

GENERAL EDUCATION



ASSESSMENT REPORT 2025

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT 2025

- David Hubert, Associate Provost for Learning Advancement
- Michael Young, Associate Dean of General Education and Honors
- Sherry Jensen, Associate Dean of Business Management and Economics and Former Faculty Lead of the General Education Committee

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
Executive Summary	3
Assessment Methods	4
Social Sciences (SS)	5
Humanities (HU)	11
Fine Arts (FA)	16
Acknowledgements	22
References	23



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This year's assessment of learning outcomes in General Education at Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) calls our attention to the following:

- Our students taking SS, HU, and FA courses are, on average, performing very well in attaining program learning outcomes. Of the 21 specific learning outcome measures described in this report, spread over three different General Education designations, students scored satisfactorily (2.5 or better on a 4.0 scale) on 17 of them. This constitutes a strong performance, especially since we set a high bar. On 12 out of the 21 specific learning outcome measures, the mean score was above 3.00.
- Areas for improvement include the following:
 - Reflection. Some of the lower scores were on assessments of student reflection. Reflective thinking is a type of critical thinking. It is also a common pedagogy in our General Education program because we want students to become reflective practitioners regardless of major and also because reflection helps to integrate General Education and make it meaningful to students. Students tend not to come out of high school with much practice in reflection. Most courses could do a better job scaffolding reflection into student work. We note that male students typically tend to lag behind their female classmates in their capacity (or willingness?) to reflect deeply. Notably, this was the case in FA courses, but not in SS courses.
 - Departments offering SS courses should critically explore this question: For all learning outcomes measures outside of reflection, why did concurrent enrollment students score considerably worse than non-concurrent enrollment students? This was not the case with FA courses. There were no concurrent enrollment students in the HU sample. For departments offering SS courses to concurrent enrollment students, this report provides some indication that there may be a quality control issue for SS courses taught in high schools. That possibility should be explored through additional research, and the issue rectified.
 - For SS courses, students scored just under our 2.5 threshold on the information literacy measure of being able to state the purpose or audience for their work. Students struggled with the reflection task of making disciplinary and/or content connections between one course and other courses or other academic knowledge. One way to address this is to more explicitly foreshadow to students during the semester that they will be asked to make these connections at the end of the semester.
 - Students in HU courses scored well on all the learning outcomes measures, but their score of 2.38 on the reflection measure was just below our threshold. In designing the Signature Assignment and Reflection Guide for HU courses, faculty took a laissez-faire approach to the question of which reflection prompts might be used in a given course. That is fine, but it might be best to encourage HU faculty to have students be more intentional about putting the reflection prompt along with their response and deeply reflecting in response to the prompt.
 - In FA courses, students scored very well on all learning outcome measures, including for reflection. It is interesting that female students scored better than their male classmates on all the learning outcome measures in FA courses. FA faculty should also discuss ways that they can help male students with deep reflection.
 - Even with an initial pool of 256 student ePortfolios in each General Education designation, we could not find our target 100 student ePortfolios that we could assess in SS, HU, or FA. This difficulty undercuts the validity of the General Education program's assessment of its learning outcomes. We have always taken a hands-off approach to compliance with ePortfolio, because at its inception faculty expressed concerns about it being used to intrusively monitor their behavior. Clearly, this approach has hurt our ability to assess the program with ePortfolio. As we go forward with a Canvas-based assessment system, we will necessarily be more interested in individual faculty compliance with signature assignment and reflection naming conventions.

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) has been using ePortfolios as a requirement in General Education courses for fifteen years, primarily as a common pedagogy that promotes deeper learning, intentionality, and integration of the General Education program. In addition, we have found ePortfolio to be an effective tool to assess the extent to which students achieve the program's learning outcomes. The ePortfolio requirement affords us insight into how students experience General Education as a program. Each assessment examines whether students are adequately meeting those learning outcomes. As Schneider and Rhodes (2011) noted around the time SLCC began its ePortfolio initiative, “the emerging evidence of portfolios of student work suggests that applying knowledge, selecting examples or representations of students’ own work, integrating learning from several sources, and reflecting on the process of learning, its quality, and the outcomes—the how and why of learning—further strengthens student learning.” We have found this to be true.

We have a rotating assessment schedule and in a given year assess specific designations in our General Education program. For 2025, we focused on Social Sciences (SS), Humanities (HU), and Fine Arts (FA), which are requirements in all Associate of Sciences/Associate of Arts (AA) degrees.

