

Date Received August 20, 2007

**Assessment Report Form
Edison State College**

1. Assessment Project Report:

Program	General Education Assessment in HUM 2230
Department	Humanities
College	Arts and Sciences
Program Assessment Coordinator	Dr. Wendy Chase
Academic Year	2006 - 2007
Report Submitted by	Wendy Chase (Lead Faculty in Humanities)
Phone/email	wchase@edison.edu
Date Submitted	August 20, 2007

2. According to the Assessment Plan, what were the planned assessment activities to be conducted during the Academic Year? You may want to copy and paste from this program's assessment plan.

Which outcomes for this program were measured?	How did you measure the outcomes?	What results did you expect?
Written Communication, Critical Thinking, Technology/Information Management, and Ethics/Values	Common Graded Assignment	This was a pilot Common Graded Assignment.

3. Results, conclusions, and discoveries. What are the results of the planned activities listed above? What conclusions or discoveries were made from these results. Describe below or attach to the form.

Overall, taking each general education competency separately, the two strengths of the Edison College General Education program are evident: written communication and, to a lesser extent, critical thinking. These are the two areas that Edison College has targeted for improvement within the Writing Program in the last two years.

In the HUM 2230 general education common graded assignment, the follow scores illustrate the number of students (within the entire 1 – 60 hours cohort) who earned an “acceptable” score: a “3” or above:

Written Communication = 87% of the students earned a “3” or above;
Critical Thinking = 79% of the students earned a “3” or above;
Technology/ Information Management = 53% of the students earned a “3” or above;
Ethics/Values = 27% of the students earned a “3” or above.

4. Use of Results. What program changes are indicated? How will they be implemented? If none, describe why changes were not needed.

1. The development of the “common graded assignment” needs to match the rubric more carefully. When revising this assessment process for the general education assessment of ECO 2013 and PHI 2600 in Spring, 2008, it would be helpful to have the scoring team that participated in the pilot to assist faculty develop the rubric, especially in “technology/information management” and “ethics/values.” The lower scores in the latter two competencies reflect, to some extent, the ambiguity of the rubric in these areas.
2. The scorers felt a 4 – point rubric would be easier and more effective to use for this type of assessment.
3. The “norming” process for scoring this type of analytical essay has to occur throughout the scoring session; generally, every third essay should be normed by each pair.

5. Dissemination of results, conclusions, and discoveries. How and with whom were the results shared?

A copy of this report will be placed on the Edison College website, and the information will also be shared with faculty during duty days in August, 2007.