Learning Outcome
Communication

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Rubric-graded report

Measure 1 Description:
Students will demonstrate their ability to produce a thesis-driven, organized, college-level essay.

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.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
153

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
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) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
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 succeed 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%)

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

- The average score on the first essay was 3.37.
- The average score on the last essay was 4.22.
Measure 2 Results:

- 66.1% of students scored 3.5+ on the first essay.
- 87.5% of students scored 3.5+ on the last essay.

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
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) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
These numbers are very similar to the previous year; no significant changes.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
The multiple methods are revealing, showing that there is a real split between those who are writing well initially. About one-third of the students did not score a 3.5 on the first essay, but the average score for that essay was 3.37. What this suggests is that there the level of writing expertise that are students have when entering our classes is uneven.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate
performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

We will continue to stress writing, because as we have seen in our classes, though students may meet the prerequisite for college-level reading and writing skills, many students have not yet taken English 121 or 122, College Composition. In addition, some students in the classes may have passed out of developmental ENG classes with grades of C, hardly guaranteeing them success in the college classroom that emphasizes writing. Making all of our exams more writing-focused is a strategy we have discussed and which is gaining increasing favor among faculty.

Further Action:

Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Learning Outcome

Analysis and Critical Thinking of the Arts

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:
To think analytically and critically about individual works of art and writing by describing their basic elements, influences and effects.

During the first week of class, students are given a short pre-test. One of the questions is focused on the ability to think analytically and critically about individual works of art and writing by describing their basic elements, influences and effects.

We then compare the scores of each question (according to a mutually-agreed-upon rubric where 1 = "poor" and 5 = "outstanding") 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.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
75% of students should be able to score a “3” (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor).

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
75% was chosen as the benchmark because historically, Humanities retention has been 65-70%, but with the

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark
1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

- The average pre-test score for the Analysis of Individual Works was 1.83
- The average post-test score for the Analysis of Individual Works was 4.10

Measure 2 Results:

- Almost 24% of students scored 3+ on the pre-test for Analysis of Individual Works.
- Over 83% of students scored 3+ on the post-test for Analysis of Individual Works.
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
Students exceeded the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
This went up over 10% from the previous year (71.4% to 83.3%).

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
Both measures seem consistent, revealing that students do well once they are introduced to the course material.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
We would not, based on these findings, significantly alter curriculum. The ability to analyze the details of individual artworks (paintings, poems, architecture, sculpture, etc.) and connect them to the culture in which it was produced remains an area of critical thinking that challenges students.

Further Action:

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action
Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Learning Outcome

Cultural Awareness

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:

Measure 1 Sample Size:

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:
Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Met benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

- The average score for Cultural Awareness on the Pre-Test was 0.66/5.0
- The average score for Cultural Awareness on the Post-Test was 3.77/5.0

Measure 2 Results:
• Only 5% of students scored above 3.5 on the Pre-Test for Cultural Awareness
• 79% of students scored above 3.5 on the Post-Test for Cultural Awareness

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
The students slightly surpassed the benchmark.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
This data is a bit higher (4%) than last year.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
The multiple measures match up nicely; both reveal that students were quite lost on this concept before entering the class, but once they were exposed to the concepts, they did well.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Surpassed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
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.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:
Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

---

**Learning Outcome**

Analysis and Critical Thinking of Common Trends in a Given Culture

**Measure 1 Type:**

Direct

Pre-Post tests

**Measure 1 Description:**

We want students to recognize and to describe structural, stylistic and cultural relationships among the arts produced in a given culture (ancient India, Renaissance Italy, the Enlightenment, etc.).

During the first week of class, students are given a short pre-test. One of the questions is focused on analyzing and describing common ideas within the arts of a given culture. At a later point in the semester, that same question appears on an exam.

We then compare the scores of each question (according to a mutually-agreed-upon rubric with 1="poor" to 5="outstanding") 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.

**Measure 1 Sample Size:**

153

**Measure 1 Benchmark**

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
75% of students should be able to score a “3” (“Proficient”) or better on a scale of 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Poor).

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
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.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
• Average score on pre-test for analysis of works within a specific culture was 1.55.
• Average score on post-test for analysis of works within a specific culture was 3.08.

Measure 2 Results:

• Almost 18% of students scored 3+ on the pre-test for analyzing works within a culture.
• 70% of students scored 3+ on the post-test for analyzing works within a culture.

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

Of all the goals, this one fell short of the benchmark.
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
Unfortunately, while up slightly from last year’s 68.3%, we still fell short of the 75% benchmark.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
Both measurements show that the students who finished the class, many still struggled with this concept.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Missed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
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, not just one (painting, literature, etc.)

Further Action:

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)