Working with Data Science and Analytics, we pulled three samples of 256 ePortfolios for students who had passed their SS, HU, or FA requirements in the past year. We then identified the ePortfolios that were actually available in the system and that had accessible signature assignments and reflections.

We assess student attainment of General Education learning outcomes by having pairs of reviewers holistically examine the signature assignments and reflections students put in their ePortfolios for the SS, HU, and FA designations. Reviewers use a designation-specific holistic rubric that was developed in consultation with faculty and that combines internally developed rubrics, VALUE rubrics from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), and AAC&U VALUE rubrics modified for our circumstances at SLCC. Assessment teams went through a norming session before they began applying their assigned rubric.

Reviewers scored the artifacts and reflection on the designation page relevant to the learning outcome and rated them on a scale of 1-4, with 4 being strongest score. When reviewer scores differed, the assessment spreadsheet automatically calculated and recorded the average of the two scores.

A note about the 1-4 scoring range for undergraduate work on AAC&U rubrics, which we’ve adopted for all of our general education assessment rubrics at SLCC. AAC&U (no date) describes the VALUE rubrics this way: “The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.” There is no threshold level set for where community college students should be when they graduate. Nevertheless, we have decided to set a relatively high bar of a mean score of 2.5 for our learning outcomes. When scores fall below that level, we want departments to take a look at rethinking pedagogy and course design to better help students. We take a mean score of at least 2.5 to suggest that our students are well placed to develop their skills when they transfer to upper-division courses or apply their skills in the workplace. This is a high bar, because students may take General Education courses at any time in their SLCC career instead of right before graduation.

SOCIAL SCIENCES (SS)

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ADDRESSED IN SS COURSES

Gen Ed Learning Outcome	Students can...	Data Table
Effective Communication	Critically read and analyze primary and secondary sources.	1
Effective Communication	Develop appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work.	2
Critical Thinking	Select and use information to investigate a point of view or conclusion.	3
Information Literacy	Use sources that are appropriate/credible/authoritative for the project.	4
Information Literacy	State the intended audience/purpose of their research.	5
Information Literacy	Cite sources and use a consistent format.	6
Reflection	Make disciplinary and/or content connections between one course and other courses or other academic knowledge.	7

SS Student Performance on Effective Communication Measures (see Tables 1-2 below)

Students in our sample performed well on the two sub-indices of the effective communication learning outcome. On a 1-4 scale, the mean score for being able to critically read and analyze primary and secondary sources was 2.63. The mean score for successfully developing appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work was 3.05.

Female students were somewhat better than their male counterparts in critically reading and analyzing primary and secondary source documents. Hispanic students scored noticeably worse on that measure than did non-Hispanic students, but the opposite was true for developing appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work. Interestingly, concurrent enrollment students performed significantly worse on both sub-indices of effective communication than did non-concurrent enrollment students.

SS Student Performance on a Critical Thinking Measure (see Table 3 below)

Reviewers also examined the SS assignments and reflections to determine whether students can select and use information to investigate a point of view or conclusion. Overall, students scored 2.79 on this indicator of critical thinking. Women scored better than did men. Hispanic students scored better than did non-Hispanic

students. Non-concurrent enrollment students scored considerably better than concurrent enrollment students.

SS Student Performance on Information Literacy (see Tables 4-6 below)

Students in our sample performed well on three measures of information literacy: a mean score of 2.68 on the ability to use sources that are appropriate/credible/authoritative for the project, and a mean score of 2.75 for citing sources and using a consistent format. With a mean score of 2.42 for being able to state the purpose or audience for a piece of work, students scored just below our 2.50 threshold. Female students as well as non-Hispanic students did better at citation than did their male and Hispanic classmates, and Hispanic students were less likely than non-Hispanic students to use appropriate or credible sources. Concurrent enrollment students did poorly on these three sub-indices of information literacy.

SS Student Performance on Reflection (see Table 7 below)

Students in our sample performed lower than we would like on reflection, with a mean score of 2.22 on the ability to make cross-disciplinary or cross-content connections. First-Generation students scored noticeably better than did their non-1st Generation classmates.

Examples of Student Work in SS Courses

Students can choose from 33 courses to satisfy SLCC's SS requirement in its General Education program. In each course, students complete a signature assignment and a reflection, both of which are showcased in their ePortfolios. This section of the General Education report goes beyond the quantitative assessment results to share the kinds of work and reflection students actually do in SS courses.

