

**Report to the Faculty Senate, Wright State University  
For 2020-2021 as of April 15, 2021.**

**From the Wright State University Core Oversight Committee (UCOC)**

Members: Ann Bowling (Chair – CONH), Dan Young (CECS), Romena Holbert (CEHS), Judson Murray (COLA), Nate Tymes (LAKE), Bill Wood (RSCOB), No Representative (CoSM) Cristina Redko (BSOM – Ex-officio/NV), Susan Carrafiello (Honor’s Program – Ex-Officio/NV), and Tammy Kahrig (Vice Provost of Undergraduate Curriculum & Instruction & Institutional Accreditation (Ex-officio/NV)

**I. Positive Outcomes:**

- All Department Chairs for Element 6 and Element 2 Core Courses are in the process of completing the final reports for these elements. These reports were delayed last year due to Covid-19. Final Reports for Element 6 are due May 7, 2021 and final reports for Element 2 are due at the latest by September 2021.
- Revision to Final Assessment Report Template based on input from Tammy Kahrig and information needed for Higher Learning Commission Assessment requirements.
- Identified additional indirect/direct measurements of the Wright State University Core Learning Outcomes using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

**II. Core Course Assessment**

- A. Element 6 (2018-2019): In Progress. Final reports due date extended to May 2021.**  
The assessment of Element 6 was initially planned for the academic year of 2018 to 2019. Due to the AAUP strike in Spring 2019 not all assessment plans were submitted until Fall 2019. Then the additional Covid-19 pandemic has caused a delay in the submission of the final reports. Currently Assessments completed, final reports due May 7, 2021. Assessment Plan with Report Form sent to Chairs of BIO (Scott Baird), CHM (Chad McGowin), EES (Chad Hammerschmidt), and CS (Matt Rizki).
- The following reports need to be submitted: BIO 1050, BIO 1070, BIO 1120, BIO 1150, BIO 3450, CHM 1020, CHM 1210 (L), CHME 1220 (L), CHM 2450, CS 1150, EES 1030, EES 1050, EES 1070, EES 2150, EES 2510, EES 2550, EES 3450.
- B. Element 2 (2019-2020): In Progress.** Assessment plans for all courses were received and approved. Assessment Plan with Report sent to Department Chairs. If data collected, reports are due on May 7, 2021. If data still needs to be collected, data to be collected this semester and report submitted by September 2021. Department Chairs (Ayse Sahin – MTH & STT), (Andrew Beauchamp – EC), (Raghu Srinivasan – EGR).

- The following reports need to be submitted: EC 1050, EGR 1010, MTH 1440/1450, MTH 2240, MTH 2280, MTH 2300, MTH 2310, STT 1600, STT 2640.
- MTH 2430 – Not being evaluated due to changes in course.

#### C. **Element 5 (2020-2021): Approved Timeline**

- April 2020 – Send reminder email to Chairs notifying them that plan will need to be submitted in Spring 2021.
- Fall 2021 – Assessment Completed
- Spring 2022 – Report Submitted
- Spring 2022 – Recommendation regarding GE submitted to Faculty Senate

### **III. Challenges**

- No Committee Representative from the College of Science and Math (CoSM). This has been especially challenging this year as most of the courses for Element 6 and Element 2 are from the College of Science and Math. It is imperative that this committee have representatives from the College of Science and Math (CoSM) and the College of Liberal Arts (COLA) as the majority of Core Courses are from these two colleges.
- Since the beginning of this assessment process, there has been a continual catch-up process that has been occurring each year. We are currently on track to be up to date with the assessment process by the beginning of Fall 2021.
- Reevaluation of the Elements to begin in 2024-2025. As we look toward the second six-year cycle of assessment, faculty will need to have incorporated the results of the first assessment, so that progress can be shown in the second cycle.
  - For Example: Element 3, based on the revised plan will be assessed again in 2023-24, ideally the findings of the previous assessment will be incorporated into the future assessment plan.

