



**ANTIOCH
COLLEGE**

Academic Affairs Assessment Committee

General Education Program:

Assessment of Academic Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014

June 3, 2015

Executive Summary

The Academic Affairs Assessment Committee (AAAC) analyzed data from course assessment reports, records from the Registrar's Office, and results from College institutional surveys in order to assess the effectiveness of the General Education Program. The AAAC also examined additional questions in the present analytical report, including an exploration of how quantitative and written communication are being assessed and how instructors at the College use assessment reports to revise their courses. The AAAC also undertook a preliminary effort to map College Liberal Arts Learning Outcomes (LALOs) to established institutional survey items to provide an indirect measure of student learning. The results of the report are summarized below:

- The General Education Program is meeting nearly all of the outcomes and goals articulated in the Academic Affairs Assessment Plan (AAAP)—**see Table 1**
 - The goal of 80% of students meeting standards for normal academic progress was not met; 77% of students met these standards—**see Table 1**
- College LALOs can be successfully mapped to survey items and constructs from the CIRP survey series and can provide an indirect measure of student learning—**see Table 6**
 - These survey items and constructs will be assimilated into the AAAP
- Student results on the CIRP items and constructs that can be mapped to LALOs show students are performing equal or greater than their peers at 4-year colleges—**see Table 6**
 - The amount of those students reporting frequently revising their writing is the lone exception; Antioch students report revising less frequently than peers
- Data from assessment reports show that scores in the LALO of written communication have improved between the 2012 and 2013 academic year—**see Table 3**
- While most classes that emphasize writing assess written communication, few classes that emphasize quantitative skills assess quantitative communication—**see Table 4**
- Instructors regularly use their assessment reports to revise their courses: on average, over 40% of instructors report making changes to their courses each quarter based on assessment findings—**see Table 5**

General Education Program—Assessment of Academic Years 2012 and 2013

Introduction

Data on student learning outcomes reported in assessment reports was summarized for the last two academic years (2012-2013 and 2013-2014) for courses in the general education program. Data were also gathered from other sources, including the registrar's office and institutional surveys. These data were analyzed in relation to the goals and objectives of the General Education Program. These goals are articulated in the Academic Affairs Assessment Plan (AAAP), and consist of several measurable objectives that relate to each goal. The purpose of the present analytical report was to determine if the individual objectives underlying each goal are being met, and if the recently revised General Education Program Assessment Plan (GEP AP) is functional.

In addition, the Academic Affairs Assessment Committee (AAAC) sought to investigate several other areas of student learning in the context of assessment, including improvement in written communication outcomes, implemented assessment of quantitative and written communication, and explore how College faculty use their assessment reports to make changes in their courses. In detail, these questions examined: 1) Whether scores in written communication improved between the 2012-2013 and the 2013-2014 academic years; 2) Whether quantitative and writing-specific courses assess quantitative or written communication, respectively; and 3) What percent of College instructors are making changes to their courses based on the process of assessing student learning?

Finally, the AAAC undertook a preliminary effort to map College Liberal Arts Learning Outcomes (LALOs) onto institutional survey items and constructs. Specifically, AAAC intentionally linked LALOs to survey items and constructs from the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) student surveys, which include the Freshman Survey (TFS), Your First College Year survey (YFCY), and the College Senior Survey (CSS). These surveys are intended to be taken prior to starting at Antioch, upon completion of the first year, and upon graduation. The data can then be linked longitudinally to assess academic growth. Moving forward, the AAAC will consider the value of consistently integrating these metrics into the GEP AP and the AAAP as a whole.

Method

There are four General Education Goals. These goals are as follows:

1) To impart fundamental knowledge, skills, abilities, and habits of mind that enable students to succeed academically;

- 2) To develop analytical, critical, and problem solving skills;
- 3) To enhance a student's written communication and quantitative reasoning skills; and
- 4) To impart in students an understanding and appreciation of global cultures, situations, and diversity.

Using data from the College's assessment reports as well as the registrar's office, analyses were conducted to determine if the objectives underlying each learning goal were met. The current analysis used data from several sources of information about student learning and assessment. A primary source was course-based assessment reports submitted by College faculty upon the completion of each academic quarter. These reports consist of faculty reflection upon student learning in the context of the course, as well as quantitative data on selected College LALOs. These data are reported on a 5-point scale based on established rubrics shared by all instructors. An additional data source was academic data from the Registrar's Office, including progress towards degree and course completion rates. This information from the Registrar's Office was coupled with the assessment report data to assess the measurable objectives underlying the current learning goals of the general education program.

