## Assessment Overview

**Discipline/Program Name:** HUMANITIES  **Assessment Year:** 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Essays</td>
<td>180/159</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75% of students score “3” (Proficient) of higher</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>Pre/Post Tests</td>
<td>180/159</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75% of students score “3” (Proficient) of higher</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To think analytically and critically about individual works of art.</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Pre/Post Tests</td>
<td>180/159</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75% of students score “3” (Proficient) of higher</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>Neutral/Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To recognize and to describe structural and stylistic relationships among the arts in a given culture.</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Pre/Post Tests</td>
<td>180/159</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75% of students score “3” (Proficient) of higher</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the Learning Outcome That You Have Measured</td>
<td>SLO, Discipline or Other</td>
<td>Pre-Post Test, Judged Competition, Embedded Questions, Rubric Graded Essay</td>
<td>Number of Students Assessed</td>
<td># of Years This Outcome Has Been Assessed</td>
<td>Measurement Standard</td>
<td>Report the Results of Your Data Analysis</td>
<td>Strong: Exceeds Benchmark Neutral: Meets Benchmark Weak: Misses Benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation: Complete this Assessment Overview Table after you have completed your Assessment Summary in the following template.
Program / Discipline Assessment Report

Program/Discipline: Humanities  
Responsibility: Lance Rubin

Program/Discipline's Mission Statement:
Congruent with the purposes, goals, and character of Arapahoe Community College, the mission of the Department of Humanities is to promote – through the study of the diverse and different cultures from the past and the present – the intellectual, academic, professional, and spiritual development of our students. Encouraging consideration of the idea that the humanities offer (in addition to aesthetic enjoyment) important insights into the development of Western and non-Western cultures, human nature, and the human experience, the program strives to generate a dialogue revolving around the definitions, character, and applications of the arts.

Program/Discipline's Assessment History:
By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, how has it previously affected your program's curricula and/or teaching strategies?
It has helped us to tweak curriculum. For example, we have incorporated more non-Western arts into the course and have moved more of our evaluation/grading on writing-centered assignments. It has, over the years, helped us to choose appropriate textbooks and supplementary readings.

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?
Students have developed a more global sense of culture, as well as becoming more proficient writers.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?
None

Who receives information about your department's assessment and why? (Please note if you plan on altering either of these items for the coming year.)
Results will be shared with all Humanities faculty and instructors, the LAPP Dean, the Vice-President of Instruction, and the Assessment Committee.

Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary

Previous Academic Year: 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Outcome Title: Essay Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO: Communication (Written)</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate their ability to produce a thesis-driven, organized, college-level essay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

- 1) 75% of students should be able to score a 3.5 (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5.0 (Outstanding) to 1.0 (Poor).
- 2) 75% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, Humanities retention has been 65-70%, but with the prerequisites that have been put in place for all Humanities classes, we hope to see a higher percentage of students succeeded than we did when there were no prerequisites. 3.5 was chosen as the score because this would equate to a solid “C” paper (75%).

**Description of assessment process:**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

- 1) Students complete a take-home essay with each exam in HUM 121, 122 and 123, so faculty get two or three short (4+ pages) essays throughout the semester (some only give a Midterm and final, but some give 3 exams over the term). Using the draft of the 5-point rubric for writing skills/written communication, faculty compare the first essays to the last essays. Note, these scores reflect writing skills, not content.
- 2) These scores indicate increased student mastery on writing thesis-driven essays.
- 3) This is measured every semester.
- 4) There were 180 students who made up the sample size for the first essay and 159 students for the last essay (withdrawals accounting for the decreased number for the essay at the end of the semester).