### **IV. Core Course Assessment Plan – Revised Six Year Cycle**

Assessment of all Core Courses takes place in a rotation of six years and is designed to demonstrate that the course meets CORE learning outcomes, or if not, it gives the faculty the information with which to revise the course in order to meet the learning outcomes. Courses are grouped by element and the assessment follows this schedule:

- Element 3 – Global Traditions—Interdisciplinary Global Studies, 2017-18 - **Completed**
- Element 6 – Natural Science, 2018-19 – **In Progress**
- Element 2 – Mathematics, 2019-20 – **In Progress**
- Element 5 – Social Science, 2021-22 – **Planned**
- Element 4 – Arts/Humanities, 2022-23
- Element 1 – Communication, 2023-24
- Element 3 – Global Traditions – Interdisciplinary Global Studies, 2024-25

<http://www.wright.edu/wright-state-core>

**Core Course Assessment Plan, 2021-22  
Element 5: Social Sciences**

**Please complete all sections; do not delete section information. Submit to Pilot when complete.**

**SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION**

Course Dept. Prefix: \_\_\_\_\_ Course #: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester when assessment will occur:  Fall 2021  Spring 2022  Summer 2022

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Section Types and number of sections offered in 2019-20. Complete all that apply.

- |                           |                         |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| _____ Dayton face-to-face | _____ Lake face-to-face |
| _____ Dayton online       | _____ Lake online       |
| _____ Dayton Honors       | _____ Lake Honors       |

Note: If section at Lake Campus must include assessment of Lake Campus section(s) and faculty from Lake Campus as evaluators.

- Attributes:
- |       |                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------|
| _____ | Integrative Writing in Core      |
| _____ | Multicultural Competency in Core |
| _____ | Service Learning in Core         |

Dept. Core Assessment Lead: \_\_\_\_\_

Name	email
------	-------

List at least two assessors; this may include course instructor only if there are multiple sections and multiple instructors of the course. Note - The instructor may not assess his/her students' papers.

- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 2: ASSESSMENT PLAN**

**It is preferable to have the assessment plan for all sections of a course. If not feasible, please complete an assessment plan for separate sections.**

Course Outcomes. \_\_\_\_\_ Check here if Outcomes have been modified.

The course must address all 5 outcomes but must assess a minimum of 1 outcome. Highlight in yellow the outcome(s) you will assess. If you have modified the outcomes, please insert here in place of standard outcomes.

1. Critically apply knowledge of social science theory and methods of inquiry to personal decisions, current issues, or global concerns.
2. Explain and critique the methods of inquiry of social science disciplines.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical issues involved in the acquisition or application of social science knowledge.
4. Demonstrate, from a social science perspective, an understanding of the responsibilities of an informed and engaged citizen to the success of democratic society.

Assignments. Select **one** of the options below for assessment of one or more outcomes

The goal of assessment is to determine the degree to which students are able to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, or competencies stated in each of the Core Learning Outcomes. Moreover, the assessment is intended to provide **your department** information regarding patterns of student performance relative to the learning outcomes so **you** may identify opportunities for actions to improve student attainment of the Core Learning Outcomes. With that goal in mind, please identify below the student work products you plan to examine to allow you to best determine the degree to which students are achieving the learning outcomes and to assist you with learning improvement efforts.

Written assignment(s) that addresses/address outcome(s). Include outcome #, title and description for each assignment.

Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Description of assignment: \_\_\_\_\_

Essay question(s). Provide the question(s) and outcome(s) below.

- 1. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_ Essay Question: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_ Essay Question: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_ Essay Question: \_\_\_\_\_

Pilot asynchronous written discussion that addresses outcome(s). Provide the outcome # and question(s).

- 1. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_ Discussion Question: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_ Discussion Question: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_ Discussion Question: \_\_\_\_\_

Multiple Choice or T/F Marker questions – 3 to 4 questions per outcome. List the outcome and question numbers. A rubric is not used for Marker questions. "All the above" should not be used as the correct answer more than once. **Courses that are IW or SRV/SRVI must use written assignments for those attributes.** Complete the benchmark: We expect \_\_\_\_\_% of students to answer \_\_\_\_\_% of the question(s) correctly.