In ECON 1010, Economics as a Social Science, students completed several related signature assignments, including a multimedia social issue topic presentation and a couple of assignments that ask students to define and apply key economic terms. In their signature assignment (see link above), one student made a presentation about housing affordability and then evaluated the policy proposals of the Trump/Vance and the Harris/Walz campaigns. It is clear that this engaging project captures important skills that speak to both course and General Education learning outcomes. It's also a joy to read this student's reflection. They say the course was both "*challenging and rewarding.*" They go on to write that "*one of the most impactful lessons I learned was the importance of recognizing economics as a tool to analyze human behavior.*" The signature assignments and reflection in this course illustrate what higher education is all about: placing students out of their comfort zones, providing scaffolded assistance, and helping them gain confidence in their knowledge and skills by the end of each course.

A student in PSY 1100, Lifespan Development, might do a research paper on a relevant topic in psychology. While completing their assignment, a paper on binge drinking and brain development, one student used credible sources to come to this conclusion: "*Evidence shows that extreme binge-drinking in young adulthood and college students have notable effects on the hippocampus, the cerebellum, the brain stem, and part of the forebrain.*" This kind of assignment forces students to engage with psychology as a social science grounded in empirical research. In their reflection, this student made connections between this course and their public speaking course: "*All of my courses this semester intersected at some point in different ways. In my Intro to Communications class, some of the concepts that we discussed during our Public Speaking unit were self-esteem and self-efficacy. In Chapter 8, in the section about Personality & Self, our Lifespan Development class went into more detail about some of these concepts. This helped me better understand what I was aiming for and [improve] my public speech in my Communications class. It allowed me to have more knowledge about these important concepts that I may have not learned if I was not in the course.*"

Students in ANTH 1030, World Prehistory, might be given the task of creating a poster describing their own experiments with how prehistoric peoples dried food. This is a great example of a signature assignment that is fun, engaging, and promotes deep learning. This student's reflection was not particularly strong. Still, they showed an appreciation for the "*skill, patience, and adaptability*" that prehistoric peoples needed in order to not only survive, but innovate.

SS ASSESSMENT DATA TABLES

Table 1: Critically read and analyze primary and secondary sources.			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
83	All	2.63	1.17
54	Female	2.69	1.16
29	Male	2.52	1.19
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.46	1.31
53	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.70	1.14
16	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.53	1.20
40	1st Generation	2.61	1.15
38	Not 1st Generation	2.54	1.19
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.40	1.08
11	Concurrent Enrollment	1.95	0.99
72	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.73	1.17

Table 2: Develop appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work.			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
85	All	3.08	0.80
56	Female	3.06	0.82
29	Male	3.10	0.78
14	Hispanic or Latinx	3.32	0.70
54	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.09	0.78
17	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.82	0.93
42	1st Generation	3.02	0.89
38	Not 1st Generation	3.07	0.73
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.60	0.42
12	Concurrent Enrollment	2.42	0.79

73	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.18	0.76
----	---------------------------	------	------

Table 3: Select and use information to investigate a point of view or conclusion.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
78	All	2.79	0.98
50	Female	2.84	0.96
28	Male	2.71	1.01
11	Hispanic or Latinx	3.00	0.89
51	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.87	0.93
16	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.41	1.11
37	1st Generation	2.74	0.95
36	Not 1st Generation	2.79	1.02
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.20	0.97
11	Concurrent Enrollment	1.86	0.90
67	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.95	0.91

Table 4: Use sources that are appropriate/credible/authoritative for the project.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
84	All	2.68	1.14
55	Female	2.73	1.06
29	Male	2.60	1.28
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.43	1.24
53	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.75	1.02
17	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.71	1.41
41	1st Generation	2.61	1.14
38	Not 1st Generation	2.64	1.14
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.60	0.89
12	Concurrent Enrollment	2.13	1.45
72	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.78	1.06

Table 5: State the intended audience/purpose of their research.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
85	All	2.42	0.85

56	Female	2.40	0.84
29	Male	2.47	0.88
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.57	0.98
54	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.50	0.76
17	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.06	0.95
42	1st Generation	2.40	0.90
38	Not 1st Generation	2.42	0.82
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.60	0.82
12	Concurrent Enrollment	1.75	0.92
73	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.53	0.79

