

GE SLO 1 – Effective Communication

NARRATIVE:

In October 2015, an inter-disciplinary team of 9 faculty and support staff convened to discuss GE-SLO 1 (effective communication). Having defined some specific qualities we were looking for in student work, we assessed those SLOs relevant to GE-SLO 1 in the classes we were teaching during the Fall 2015 semester.

Disciplines represented:

- Administration of Justice
- Film
- Communication Studies
- Art
- The Writing Center / ENGL800 Lab
- Biology
- Learning Support Center
- Admissions & Records
- English

NOTE:

The labs and Admissions & Records information is not included in the summary table. The Writing Center labs do an assessment every spring, and supplied their Spring 2015 information. This is a questionnaire, and does not include the students' G-numbers and cannot be disaggregated. Admissions & Records also survey students by means of an anonymous questionnaire. They supplied data from the Fall 2014-Spring 2015 year.

No results were obtained from the ART class.

RESULTS

COURSE	Relevant SLOs	# of sections assessed	#students	#results overall	success by SLO	overall success
ADMJ 120	1	1	38	38		31/38 = 81%
LCTR 100	1	1	20	20		15/20 = 75%
BIOL 100	1	3	55	55		41/55 = 74.5%
FILM 100	2	1	29	58	SLO 1: 18/29 = 62% SLO 3: 28/29 = 96.5%	46/58 = 79.3%
COMM 110	2	1	19	38	SLO 1: 15/19 = 78.9% SLO 2: 17/19 = 89.4%	32/38 = 84.2%
COMM 130	1	1	20	20		18/20 = 90%
ENGL 100	3	2	53	159	SLO 1: 44/53 = 83% SLO 2: 36/53 = 67.9% SLO 3: 38/53 = 71.6%	118/159 = 74.2%

DISCUSSION

In total, we assessed 234 students, in 10 sections, in 7 courses, from 6 disciplines, in a combined total of 11 SLOs (most courses had only one learning outcome tied to GE-SLO 1, but some had two or three).

Observations:

- While our pool was relatively small, we still ended up with a lot of students. And the process of entering and re-entering G#s is extremely laborious.
- The numbers are skewed here by the fact that 53 students in 2 sections of English represent almost one-half of all the results.
- It's not clear what the take-away from this would be. Would it tell us much that we don't already know? Does it give our faculty a different perspective on student achievement in their classes? Also, we should consider associating the CRN number too, because we will likely want to run comparisons between students in night classes v. day classes, or online v. on-campus instruction, etc., all of which is conveyed in the CRN number.
- There really wasn't any way to fold the instructional labs into this; they don't collect data using a G-number. We need to work on this problem separately.
- Nor was there any way to fold the administrative outcomes into this. We should look into a different standard, and different assessment methods, for administration (service outcomes?)

Suggestions:

- Work on making a link between Banner (or G-numbers) and TracDat. Re-entering data for students takes forever, and it's very easy to get a digit wrong and mess up the record.
- Let's not use the outcomes we've already got in our courses. It just makes it too unclear: one outcome in a large class versus four outcomes in a smaller one? And we're comparing apples and oranges. Instead, each faculty group should try to forge a common assignment, or at least common parameters to an assignment, and assess our students using this special GE assignment. ALSO, each section should use maybe 10 or 20 students, so that one subject doesn't dwarf another.
- Look into alternative ways to assess labs and administration.