**Results**

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome: Written Communication</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Essay Scores: Average (SS=180)</th>
<th>Last Essay Scores: Average (SS=159)</th>
<th>Average Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write in a method appropriate to audience and purpose.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome: Written Communication</th>
<th>Percentage of students scoring 3.5+ on 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; essay</th>
<th>Percentage of students scoring 3.5+ on last essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What did the department learn?**

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

- 1) The students easily surpassed the benchmark, averaging higher than 3.5 on the first essay. Likewise, the number of students who scored Proficient on the last essay compared to the first went up significantly.
- 2) The percentage of students who scored “Proficient” or better on the first essay was lower than last year, while the percentage of the students scoring “Proficient” on the last essay was only slightly lower than last year.
- 3) The multiple methods are revealing, showing that there is a real split between those who are writing well initially. 36.2% of the students did not score a 3.5 on the first essay, but the average score for that essay was 3.69. What this suggests is that the level of writing expertise that are students have when entering our classes is uneven.

**Student performance summary**

1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, average, weak, etc.)?

- 1) Obviously, student performance was strong in that over 88% of the students were “Proficient” by the last essay. However, those average scores at the end of the class could, we think, be higher.
- 2) We will continue to stress writing, because as we have seen in our classes, though students may
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>weak, or neutral)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark for success

1. Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2. What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1. 75% of students should be able to score a “3” (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor).
2. 75% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, Humanities retention has been 65-70%, but with the prerequisites that have been put in place for all Humanities classes, we hope to see a higher percentage of students succeeded than we did when there were no prerequisites.

### Description of assessment process:

1. What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review)?
2. How do these methods show students are learning?
3. What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4. How many students made up the sample size?

1. During the first week of class, students are given a short quiz. One of the questions is focused on the SLO Cultural Awareness. At a later point in the semester, that same question appears on an exam.
2. We then compare the scores of each question (according to a mutually-agreed-upon rubric) in an attempt to see what our students know coming into our classes and what they know after they have been taught some of the specific content of our classes.
3. This is measured every semester, not only for our own assessment, but so that students understand the focus of Humanities classes. Unlike classes with “Literature” or “Philosophy” or “Theatre” in the title of the course, “Humanities” is a bit more ambiguous, and faculty have lots of anecdotal evidence that there are students in every class who are not exactly sure what they signed up for.
4. The sample size for the pre-test was 180. Withdrawals and students who stopped attending dropped this number to 159 for the later exams.

### Results

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome: Cultural Awareness</th>
<th>Pre-Test (SS=180)</th>
<th>Post-Learning (SS=159)</th>
<th>Average Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#5: Compare-contrast cultural attitudes and values of the past eras to the present.</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What did the department learn?

1. How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2. How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3. If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1. The students just met the 75% benchmark and the scores increased by nearly 180%.
2. Last year, nearly 80% scored a “proficient” score; however, those scoring 3+ on the pre-test was closer to 20%, suggesting that this year, students did not know much about comparing cultures coming into the class.
3. The multiple measures match up nicely; both reveal that students were quite lost on this concept before entering the class, but understood it on the way out.

### Student performance summary

1. Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome?
2. How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1. We would consider this somewhere between neutral and strong.
2. We would not, based on these findings, significantly alter curriculum, though making sure that students see connections between past and present cultures remains an important priority, not just for assessment, but to assure the students of the “relevance” of the discipline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 3</th>
<th>Outcome Title: Analysis and Critical Thinking: Individual Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Type: Discipline</td>
<td>Outcome Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To think analytically and critically about individual works of art and writing by describing their basic elements, influences and effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1) 75% of students should be able to score a “3” (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor).
2) 75% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, Humanities retention has been 65-70%, but with the prerequisites that have been put in place for all Humanities classes, we hope to see a higher percentage of students succeeded than we did when there were no prerequisites.

**Description of assessment process:**
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1) During the first week of class, students are given a short quiz. One of the questions is focused on the SLO Cultural Awareness. At a later point in the semester, that same question appears on an exam.
2) We then compare the scores of each question (according to a mutually-agreed-upon rubric) in an attempt to see what our students know coming into our classes and what they know after they have been taught some of the specific content of our classes.
3) This is measured every semester, not only for our own assessment, but so that students understand the focus of Humanities classes. Unlike classes with “Literature” or “Philosophy” or “Theatre” in the title of the course, “Humanities” is a bit more ambiguous, and faculty have lots of anecdotal evidence that there are students in every class who are not exactly sure what they signed up for.
4) The sample size for the pre-test was 180. Withdrawals and students who stopped attending dropped this number to 159 for the later exams.