Table 6: Cite sources and use a consistent format.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
85	All	2.75	1.18
56	Female	2.84	1.10
29	Male	2.57	1.31
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.68	1.37
54	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.82	1.12
17	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.56	1.24
42	1st Generation	2.70	1.23
38	Not 1st Generation	2.71	1.16
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.40	0.82
12	Concurrent Enrollment	2.00	1.19
73	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.87	1.14

Table 7: Make disciplinary and/or content connections between one course and other courses or other academic knowledge.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
74	All	2.22	1.00
50	Female	2.20	0.99
24	Male	2.27	1.03
12	Hispanic or Latinx	2.17	1.21
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.16	0.93

14	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.50	1.06
41	1st Generation	2.43	1.00
30	Not 1st Generation	1.90	0.96
3	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.67	0.58
12	Concurrent Enrollment	2.25	0.84
62	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.22	1.03

HUMANITIES (HU)

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ADDRESSED IN HU COURSES

Gen Ed Learning Outcome	Students can...	Data Table
Effective Communication	Critically read and analyze primary and secondary sources.	8
Effective Communication	Develop appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work.	9
Critical Thinking	Take imaginative positions.	10
Creative Expression	Use appropriate methods and tools to analyze, interpret, and/or critique creative processes, works, and/or presentations.	11
Information Literacy	Use sources that are appropriate/ credible/ authoritative for the project.	12
Reflection [Reflections scored with the rubric that matches the prompt to which students are responding]	Make connections between coursework and their personal lives. Make disciplinary and/or content connections between one course and other courses or other academic knowledge. Make links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school. Reflect on themselves as learners and their improvement over time. Reflect on process(es) they went through to create their signature assignment.	13

HU Student Performance on Effective Communication Measures (see Tables 8-9 below)

Students in our sample performed well on both sub-indices of the effective communication learning outcome. On a 1-4 scale, the mean score for critically reading and analyzing primary and secondary sources was 2.99. The mean score for developing appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work was 3.66, which is very impressive.

On both measures, women outscoring their male classmates. Hispanic students scored higher on both effective communication sub-indices than did non-Hispanic students. First-Generation students did somewhat better on both measures of effective communication compared to non-1st Generation students.

HU Student Performance on a Critical Thinking Measure (see Table 10 below)

Reviewers also examined the HU assignments and reflections to determine whether students take imaginative positions. Overall, students scored 3.11 on this indicator of critical thinking. Women scored better than did men. Hispanic students scored better than non-Hispanic students, and 1st-Generation students scored better than did non-1st Generation students.

HU Student Performance on a Creative Expression Measure (see Table 11)

Students in our sample performed very well on a creative expression measure in which they were asked to use appropriate methods and tools to analyze, interpret, and/or critique creative processes, works, and/or presentations. The mean score for all students in the sample was 3.38. Results indicated only small differences between various demographic groups in the sample.

HU Student Performance on an Information Literacy Measure (see Table 12)

Students in our sample performed well on the following measure of information literacy: Using sources that are appropriate, credible, and authoritative for the project. The mean score for all students was 2.83. Hispanic students did better on this learning task than did non-Hispanic students, but there were no significant differences between other demographic groups.

HU Student Performance on Reflection (see Table 13)

Students in our sample performed less well on reflection than they did on the other learning outcomes. The overall mean score of 2.38 is below our 2.50 threshold for strong work. Reflection scores for Hispanic students were stronger than non-Hispanic students, as were scores of First Generation students compared to non-First Generation students.

Examples of Student Work in HU Courses

Students can choose from 36 courses to satisfy SLCC's HU General Education requirement for AS degrees. In each course, students complete a signature assignment and a reflection, both of which are showcased in their ePortfolios. This section of the General Education report shares the kinds of work and reflection students actually do in HU courses.

In HUM 1010, Introduction to the Humanities, students might work on a project called My Manifesto, in which they are asked to reflect on a ideal that they believe in, why it is important to them, and what they plan to do to create the changes they would like to see in the world. In this [example Manifesto](#) a student writes that *"an ideal that is important to me is gender equality."* They go on to write that *"I will be encouraging more women in my community to run for office to help cultivate more equality by having better representation."* In their [reflection](#), this student articulated the connections between several of their courses. *"Through humanities, sociology and communication,"* they wrote, *"I was able to reflect on history, culture and the ways they all correspond with one another. Through our beliefs, culture and society, we all play a part in creating the world we live in. We can create change through the steps we take now."*