- 1. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_
  - a) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_
  - a) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Outcome #: \_\_\_\_\_
  - a) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - c) Question: \_\_\_\_\_
  - d) Question: \_\_\_\_\_

Collecting and submitting the student assignment(s)

\_\_\_\_ Will upload assignment(s) to Pilot

\_\_\_\_ Will give access to assignment(s) on Pilot

\_\_\_\_ Paper Copies: Student workers will copy the assignment before any grading begins and scan a separate .pdf of every student’s assignment. The student worker will then create a zip file of the ungraded student work to be sent to Tammy Kahrig for entry into the Aqua system. Once the student work has been entered into Aqua, faculty listed as “Assessors” will be contacted to review a random sample of the work according to the rubric and results will be compiled and returned to your department.

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION : RUBRIC SELECTION (A, B, C, & D)**

Select the items you feel best match your assignment(s) in the rubric(s) on the next pages. Please highlight in yellow. **If this course has an IW attribute, please also complete section B. If the course has an MC attribute, please complete Section C. If the course has an SRV/SRVI attribute, please complete section D**

**A. Element 5 Rubric.** Select the item(s) you will use in your rubric by highlighting in yellow the item(s). You may select one or more of them. As there is overlap, choose the items that best fit the assignment you select for assessment. The items below are taken from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) Value Rubrics for Undergraduate Education.

**If you have an MC, IW, and/or an SRV/SRVI attribute, please also see pages 6, 7, and 8.**

**IF YOU ARE USING MARKER QUESTIONS FOR THE OUTCOME, DO NOT USE THIS RUBRIC.**

**Benchmark: \_\_\_\_\_% achieve a \_\_\_\_\_ level of performance rating on the rubric.**

	<b>Mastery 4</b>	<b>Partial Mastery 3</b>	<b>Progressing 2</b>	<b>Benchmark 1</b>
<b>Analysis of Knowledge</b>	Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.

	<b>Mastery 4</b>	<b>Partial Mastery 3</b>	<b>Progressing 2</b>	<b>Benchmark 1</b>
<b>Evidence</b> <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/ evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/ evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
<b>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</b>	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
<b>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</b>	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.
<b>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.	Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.	Student only names the major theory she/he uses.
<b>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/ concepts.

	<b>Mastery 4</b>	<b>Partial Mastery 3</b>	<b>Progressing 2</b>	<b>Benchmark 1</b>
<b>Design Process</b>	All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant subdisciplines.	Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for.	Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused.	Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.
<b>Analysis</b>	Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.
<b>Conclusions</b>	States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings.	States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings.	States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings.	States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupportable conclusion from inquiry findings.

**B. Integrated Writing Rubric (if applicable)** If this is an IW course, you will use the items on this page. You may select one or more of them. Please highlight in yellow.

Benchmark for Rubric \_\_\_\_\_

Item	Mastery 4	Partial Mastery 3	Progressing 2	Emerging 1
<b>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</b>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
<b>Content Development</b>	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
<b>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</b>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
<b>Sources and Evidence</b>	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

**C. Multicultural Competence Rubric (if applicable)** If this is an MC course, you will use the items on this page. You may select one or more of them.

Benchmark for Rubric \_\_\_\_\_

Item	Mastery 4	Partial Mastery 3	Progressing 2	Emerging 1
<b>Cultural self- awareness</b>	Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.)
<b>Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks</b>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
<b>Empathy</b>	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.
<b>Verbal and nonverbal communication</b>	Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.	Has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.
<b>Curiosity</b>	Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.	Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.	Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures.	States minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.
<b>Openness</b>	Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others. Suspends judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.	Begins to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others. Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.	Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of own judgment and expresses a willingness to change.	Receptive to interacting with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, but is unaware of own judgment.