The assessment reports also provided data that allowed for investigation of the secondary research questions. The LALO score for Written Communication was used to look for improvement in students' writing skills across the two academic years in all general education courses that assessed this LALO; using a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), average scores between the two academic years were assessed for significant differences. A survey of the assessment reports provided information on how many quantitative/writing-specific courses were assessing relevant learning outcomes. The narrative sections of the assessment reports provided information on how many instructors were making changes to their courses in the context of the assessment process.

The survey data was provided by the YFCY survey, facilitated by the Cooperative Institution Research Program (CIRP—hosted by HERI). This survey was given to all first-year Antioch College students in June of 2014 who completed TFS in Fall of 2013. This group consisted of 30 students; of the 30, 22 (73%) completed some or all of the YFCY survey. In terms of sex and ethnicity demographics, these 22 students provided a representative sample of the 88 total students in the cohort (25%, and reflective of sex and ethnicity distributions).

The constructs (and underlying construct items) used from the YFCY survey include Habits of Mind, Pluralistic orientation, Positive cross-racial interaction, Negative cross-racial interaction, Social agency, Civic awareness, and Civic engagement. Habits of Mind is a unified measure of behaviors and traits associated with academic success and lifelong learning; this construct mapped onto a variety of LALOs, including Knowledge and Inquiry (KI), Skills and Innovation (SI), Critical Thinking (CT), and

Written, Oral, and Quantitative communication (WOQC). Pluralistic orientation measures skills and dispositions appropriate for living and working in a diverse society; this construct mapped onto Intercultural Effectiveness (IE). Positive/negative cross-racial interactions are measures of students' level of positive/negative interaction with diverse peers; these constructs also mapped onto IE. Social agency measures the extent to which students value political and social involvement as a personal goal; this construct maps onto Social Engagement (SE). Civic awareness measures students' understanding of the issues facing their community, nation, and the world; this construct also maps onto SE. Civic engagement measures the extent to which students are motivated and involved in civic, electoral, and political activities; this construct maps onto SE and Deliberative Action (DA).

Results

Assessment of Objectives supporting Learning Goals of the General Education Program

There are several measurable objectives underlying each goal of the General Education Program. Using data from the College's assessment reports as well as the Registrar's Office, an analysis was conducted to determine if the objectives underlying each learning goal were met. Table 1 shows each objective and data to determine if the objective is being met. Table 2 shows average LALO scores across each quarter in the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years; these scores are from course-based assessment reports completed by instructors at the completion of each academic quarter for each course taught.

Learning Goal	Objective	Goal	Actual data	Comments
1	% of students meeting Normal Standards of Progress	80% of all students will meet NSP	77%	Goal not met (Data from Class of 2016)
1	% of rising 3 rd year students GPA	75% will have 3.0 or better	95% have 3.0 or better	Goal met
1	Average LALO score for KI across Foundation courses	Average score of 3.75 or better	3.96	Goal met
2	Average LALO score for SI across Foundation courses	Average score of 3.75 or better	3.98	Goal met
2	Average LALO score for CT	Average score of	3.87	Goal met

	across Foundation courses	3.75 or better		
3	Average LALO score for WC across Foundation courses	Average score of 3.75 or better	4.09	Goal met
3	Average LALO score for WC across all GSW courses	Average score of 3.75 or better	4.08	Goal met
3	Successful completion rate in GSW	At least 75%	92%	Goal met
4	Successful completion rate in Global Seminar	At least 75%	94%	Goal met
4	Successful completion rate in Work Portfolio	At least 75%	97%	Goal met

Table 1: General Education Goals and data

Quarter	<i>LALOs</i>	<i>KI</i>	<i>SI</i>	<i>CT</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>DA</i>	<i>WOQC</i>
F 12		4.11	4.07	4.20	4.58	--	--	4.35
W 13		4.02	3.6	3.77	2.6	2.7	2.44	3.44
Sp 13		--	--	--	--	--	--	4.18
Su 13		3.24	4.09	4.28	--	--	--	4.23
F 13		4.1	4.24	2.24	4.65	--	4.07	4.41
W 14		4.17	4.01	4.08	3.61	--	--	4.77
Sp 14		--	--	4.71	--	--	4.7	4
Su 14		4.09	3.87	3.8	4.03	4.34	2.97	4.19
	Average	3.96	3.98	3.87	3.89	3.52	3.54	4.20

Table 2: Course-based assessment report data on LALOs

As Table 1 illustrates, the General Education program is meeting the majority of goals articulated in the Academic Affairs Assessment Plan. The lone exception is the percentage of students in the 2016 class meeting standards of academic progress.