In HIST 2710, U.S. History Since 1877, students might be asked to do an assignment in which they show how our understanding of history is governed in part by the context of our inquiry. As you can see from [this student's work](#) on our historical understanding of the Cold War, undergraduate students at SLCC are capable of understanding the nuances of the arguments about the Cold War by George Kennan, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Gar Alperovitz. The student concludes that *"This process of reinterpretation may serve to remind us that history is not so much a fixed account but is rather a constant dialogue that requires continual scrutiny to maintain awareness of the numerous experiences and motivations that have shaped the events of the past. By revising what is 'known', historians refine the narrative in order to reflect a more complete truth."* In their reflection, they note that with *"the passage of time and hindsight, we are able to acknowledge that ideological and practical factors often operate in tandem. This assignment underscored the fact that as new evidence and perspective emerge over time, revising historical accounts is not only valid but necessary."*

HU ASSESSMENT DATA TABLES

Table 8: Critically read and analyze primary and secondary sources.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
71	All	2.99	1.05
47	Female	3.03	1.02
24	Male	2.90	1.13
21	Hispanic or Latinx	3.31	0.90
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.90	1.09
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	1.75	0.35
30	1st Generation	3.03	1.00
33	Not 1st Generation	2.91	1.11
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.13	0.88
0	Concurrent Enrollment	N/A	N/A
71	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.87	1.14

Table 9: Develop appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
71	All	3.36	0.75
47	Female	3.41	0.67
24	Male	3.25	0.88
21	Hispanic or Latinx	3.50	0.67
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.32	0.77
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.75	1.06
30	1st Generation	3.42	0.59
33	Not 1st Generation	3.32	0.74
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.31	0.75
0	Concurrent Enrollment	N/A	N/A
71	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.36	0.75

Table 10: Take imaginative positions.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
-----------	--------------------------	--------------	----------------------

71	All	3.11	0.80
47	Female	3.16	0.73
24	Male	3.02	0.94
21	Hispanic or Latinx	3.29	0.29
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.07	0.81
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.25	0.35
30	1st Generation	3.22	0.72
33	Not 1st Generation	3.06	0.74
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.94	0.90
0	Concurrent Enrollment	N/A	N/A
71	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.11	0.80

Table 11: Use appropriate methods and tools to analyze, interpret, and/or critique creative processes, works, and/or presentations.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
71	All	3.38	0.74
47	Female	3.37	0.74
24	Male	3.40	0.75
21	Hispanic or Latinx	3.45	0.74
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.36	0.75
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.00	0.71
30	1st Generation	3.38	0.70
33	Not 1st Generation	3.35	0.64
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.50	0.53
0	Concurrent Enrollment	N/A	N/A
71	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.38	0.74

Table 12: Use sources that are appropriate/ credible/authoritative for the project.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
71	All	2.83	1.11
47	Female	2.81	1.07
24	Male	2.88	1.20
21	Hispanic or Latinx	3.07	1.06

48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.78	1.11
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	1.50	0.71
30	1st Generation	2.80	1.10
33	Not 1st Generation	2.79	1.19
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.13	0.99
0	Concurrent Enrollment	N/A	N/A
71	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.83	1.11

Table 13: Reflection [Scored with appropriate rubric]

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
61	All	2.38	1.04
40	Female	2.40	1.01
21	Male	2.33	1.12
18	Hispanic or Latinx	2.58	1.13
41	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.30	1.01
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.00	1.41
26	1st Generation	2.58	1.04
29	Not 1st Generation	2.38	1.09
6	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	1.50	0.63
0	Concurrent Enrollment	N/A	N/A
61	Not Concurrent Enrollment	2.38	1.04

FINE ARTS (FA)

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ADDRESSED IN FA COURSES

Gen Ed Learning Outcome	Students can...	Data Table
Effective Communication	Critically watch/observe and analyze visual material.	14
Effective Communication	Follow the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields.	15
Effective Communication	Employ fundamental discipline-specific principles, terminology, skills, technology, and/or methods through the study of literary, performing, and/or visual arts.	16
Effective Communication	Use appropriate methods and tools to analyze, interpret, and/or critique creative processes, works, and/or presentations.	17
Information Literacy [Scored with appropriate rubric]	State the intended audience/purpose of their research. Contribute original thoughts/ideas (inference, connections, plans, recommendations, etc.)	18
Critical Thinking	Select and use information to investigate a point of view or conclusion.	19
Critical Thinking	Take imaginative positions.	20
Reflection	Make connections between coursework and their personal lives. Reflect on process(es) they went through to create their signature assignment.	21

