Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

The following plan was developed by Humanities faculty during Destination 2009 for implementation during the 2009-2010 academic year.

➢ Program Area: **General Education**

➢ Discipline (for plans within General Education): **Humanities**

➢ Planning Team Members:

  • Diane Brown
  • Andrew Alexander
  • Lisa Dennis
  • Karen Styles

➢ Collegewide Implementation Team Member (Working in collaboration with the Learning Evidence Team) – **Karen Styles and Diane Brown**

➢ Program Learning Outcome Selected for Assessment: **Cultural and historical understanding**

  Demonstrate understanding of the diverse traditions of the world, and an individual's place in it.

  • Performance Indicators:

    ▪ **Students will demonstrate the ability to interpret primary sources** (painting, music, literature, philosophy, religion, etc.) utilizing secondary sources and cultural contexts.

    ▪ **Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze primary sources utilizing secondary sources and standard methods appropriate to the medium and historical period.**

    ▪ **Students will demonstrate the ability to justify their preferences or perspectives based on analyses and interpretations**

    ▪ See attached Rubric

➢ Targeted Course(s): **Gordon Rule Writing Reinforcement Courses** - HUM 2220, 2250
• Common Course Outline

  ▪ The Common Course Outline for HUM2220 was completed on 5/29/2007 and was due for revision on 5/29/2009.
  ▪ The Common Course Outline for HUM2250 was completed on 9/14/2007 and is due for revision on 9/14/2009.
  ▪ Common Course outlines are reviewed on a 2-year cycle.
  ▪ Changes to course level outcomes as a result of program outcomes assessment must reflected in the faculty approved common course outline

• Targeted Course Level Outcome:

  ▪ Analyze and interpret works of art, literature, religion, philosophy, and other primary source texts in their historical and cultural contexts.

• Description of Proposed Common Assignment: **Evaluative/Comparison-Contrast Essay**

  ▪ Instructions Attached

➤ Implementation Timeline / Plan:

  • Discipline coordination / preparation in Fall 2009
  • Determination of random sample by Institutional Research and Institutional Assessment Offices in January 2010
  • Notification of impacted faculty in early February
  • Collection of randomly sampled student papers – end of Spring term 2010
  • Holistic scoring of sampled papers and faculty discussion – May 6, 2010

➤ Sampling Procedure

  • See attached sampling procedure

➤ Identified Faculty Development / Support Needs

  • Dissemination of results from Spring Learning Day 2009 Composition Grading Session

➤ Attachments:

  • General Education Student Learning Outcomes
  • Informed Consent statement to be included in all Syllabi
• Sample sampling process
• Evaluative/Comparison-Contrast Essay Assignment Instructions
• Proposed Rubric
General Education Student Learning Outcomes

The general education program at Valencia is an integral part of the A.A. Degree program and is designed to contribute to the student’s educational growth by providing a basic liberal arts education. A student who completes the general education program should have achieved the following outcomes:

Cultural and Historical Understanding: Demonstrate understanding of the diverse traditions of the world, and an individual's place in it.

Quantitative and Scientific Reasoning: Use processes, procedures, data, or evidence to solve problems and make effective decisions.

Communication Skills: Engage in effective interpersonal, oral, and written communication.

Ethical Responsibility: Demonstrate awareness of personal responsibility in one’s civic, social, and academic life.

Information Literacy: Locate, evaluate, and effectively use information from diverse sources.

Critical Thinking: Effectively analyze, evaluate, synthesize, and apply information and ideas from diverse sources and disciplines.
Participant Informed Consent Form
(Informed consent forms to be included in all General Education syllabi starting Spring 2010)

Research is being conducted to assess General Education Program student learning outcomes. Student work will be collected at random from students enrolled in General Education courses each academic term. Your instructor may be asked to submit an article of work that you have completed during the course of the semester. Your identification will be removed from the work so as to preserve your anonymity and confidentiality. The work will then be scored holistically using a rubric. Those results will be used to improve instruction not to assess you as an individual student. You will not be asked to do anything outside of your normal class assignments and this assessment is completely separate from and will have no effect upon your class average or final course grade. There are no identifiable risks to you. The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records. All information is subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974, which is designed to protect the privacy of educational records.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without negative consequences. To withdraw at any time during the study, simply ask your instructor not to submit any of your work.