Improvement in Written Communication

Efforts for continuous improvement in all areas of student learning outcomes have been ongoing, particularly in the area of written communication. One way to assess if student skills in written

communication have improved is to investigate student learning outcomes through course assessment reports. Average scores for each academic quarter are provided below, along with averages for each quarter.

Quarter	Average Written Communication score
Fall 2012	3.8
Winter 2013	3.72
Spring 2013	4.18
Summer 2013	4.16
2012-2013 average	3.97
Fall 2013	4.32
Winter 2014	4.42
Spring 2014	4
Summer 2014	3.92
2013-2014 average	4.17

Table 3: Average written communication LALO score from course-based assessment reports

These data were submitted to a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine if there were significant differences in Written Communication between the two academic years. The results showed that Written Communication scores for the 2012-2013 year ($M=3.97$) was lower than the Written Communication scores for the 2013-2014 year ($M=4.17$) [$F(1, 16) = 4.82, p=.04$]. In sum, scores for this LALO improved between the two academic years.

Assessment of Quantitative and Written Communication

One of the secondary aims to this analysis was to determine if courses were assessing quantitative and written communication; specifically, if courses that emphasize quantitative and written communication are assessing these LALOs. A survey of assessment reports from these types of courses was conducted and the results are reported below.

Quarter	Q_Courses	Q_Measure	% Measuring	W_Course	W_Measure	% Measuring
F12	0	0	N/A	2	2	100%
W13	0	0	N/A	1	1	100%
Sp13	2	0	0%	0	0	N/A
Su13	3	0	0%	2	2	100%
F13	2	0	0%	2	2	100%
W14	3	0	0%	2	2	100%
Sp14	2	1	50%	1	0	0%
Su14	3	0	0%	1	1	100%

Table 4: Assessment of quantitative and written communication LALOs

Instructors Making Changes to Courses

An additional inquiry by the AAAC was to determine how many instructors are actively making changes to their courses based on self-assessments built into the assessment report process, as well as the assessment of student learning outcomes. A survey was conducted of assessment reports across the two academic years to determine how many instructors reported making changes to their courses. The results show that over 40% of instructors make changes to their courses based on the assessment process. The full results are shown in the table below.

Quarter	Courses	Changes	Percent Change
F12	29	15	52%
W13	22	11	50%
Sp13	23	6	26%
Su13	32	14	44%
F13	48	15	31%
W14	47	18	38%
Sp14	39	13	33%
Su14	58	30	52%
		Average	41%

Table 5: Instructors revising courses

Mapping LALOs onto survey constructs

As noted above, a preliminary effort was made to map College LALOs onto survey constructs and items from the CIRP survey, YFCY. The table below details this mapping, as well as providing data from Antioch students from Fall 2014, and comparison 2014 data from students at nonsectarian 4-year colleges.

Antioch LALO	LALO details	HERI construct	HERI item	Antioch item/construct score (2014 YFCY)	Peer comparison score	Peer comparison (mean score)
KI	Understanding modes of inquiry	Habits of Mind	Ask questions in class	41% frequently	36% frequently	No significant difference
KI	Understanding modes of inquiry	Habits of Mind	Look up scientific research articles or resources	59% frequently	52% frequently	No significant difference
KI	Understanding modes of inquiry	Habits of Mind	Explore topics on	55% frequently	36% frequently	No significant

	inquiry		your own			difference
SI	Problem solve and innovate	Habits of Mind	Seek alternative solutions to a problem	64% frequently	52% frequently	No significant difference
SI	Problem solve and innovate	Habits of Mind	Seek solutions to problems and explain them to others	55% frequently	59% frequently	No significant difference
CT	Evaluate knowledge	Habits of Mind	Evaluate the quality or reliability of information you received	50% frequently	52% frequently	No significant difference
IE	All components	Pluralistic orientation	All items (Construct)	52-construct score	54-construct score	No significant difference
IE	All components	Positive cross-racial interaction	All items (Construct)	54-construct score	54-construct score	No significant difference
IE	All components	Negative cross-racial interactions	All items	51-construct score	52-construct score	No significant difference
SE	All components	Social agency	All items (Construct)	56-construct score	53-construct score	No significant difference
SE	All components	Civic awareness	All items (Construct)	50-construct score	51-construct score	No significant difference