**D. Service Learning Rubric (if applicable)** If this is a SRV/SRVI course, you will use this section. You may select one or more of them.

**Benchmark for Rubric** \_\_\_\_\_

Item	Mastery 4	Partial Mastery 3	Progressing 2	Emerging 1
<b>Demonstrate understanding of how course content relates to a community problem.</b>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
<b>Demonstrate ability to apply course learning content in a community project.</b>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
<b>Demonstrate skills required to engage in an informed and respectful way with members of a community.</b>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).

**Submit the entire form to Pilot – Core Course Assessment Plan 2021-2022**

**SECTION 4: ASSESSMENT REPORT DUE October 1, 2022**

*A separate report needs to be submitted for each assessment plan approved by the Undergraduate Core Oversight Committee (UCOC).*

*Please upload this entire document to the Pilot course called **Element 5 Core Course Assessment 2020-21 (continuous year)** by **Friday, October 1, 2022**. The **Final Report Dropbox link can be accessed via Content > Dropbox (Plans, Reports) > Final Report Dropbox**.*

**Date Report Submitted:**

**Element: Core Element 5 – Social Science**

**Academic Year: 2021-2022**

**Course and Sections Assessed:**

**Assessment Plan:**

The assessment plan approved by the UCOC is filed on the pilot page under Content > Plans > (corresponding course folder)

*Describe the final assessment plan that was implemented and explain any changes made to the approved plan.*

**I. Core Learning Outcomes Assessed (list):**

**II. Procedures Used for Assessment**

For **each** learning outcome addressed by this report, state where and when data were collected (in a course, exam, or performance) and how they were evaluated (e.g. rubric, rating scale, key questions from exams, etc.). Specify the course or courses where students demonstrated the outcomes (if applicable) and the assignment(s) that you used for assessment purposes (e.g., capstone project, final examination, research paper, student presentation, performance, portfolio, etc.).

**III. Summary of Assessment Results:**

What did you find from your assessments? (Present and analyze the results from the Aqua system analysis by Vice Provost Tammy Kahrig and/or your departmental review of marker questions.) What did your data reveal about how well students are achieving the Core Learning Outcomes that you listed above? After analyzing your data, present a summary of the data, clearly indicating what any numbers represent (e.g. percentages? means? medians?). Please number each corresponding assessment, summary, and analysis.

Benchmark Met  Yes or  No

If not met, please identify conditions (if any) that may have impacted these findings.

**IV. ACTIONS TAKEN/PLANNED TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING IN THE CORE**

Describe how you shared the results with instructors of the courses, the department curriculum committee and chair, Lake campus, and other stakeholders. Explain briefly how department faculty will make improvements based upon the assessment findings (e.g. plans to gather more information; recommending changes to the learning outcomes or assessment procedures; changes in course content, instructional approaches, technology, order of course offerings, materials, resources, assignments, policies, funding, advising, planning, training for adjuncts, etc.).

**V. Assessment Administration Feedback**

The assessment of the courses was part of the Core assessment cycle. The assessment plan was reviewed and approved by the UCOC. The UCOC provided a presentation on tools available to assist with the assessment, including Watermark Aqua.

Please describe any changes you recommend about the oversight of the assessment process by the UCOC and the Academic Affairs office.

The next section is for the University Core Oversight Committee (UCOC) Review only.

**UCOC Review**

Item	Complete/NA	Revision Requested	Comments
Learning Outcomes for Global Traditions			
Rubric for LOs			
Rubric for MC Attribute			
Rubric for IW Attribute			
Rubric for SRV/SRVI Attribute			
Assigned Departmental Reviewers			

**Committee Review Completed**

Committee Chair Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Second Review (if revision requested)**

Item	Complete/NA	Revision Requested	Comments
Learning Outcomes for Global Traditions			
Rubric for LOs			
Rubric for MC Attribute			
Rubric for IW Attribute			
Rubric for SRV/SRVI Attribute			
Assigned Departmental Reviewers			

**Committee Review Completed**

Committee Chair Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_