Please feel free to contact Roberta Brown (407-582-3421) or Kurt Ewen (407-582-3413) if you have any questions about the study. Or, for other questions, contact the Chair of Valencia’s Institutional Review Board at irb@valenciacc.edu.

I am at least 18 years of age and not requesting exclusion from the study constitutes my informed consent.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.
Methodology for Simple Random Sampling of Students

Using a computer program written in SAS, a statistical software package, a simple random sample of students can be chosen from the population of students currently enrolled in a particular course or courses. The sample of students, although chosen at random, can be selected to intentionally mimic the college enrollment in terms of particular variables. The sample size is determined based upon the total number of students in the target population and the assessment tool that is being used (rubric, etc.). Specifics may vary and the results will look different based upon the assessment but will follow the ENC 1101 model. An example is provided below (Fall 2007):

************************************************************************

There were 4,529 students enrolled in ENC 1101, ENC 1101H, and IDH 1110 and a sample size of 115 students was used. This sample size was determined using a margin of error of ±.20 (5% of the scale – a 4 point rubric) and a confidence level of 95%. The sample size for a population size of 4,529 should be 98. However, from 200310 to 200630, the college-wide withdrawal rate for all courses (W only, not including WP or WF) ranged anywhere from 10.33% to 15.44%. So in preparation for a potential loss of selected students (due to withdrawal), the population was oversampled (115 as opposed to the suggested 98). The sample of students intentionally mimics the college enrollment in terms of the following: campus of enrollment, day/ evening (time of day course is offered), Full-time/Part-time (employment status of instructor), Online/Traditional (delivery method). The percentages for the population and the sample are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students:</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4529</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Campus breakdown:**
- East: 34.38% vs. 33.04%
- Osceola: 24.09% vs. 22.61%
- West: 35.15% vs. 35.65%
- Winter Park: 6.38% vs. 8.70%

**Timing breakdown:**
- Day: 77.22% vs. 74.76%
- Evening: 22.78% vs. 25.24%

**Delivery breakdown:**
- Hybrid: 1.10% vs. 1.74%
- Onsite: 93.42% vs. 90.43%
- Online: 5.48% vs. 7.83%

**FT/PT breakdown:**
- Full-Time: 55.73% vs. 56.52%
- Part-Time: 42.02% vs. 40.00%
- Not assigned: 2.25% vs. 3.48%
EVALUATIVE/COMPARISON-CONTRAST ESSAY ASSIGNMENT

INSTRUCTIONS: Compare and/or contrast 1 and 2 using Work A and Work B as examples of their respective cultural and historical contexts.

(1 and 2 represent cultures, philosophies, religions, mythologies, styles, historical periods, movements, etc. A and B are primary sources such as works of visual art, musical compositions, literature, etc.)

The essay must be word-processed, double-spaced, using size 12 font.

Be sure to include:

- Detailed descriptions of principle characteristics of 1 and 2
- Analyses of how A and B represent 1 and 2
- Specific examples from primary and secondary sources
- Identification of the key similarities and/or differences between 1 and 2
- Statement of preference, including justification for affirmations, approvals, or criticisms, based on the analyses and interpretations
- Proper documentation of sources
- 1000-2000 words

SAMPLING AT THE END OF SPRING TERM 2010

Option A: Ask for a random sample of all HUM courses. Distribution with regard to campus, time of day, mode of distribution, contract status of faculty member

Option B: Ask for just the highest enrolled HUM classes (Myth, 2220, 2250)
## Rubric for Evaluative/Comparison-Contrast Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of cultural and historical understanding</th>
<th>LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyzes primary sources utilizing information from secondary sources</strong></td>
<td>Applies information often inaccurately, incompletely, or omits relevant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyzes primary sources utilizing standard methods appropriate to the medium</strong></td>
<td>Employs standard methods inappropriately, inaccurately, or omits them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyzes primary sources utilizing standard methods appropriate to the historical period</strong></td>
<td>Employs standard methods inappropriately, inaccurately, or omits them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interprets primary sources utilizing information from secondary sources</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates inappropriate or inaccurate knowledge of the generally accepted meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interprets primary sources utilizing appropriate cultural contexts</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates inappropriate or inaccurate knowledge of the generally accepted meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justifies preferences or perspectives based on analyses and interpretations</strong></td>
<td>Articulates a preference or perspective that is inconsistent with the analysis and that is inconclusive and poorly reasoned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>