SE	All components	Civic engagement	I am interested in seeking information about current social and political issues	46% Strongly agree	17% Strongly agree	Significantly higher than peer group
SE	All components	Civic engagement	Goal: Keeping up to date with political affairs	27% Essential	14% Essential	No significant difference
DA	Reflect on the personal and social significance of learning as a guide toward a purposeful future	Civic engagement	All items (Construct)	52-construct score	49-construct score	No significant difference
WOQC	Written communication	Habits of Mind	Revise your papers to improve your writing	25% frequently	61% frequently	Significantly lower than peer group
WOQC	Written/Oral communication	Habits of Mind	Support your opinions with a logical argument	50% frequently	55% frequently	No significant difference

Table 6: Mapping LALOs to CIRP survey constructs and items

These results suggest that Antioch College first-year students are generally academically engaged at a level similar to or better than students at the average nonsectarian 4-year college. The only exception was the academic activity of revising papers to improve writing.

Conclusions and Future Directions

The results of the present analysis show that as a whole, the General Education program is successfully meeting its intended outcomes and goals. Importantly, the results demonstrate that the current assessment plan is feasible in its implementation. Although the percentage of 2016 students achieving normal standards of academic progress (77%) is below the goal of the General Education program (80%), this difference is negligible, as it is both small and greatly affected by the small class size (44/57 met SAP; had 46 met SAP—2 students more—the goal would have been met). Nevertheless, these findings will be reported to the Academic Policy and Review Committee (APRC). As subsequent cohorts progress towards graduation, additional data points will be available for the purposes of this assessment of academic progress.

It is worth noting that this analysis again demonstrated that specific LALOs are not being regularly assessed in the general education program; out of eight academic quarters, Intercultural Effectiveness was assessed five quarters, Social Engagement was assessed two quarters, and Deliberative Action was assessed four quarters. This finding has been observed in previous assessments. In response to this, the AAAC has worked with Residence Life to develop an assessment plan to better capture elements of student learning that are occurring outside the standard curriculum. Future assessments of the General Education program will work to incorporate assessments from Residence Life, as well as assessment reports from Community Life courses. In addition, this result will be explored with the Curriculum Committee (CC) and faculty in the General Education curriculum review to ensure faculty are able to assess these LALOs. Moreover, an audit of course syllabi is currently in progress, and the information provided by this audit should help determine if these LALOs are being taught in courses (while not being assessed in course-based assessment reports).

In addition, these LALOs can be measured through institutional surveys. As illustrated in this report, constructs and items from the HERI-CIRP surveys can be used to indirectly assess College LALOs. These surveys allow for both assessment of student growth over time in constructs related to academic engagement and learning, as well as comparisons to students at similar institutions. As the current results show, Antioch College students scores comparably to students at other similar institutions in most cases. There are two exceptions: Antioch students are more interested in current political events,

a finding that underscores the institutional commitment to social engagement, and Antioch students report revising papers less frequently than students at other institutions. The latter result is somewhat anomalous, given the resources available for students, namely the Writing Center. This finding should be investigated further, with the potential action of encouraging more students to utilize the Writing Center and the academic support available. It is also a possibility that the academic calendar system of quarters, when compared to the academic calendar system of semesters, does not allow for multiple revisions to occur in most courses.

Related to this, the current analysis showed that student scores in the LALO of Written Communication improved between the two academic years. This result is encouraging, and the pedagogical underpinnings should be explored further. Assessment reports for the relevant courses can be surveyed to determine if specific changes were made to courses that may have contributed to the improvement in student writing skills.

However, the AAAC recognizes that instructors at the College have not undergone a formal training on the rubrics that underlie LALO scoring. Moreover, there has not been any formal norming training between instructors, so that consistency of LALO scoring across instructors cannot be ensured. In upcoming years, it is imperative that instructors engage in this norming training, so that the AAAC can have reasonable confidence in inter-rater reliability of the LALO rubrics.

The current analysis also showed that many courses that were inherently related to quantitative communication were not assessing this LALO as reflected in the assessment reports. The AAAC will work with the CC and instructors for these courses to encourage the assessment of quantitative communication. This stands in contrast to courses related to written communication, where the vast majority of courses assessed written communication.

Finally, an overview of the General Education program allowed for an investigation into the usefulness of assessment reports. The results show that over 40% of faculty are regularly making changes to their courses based on their assessment reports. This underscores the usefulness of the assessment process at the College. Data about student learning outcomes are being captured, and this data is being used to improve course process and ultimately, student learning.

