

# ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR

Report

Humanities/Philosophy

(Instructional Degree Program)

AA/AS Emphasis

(Degree Level)

Fall 2000-Spring 2001

(Assessment Period Covered)

10-04-2001

(Date Submitted)

## Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:

1. Increase the student's ability to critically evaluate information they hear, read, and see.

## First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

### 1.a. Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success:

Through self-assessment the student shall indicate that their knowledge has: 1. increased greatly, 2. increased somewhat, 3. remained the same, 4. decreased somewhat, or 5. decreased greatly. Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, will be randomly selected and evaluated. Goal is to have 80% of the students indicating that their knowledge has increased.

- ### 1.a. Assessment Results: Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, were randomly selected to be evaluated. Three were full time faculty and three were adjunct faculty. The evaluation was given in conjunction with the regular "faculty" evaluation. One major problem was that on the faculty evaluation the highest score was 5 and the lowest 1, whereas on the assessment evaluation the highest score was 1 and the lowest 5. Thus, the results may not be a true indication of the students self perception as some students may have inadvertently reversed their intended "weights". The results are as follows:

1. Average of 25% with a range of 85% - 0%
2. Average of 51% with a range of 80% - 15%
3. Average of 23% with a range of 67% - 0%
4. Average of 0.7% with a range of 4% - 0%
5. Average of 1% with a range of 4% - 0%

76% of the students indicated that there knowledge has increased.

### 1.a. Use of Results:

Faculty in the department are questioning the validity of the above assessment because of the nature of the self-assessment, the inconsistent weighting of the scores, and the fact that the course being evaluated is a lower level required general education course. In keeping with the majority of the other departments in the school and throughout the country it has been decided that a more accurate and informative method of evaluation would be to evaluate portfolios generated in a senior level capstone course.

# ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR

Humanities/Philosophy

(Instructional Degree Program)

AA/AS Emphasis

(Degree Level)

Fall 2000-Spring 2001

(Assessment Period Covered)

10-04-2001

(Date Submitted)

## Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:

2. Increase the student's ability to work well collaboratively in diverse groups.

## First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

- 2.a. Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success:

Through self-assessment the student shall indicate that their knowledge has: 1. increased greatly, 2. increased somewhat, 3. remained the same, 4. decreased somewhat, or 5. decreased greatly.

Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, will be randomly selected and evaluated.

Goal is to have 80% of the students indicating that their knowledge has increased.

- 2.a. Assessment Results: Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, were randomly selected to be evaluated. Three were full time faculty and three were adjunct faculty. The evaluation was given in conjunction with the regular "faculty" evaluation. One major problem was that on the faculty evaluation the highest score was 5 and the lowest 1, whereas on the assessment evaluation the highest score was 1 and the lowest 5. Thus, the results may not be a true indication of the students self perception as some students may have inadvertently reversed their intended "weights". The results are as follows:

1. Average of 10% with a range of 38% - 0%
2. Average of 36% with a range of 52% - 0%
3. Average of 52% with a range of 100% - 15%
4. Average of 1% with a range of 8% - 0%
5. Average of 0%

46% of the students indicated that <sup>their</sup> ~~there~~ knowledge has increased.

- 2.a. Use of Results:

Faculty in the department are questioning the validity of the above assessment because of the nature of the self-assessment, the inconsistent weighting of the scores, and the fact that the course being evaluated is a lower level required general education course. In keeping with the majority of the other departments in the school and throughout the country it has been decided that a more accurate and informative method of evaluation would be to evaluate portfolios generated in a senior level capstone course.

# ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR

Humanities/Philosophy  
(Instructional Degree Program)

AA/AS Emphasis  
(Degree Level)

Fall 2000-Spring 2001  
(Assessment Period Covered)

10-04-2001  
(Date Submitted)

## Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:

3. Increase the student's ability to communicate clearly in writing, orally, and quantitatively.

## First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

### 3.a. Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success:

Through self-assessment the student shall indicate that their knowledge has: 1. increased greatly, 2. increased somewhat, 3. remained the same, 4. decreased somewhat, or 5. decreased greatly.

Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, will be randomly selected and evaluated.

Goal is to have 80% of the students indicating that their knowledge has increased.

3.a. Assessment Results: Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, were randomly selected to be evaluated. Three were full time faculty and three were adjunct faculty. The evaluation was given in conjunction with the regular "faculty" evaluation. One major problem was that on the faculty evaluation the highest score was 5 and the lowest 1, whereas on the assessment evaluation the highest score was 1 and the lowest 5. Thus, the results may not be a true indication of the students self perception as some students may have inadvertently reversed their intended "weights". The results are as follows:

1. Average of 29% with a range of 69% - 0%
2. Average of 41% with a range of 65% - 23%
3. Average of 31% with a range of 67% - 0%
4. Average of 1% with a range of 8% - 0%
5. Average of 1% with a range of 9% - 0%

70% of the students indicated that ~~there~~ *their* knowledge has increased.

### 3.a. Use of Results:

Faculty in the department are questioning the validity of the above assessment because of the nature of the self-assessment, the inconsistent weighting of the scores, and the fact that the course being evaluated is a lower level required general education course. In keeping with the majority of the other departments in the school and throughout the country it has been decided that a more accurate and informative method of evaluation would be to evaluate portfolios generated in a senior level capstone course.

# ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR

Humanities/Philosophy

(Instructional Degree Program)

AA/AS Emphasis

(Degree Level)

Fall 2000-Spring 2001

(Assessment Period Covered)

10-04-2001

(Date Submitted)

## Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:

4. Increase the student's ability to apply information from this course to their life and/or use the information in other courses.

## First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

### 4.a. Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success:

Through self-assessment the student shall indicate that their knowledge has: 1. increased greatly, 2. increased somewhat, 3. remained the same, 4. decreased somewhat, or 5, decreased greatly.

Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, will be randomly selected and evaluated.

Goal is to have 80% of the students indicating that their knowledge has increased.

- 4.a. Assessment Results: Six sections of 2050, spring 2001, were randomly selected to be evaluated. Three were full time faculty and three were adjunct faculty. The evaluation was given in conjunction with the regular "faculty" evaluation. One major problem was that on the faculty evaluation the highest score was 5 and the lowest 1, whereas on the assessment evaluation the highest score was 1 and the lowest 5. Thus, the results may not be a true indication of the students self perception as some students may have inadvertently reversed their intended "weights". The results are as follows:

1. Average of 34% with a range of 92% - 0%
2. Average of 43% with a range of 65% - 23%
3. Average of 18% with a range of 50% - 0%
4. Average of 1% with a range of 4% - 0%
5. Average of 1% with a range of 9% - 0%

77% of the students indicated that ~~there~~ *their* knowledge has increased.

### 4.a. Use of Results:

Faculty in the department are questioning the validity of the above assessment because of the nature of the self-assessment, the inconsistent weighting of the scores, and the fact that the course being evaluated is a lower level required general education course. In keeping with the majority of the other departments in the school and throughout the country it has been decided that a more accurate and informative method of evaluation would be to evaluate portfolios generated in a senior level capstone course.