1b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

1b: Use of Results to Improve Unit Services:

Third Means of Assessment for Evaluation Question Identified Above (from your approved assessment plan):

1c. Means of Unit Assessment & Criteria for Success:

1c. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:

1c: Use of Results to Improve Unit Services: