

**SUNY Fredonia**  
**General Education Learning Outcomes**  
**Assessment Report**  
**2011-2012**

<b>Subcommittee Information</b>	
General Education Category:	Western Civilization
Subcommittee Chair:	Name: Steven Fabian      Dept: History
Subcommittee Members:	Name: John Arnold      Dept: History
	Name: Justin Conroy      Dept.: Physics
	Name:      Dept:
	Name:      Dept:
Semester(s) In Which Data were Collected:	Spring 2012
Report Written By:	Steven Fabian
Report Date:	June 18, 2012

<b>Course Information</b>					
<b>Please provide the following information for each of the courses that are part of the curriculum for this outcome during the semester(s) of data collection:</b>					
Department	Subject Code	Course Number	Faculty Name	# of Students Enrolled	Were assessment data collected in this course?
Art History	ARTH	101	Michele Bernatz	53	YES
Art History	ARTH	102	Jeremy Culler	50	YES
English	ENGL	312	Iclal Vanwesenbeck	23	NO*
English	ENGL	314	Susan McGee	20	NO
English	ENGL	389	Theodore Steinberg	30	YES
History	HIST	115	John Arnold	63	YES
History	HIST	116	Tim Allan	28	YES
History	HIST	134	Jeffrey Glodzik	117	YES
History	HIST	134	Perry Beardsley	247	YES
Honors	HONS	229	James Piorkowski	22	YES
Philosophy	PHIL	222	Raymond Belliotti	15	YES
Philosophy	PHIL	224	Dale Tuggy	30	YES
Philosophy	PHIL	265	Chris Pacyga	36	NO
Physics	PHYS	205	Justin Conroy	66	YES
Theater	THEA	452	James Ivey	42	YES
Women's Studies	WOST	314	Susan McGee	8	NO

\* Note: Data were obtained subsequent to preparation of report.

<b>Assessment of Learning Outcome 1</b>	
<b>Outcome 1:</b>	<b>Students will demonstrate knowledge of the development of the distinctive features of the history, institutions, economy, society, culture, etc., of Western civilization</b>
Assessment Method	<p>Given the diversity of courses which fell under this category, the subcommittee agreed that it would be more effective to assess data based on methods devised by the professors teaching the CCC Western Civilization courses themselves. Professors were encouraged to embed assessment tools in their syllabi at the beginning of the year so as not to create additional work for themselves or their students. The professors were given flexibility in the types of methods they employed, so long as they directly addressed the SUNY mandated student learning outcomes (SLOs). Since professors are expected to teach these outcomes to students, this approach is appropriate. Professors were encouraged to consult with the subcommittee for assistance in devising their methods. Therefore, assessment included a wide range of methods: multiple choice tests, analytical questions, homework assignments, and essay writing. Assessment tools were reviewed by the subcommittee members to ensure relevance in assessing student learning outcomes. The subcommittee agreed this was more efficient since it would be difficult to create a <i>general</i> assessment tool which would not favor one academic discipline over another and therefore place students at a disadvantage.</p>
Evaluation Process	<p>Each participating professor sent the subcommittee a description of the assessment tool; how it addressed the CCC Western Civ category SLOs; and the quantitative results of student work using percentages or letter grades. Professors graded their own assignments.</p> <p>Professors sent their data to members of the assessment subcommittee (each subcommittee member was responsible for four or five members to facilitate communication). This data was then passed on to the chair of the assessment subcommittee for the purposes of creating the final report.</p> <p>To achieve consistency in evaluation, the subcommittee agreed upon the following rubric in December 2011. Considering there is general agreement among faculty that 'C' equates to an 'average' performance, the subcommittee agreed that 74%-85% 'meets standards'. All above this range 'exceeds standards' while 64%-73% 'approached standards'. Everything below 64% 'did not meet standards'. The data sent by professors was then translated into this rubric (participating professors were not informed about this rubric). Subcommittee members reviewed the chair's final report and made comments before the final report was edited and sent to the chair of the GenEd Committee.</p>
Timing	<p>During the fall 2011 semester, as well as in January 2012, several emails were sent to professors teaching CCC Western Civilization courses in the spring 2012 semester. These emails informed professors what was required of them in terms of assessing SLOs. Data was then collected over the course of the Spring 2012 semester and shortly after final exams.</p>
Student Participation	<p>A total of 850 students (majors and non-majors) were enrolled in CCC Western Civilization category courses for the Spring 2012 semester. Each professor teaching these courses was asked to select a 20% random sample of the total class enrollment. Data was not drawn from students who were not taking a CCC Western Civ category course during the Spring 2012 semester. We therefore drew our assessment from 174 students taking Art History, English, History, Honors, Philosophy, Physics, Theater, and Women's Studies. However, three professors did not provide data, representing a total of 87 students. To make up for the 20% sample that was unaccounted for (17 students), we included another 17 students from the HIST 134 survey courses, since these three sections represented almost half of the total Western Civ category enrollment. So, while English and</p>