The results of this report will be shared with relevant parties in the College, including with the faculty at large, the Office of Academic Affairs, and major committees, such as the CC and the APRC. The AAAC acts solely as a reporting body and does not serve an interpretive role; the onus is therefore on the faculty and their committees to act on these current assessment data. A plan for communicating these findings to specific bodies, by specific people, is outlined in Table 7.

Table 7 of 2012-2014 General Education Assessment Report, 03 June 2015
Version 1.2, 03 June 2015

Finding/Issue	Person/Committee to Inform	Person who will communicate information and follow up	Follow up action and date
Class of 2016 did not meet SAP goal	Academic Progress and Review Committee (APRC)	Ron Napoli, Registrar (member of both AAAC and APRC)	APRC informed 6 May 2015. Response: Will monitor; have already implemented stronger student support systems
IE, SE, and DA are still underrepresented	Community Life (CL) (and Residence Life), Curriculum Committee (CC)	Jim Woehrle (member of AAAC; Associate Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning (ADIERP))	(Syllabus Audit is already in process; completed and interpreted before Assurance Argument is done) ^a
LALOs may be taught but not assessed (Syllabus Audit)	Academic Affairs (already in process)	David Kammler, ADAA (chair of AAAC)	(Syllabus Audit: See above) ^a
Mapping HERI-CIRP surveys onto assessment plan constructs	AAAC and IER (In process)	ADIERP	IER Response: What is in GEPAR will work for LALOs; can import into other assessment plans AAAC: Piloting with Gen Ed AP
Incorporating HERI-CIRP survey measurements into assessment plans	AAAC and IER (In process for Gen Ed)	ADIERP and ADAA	In process. ADIERP has mapped; ADAA will incorporate into GEPAP as time allows.
Antioch students more interested in current political events than peers	Office of Admissions	Jim Kapoun (Director, Library and Information Services (DLIS); member of AAAC)	Admissions informed 15 May 2015. Response: Not surprised by information
Antioch students revise papers less frequently than peers	Writing Institute (specifically Robin Littell, Director of Writing Institute)	ADAA	Conversation with Robin Littell in late April; will monitor
LALO: WC has improved, and exploration thereof	Writing Institute	ADAA	Conversation with Robin Littell in late April; will monitor
Norming and rubric training sessions needed	Academic Affairs	ADIERP and ADAA	(Also awaits syllabus audit) ^b
QC is not being assessed much	Curriculum Committee and faculty teaching Q courses	ADAA	(Syllabus Audit: See above) ^a
Over 40% of instructors make changes based on assessment	Academic Affairs, IER, and faculty at large	(AAAC, when GEPAR is publicized)	(Be happy!)

a) A syllabus audit is in process, and we are awaiting the results. At present, we see three reasonable potential findings, each of which has different implications and necessary actions, listed below. Essentially, it is a 'wait and see' situation, which should not be acted upon without fuller understanding.

- 1) It could be that our classes are not teaching to these LALOs. (This seems unlikely, given our mission and staff, but it is possible.)
 - a. This could prompt a discussion on ways we can teach to them, and possibly why we are not teaching to them.
- 2) It could be that we are teaching to them, but not capturing/measuring data. (This seems more likely.)
 - a. This could prompt a discussion on ways to measure them, including an assessment-focused workshop in which faculty share their methods and ideas with each other.
- 3) It could be that certain LALOs are taught more in co-curricular activities (Community Life classes, ComCil, Residence Life, etc.)
 - a. This would continue our explorations in to how to capture data from these activities (already in process).

Based on what we find, it might then be appropriate for members of AAAC (such as the ADAA and the ADIERP) to meet with the Curriculum Committee, share these data, and recommend actions. For example, one hypothetical scenario is where Quantitative Communication is being taught by Math courses, but data are not being captured. A hypothetical discussion could be a) discussing requiring selective quantitative-focused math courses to measure QC (especially GSQ 105 and Math 105), and b) exploring other courses that use QC that could meet the Quantitative requirement, such as some science and social science courses (especially Peco).

b) The assessment program at Antioch College began with using standardized rubrics based on the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. We have been open only a relatively short time, but are beginning to approach a point where we have enough experience with them to consider how to modify and normalize them. Are the rubrics measuring what **we** value, and what **we** want? Adjusting these is a slow and complex process, and can realistically only be done one at a time. The syllabus audit will help us with this—it will hopefully identify who is involved in assessing which LALOs, and may help us to identify a starting point. Prior to the audit, we guess that Written Communication could be a good place to start, given the frequency of its assessment in the past, across multiple Divisions and Programs—but the audit will confirm or deny this.