**Results**
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students from Humanities 121, 122 and 123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanities Discipline Outcome 1:</strong> Students will think analytically and critically about individual works of art and writing by describing their basic elements, influences and effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS=180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Humanities Discipline Outcome 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>3+ Scores: Pre-Test</strong></th>
<th><strong>3+ Scores: Post-Learning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What did the department learn?**
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) While the students met a respectable 71% benchmark, it fell a bit short of the goal we set. At the same time, the increase in the scores themselves was very encouraging, with scores on this question up around 75% from the pre-test
2) Last year the number of students scoring a 3+ on the post-test was nearly identical, 70.9% . The average score on the pre-test was also up from 1.25 to 1.95
3) Both measures seem consistent, revealing this as one of our weaker areas.

**Student performance summary**
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1) We would consider student performance neutral, tending toward weak.
2) We would not, based on these findings, significantly alter curriculum. The new edition of the textbook we are using – as well as its online supplement – has included “Closer Look” sections where individual works of art and architecture are broken down and closely analyzed. The ability to analyze artworks and connect them to the culture in which it was produced remains an area of critical thinking that challenges students.
Outcome Title: Analysis and Critical Thinking of Common Trends in a Given Culture

Outcome Title: Analysis and Critical Thinking of Common Trends in a Given Culture

Outcome Type: Discipline

Outcome Description:
To recognize and to describe structural, stylistic and cultural relationships among the arts.

Benchmark for success
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

Description of assessment process:
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students from Humanities 121, 122 and 123</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Discipline Outcome 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To recognize and to describe structural, stylistic and cultural relationships among the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Scores Average (SS=180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities Discipline Outcome 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students scoring 3+ Pre-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) Of all the goals, this fell short of the benchmark
2) Last year, while not overwhelmingly strong, we did beat the benchmarks
3) Both measurements show that the students who finished the class struggled with this concept.

Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1) We would consider this weak.
2) We would not, based on these findings, significantly alter curriculum. But while the scores went up, we will need to make sure that we as a faculty are taking the time to get into depth on cultural characteristics and to discuss how they reveal themselves in all of the arts.
Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan

- Two or more instruments of measuring an objective may provide greater clarity and validity, but only one is required. The department or program makes the decision. The Program Assessment committee and deans are available for consultation.
- In the past, some programs have been identified purely by prefix or in some cases by the type of section offered. Sometimes, a very limited pool of students have been available for such a program to assess, or the program lacks full-time faculty to plan, assess, and report outcomes. If your program has such difficulties, please contact either the Program Assessment committee’s chair or your School's Program Assessment committee representative. We will work with you to find a solution.
- CTE programs with external accreditation may use the accreditation report to in addition or in lieu of these forms, please contact the Program Assessment committee representative if this format is desired. In absence of this contact, these forms are expected.
- Outcomes are to be measured annually. Exceptions are made with VPI approval for outcomes that clearly need a less (or more) frequent review.

Outcome minimums

- At least two outcomes are to be program/discipline-related.
- At least two outcomes must be chosen from the new Learning Outcomes for Student and Employee Enrichment (page 11). One Learning Outcome should be continued from the prior year to develop a historical trend. Learning Outcomes must be assessed and reported annually, regardless of the frequency of reporting for other outcomes.
- Both outcomes above are classified as "student learning" outcomes, requiring benchmarks and analysis. It is strongly recommended that you use the table provided in Part 1 of this report for this function. Definitions and examples of these outcomes are provided in Appendix A at the end of this document. Your Program Assessment committee is available to assist.
- An assessment report is requested annually.
Current Academic Year: 2013

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
  No changes planned, though we are interested in helping to measure the SLO of Responsibility and Accountability

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
  No changes planned

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
  No changes planned

Have you submitted a separate budget worksheet? (Choose by bolding; for information about this worksheet, please refer to the specific budgeting e-mail sent by the committee chairperson.)

  Yes  No

Please submit this report (including both last year's summary and this year's plan) in a Word document to the Program Assessment committee chairperson (Cheyne Bamford: cheyne.bamford@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.