	<p>Philosophy are underrepresented, and Women’s Studies is not represented in this report, an accurate sample number has been provided for the category overall.</p>
<p>Assessment Results</p>	<p>174 students were assessed out of 850.</p> <p>OVERALL  Exceeds standards = 37 (21%)  Meets standards = 89 (51%)  Approaches standards = 35 (20%)  Does Not Meet Standards = 13 (8%)</p> <p>100 Level (129 Students)  Exceeds standards = 21 (15%)  Meets standards = 68 (53%)  Approaches standards = 30 (23%)  Does Not Meet Standards = 10 (8%)</p> <p>200 Level (29 Students)  Exceeds standards = 9 (31%)  Meets standards = 14 (48%)  Approaches standards = 3 (10%)  Does Not Meet Standards = 3 (10%)</p> <p>300/400 Levels (16 Students)  Exceeds standards = 7 (44%)  Meets standards = 7 (44%)  Approaches standards = 2 (12%)  Does Not Meet Standards = 0 (0%)</p>
<p>Level of Attainment</p>	<p>The results for the 2011-2012 assessment of the overall CCC Western Civilization category are positive. Over 70% of our students met or exceeded standards; 20% approached standards; and 8% of students did not meet standards.</p> <p>The breakdown of results by course level shows general improvement based on advancement; however, data from six students are lacking in the 200 level category, and data from eleven students are lacking from the 300/400 level categories. To compensate for the missing students, seventeen more students were included from the 100 level category to achieve a 20% overall sample.</p> <p>Considering there is general agreement among faculty that ‘C’ equates to an ‘average’ performance, the subcommittee agreed that 74%-85% ‘meets standards’. All grades above this range ‘exceeds standards’ while 64%-73% ‘approaches standards’. Everything below 64% ‘does not meet standards’.</p>
<p>Comparison to Previous Results</p>	<p>The previous report written in 2008 assessed a 20% sample of 638 students; however, because students were asked to volunteer, only 102 students did so, representing 16% instead of 20%.</p> <p>It is difficult to compare this assessment’s results with the previous assessment because the final report does not provide a clear breakdown of 2008 results. Instead, the report speaks to general trends, reporting that responses to Questions I/A and I/B, which reflected the first SLO were positive, while responses to Question II, which reflected the second SLO, were more negative.</p> <p>Assessment subcommittee members also used a different assessment tool: they created a general “Western Civilization and Culture Test” adapted from the</p>

	Department of History's 'Historical Awareness Test' and asked students to volunteer.

<b>Assessment of Learning Outcome 2</b>	
<b>Outcome 2:</b>	<b>Students will relate the development of Western civilization to that of other regions of the world.</b>
Assessment Method	See Outcome 1 above.
Evaluation Process	See Outcome 1 above.
Timing	See Outcome 1 above.
Student Participation	See Outcome 1 above.
Assessment Results	While instructions were clear that professors had to assess two student learning outcomes, there were only two professors who distinguished between the results. Therefore, distinguishing between the results overall was not feasible. This is not to say that professors did not assess the two outcomes, only that most combined them within a single exercise, assignment or test OR combined the results of separate assessments into one final outcome. That said, however, it appears that results were also positive for this outcome.
Level of Attainment	See Outcome 1 above.
Comparison to Previous Results	The previous assessment <i>did</i> distinguish between the results of the two SLOs and found evidence that student learning in the latter outcome was wanting. It is difficult to ascertain clearly whether student learning has improved for this outcome based on assessment methods for 2011-2012, but the sense is that it has.

<b>Conclusions</b>	
What are the three most important conclusions drawn from your data about attainment of student learning outcomes within the category?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professors are, overall, doing a commendable job of teaching the SLOs in their courses.</li> <li>2. Since samples were taken from lower and upper level classes, we observed how student learning improved as students advanced because the percentage of students 'not meeting standards' and 'approaching standards' decreased from 100 level courses to 200 and 300 level courses.</li> <li>3. Students who were assessed based on written exercises (essays, essay questions, analytical presentations, etc.) performed better than students who were assessed using multiple choice questions.</li> </ol>
What factors make it difficult to draw conclusions about student learning in this category?	All professors' assessment tools evaluated both student learning outcomes, but most did not break down their results into two separate outcomes. Most professors blended the two outcomes together in their assignments or exams.
What are your recommendations for improving the process of assessment of student learning in this category?	<p>Future assessment subcommittees for this category need to make it clear to professors to separate the results of the two SLOs if they decide to allow professors to embed their own assessment tools in their courses.</p> <p>Multiple choice questions may not be the best method to assess</p>

	<p>student learning; however, the HIST 134 courses rely heavily on multiple choice tests given the high enrollment numbers. Also, adjuncts traditionally teach these survey courses and so if future subcommittees wish to use an analytical written assignment as their assessment tool, they should be prepared to evaluate the student responses without the assistance of the adjunct whose payscale is significantly lower than tenured and tenure-track professors.</p>
<p>What are your recommendations for improving student learning in this category?</p>	<p>None based on the positive data collected. More attention could be paid to teaching the second SLO, but see below for further comment.</p>
<p>Please share any other comments the subcommittee may have.</p>	<p>The second student learning outcome, relating aspects of western civilization to other world civilizations, presents a sticky situation. Since there is already a category that incorporates this outcome – Other World/Non-Western Civilizations – it ought to be reconsidered how much time should actually be devoted to teaching this SLO to students in this category. While neither of the outcomes for the CCC Other World category <i>explicitly</i> addresses relating western civilization to the rest of the world, it is implied in the first SLO and, indeed, taught in the World History survey courses (HIST 101, HIST 102). It is important to relate western civilization to other parts of the world, but the emphasis should be primarily on teaching students western civilization instead of only 50% as implied by dividing up the SLOs 50/50 for this category. At the very least, this issue merits some discussion on campus. The same issue was raised in the previous 2008 final report.</p>