FA Student Performance on Effective Communication Measures (see Tables 14-17 below)

Signature assignments in FA courses are assessed with four different measures pertaining to effective communication. Students in our sample performed very well on all four measures. The mean scores for each aspect of effective communication were as follows:

- Critically watch/observe and analyze visual material. 3.54
- Follow the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields. 3.33
- Employ fundamental discipline-specific principles, terminology, skills, technology, and/or methods through the study of literary, performing, and/or visual arts. 3.49
- Use appropriate methods and tools to analyze, interpret, and/or critique creative processes, works, and/or presentations. 3.47

Female students performed better than male students on all four measures. The disaggregation of other demographic variables revealed no clear patterns.

FA Student Performance on Information Literacy Measures (see Table 18 below)

In the information literacy domain, signature assignments in FA courses were scored with one of two information literacy rubrics, depending on the nature of the assignment. Reviewers were looking at whether students could state the intended audience/purpose of their research **or** contribute original thoughts/ideas (inference, connections, plans, recommendations, etc.). The mean score for the two measures was 3.38, with 1st Generation students scoring considerably better than non-1st Generation students.

FA Student Performance on Critical Thinking Measures (see Tables 19-20 below)

With a mean score of 3.33, students in FA courses did very well on selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion. Female students outscored their male counterparts on this measure, as did Hispanic students compared to their non-Hispanic students classmates. First Generation students did better than did non-1st Generation students. For the critical thinking measure asking students to take imaginative positions, the mean score was also 3.33. Female students outscored male students and 1st Generation student outscored non-1st Generation students.

FA Student Performance on Reflection (see Table 21 below)

With a mean score of 3.11, students in FA courses did well in their reflections. Reflections from female students were much stronger than reflections from male students. Hispanic students scored better on reflection than non-Hispanic students, and 1st Generation students scored better than non-1st Generation students. Finally, reflections from concurrent enrollment students were stronger than those from non-concurrent enrollment students.

Examples of Student Work in FA Courses

Students can choose from 25 courses to satisfy SLCC's FA General Education requirement for AS/AA degrees. In each course, students complete a signature assignment and a reflection, both of which are showcased in their ePortfolios.

In FILM 1023, Introduction to Film, students not only learn about academic concepts associated with filmmaking, but they actually create their own short films. This student wrote an intriguing short script, and then translated it into an engaging film that they uploaded to their YouTube [Note that we're not showing the film because it cannot be downloaded and anonymized.] Their reflection is a model of a student looking back over a process, so it is worth quoting at length:

"My completed film was very different from my originally scripted idea. I needed to give the story more personality and plot, which is difficult to do in such a short time span. And even when I took my final draft and turned it into a film, there were so many things that I encountered that were out of my control. Certain things had to change in order to make it progress smoothly, as well as my actors taking creative liberties with the script that I hadn't anticipated and they insisted on.

"Looking over my story I created, I was wishing I had planned a bit more for the technology aspects. I was relying on others to help me with certain things, such as connecting the news article to the TV, while I was unsure how to do it myself. When we were unable to, we had to come up with the creative solution of using a

speaker, and then having another turn the speaker off while the main actress pretended to turn off the TV. It was a difficult thing to navigate with the timing, and having to delegate certain things to others as I could not be over everything as the film progressed. There were several other technological issues with creating my film, and I was really happy with how the final product turned out despite them.”

In ART 1010, Exploring Art, students might do a museum art report in which they discuss self-selected art works at particular museums. In addition, the student uploads to their ePortfolio some of their own artwork completed during the semester. You can see from this student's work that they uploaded pieces specifically created to illustrate what they are learning in class. In their reflection, this student wrote the following: “I have always taken art classes and have been fascinated by the complexity of it all, but I never truly understood it until now. I have enjoyed all the work we have done in this class from the discussions and reports to the paintings and drawings we did. They all gave me the opportunity to grow as an artist and improve the skills that I want to have. My favorite topic this semester was when we were discussing paintings and all the different types of mediums, materials and arts there are. Painting has always been my favorite form of art so being able to discuss and do my own paintings were both such wonderful experiences. I especially enjoyed my trip to the BYU art museum. Being able to see the beautiful art there face to face was an amazing experience and by writing the reflection it gave me a chance to think more critically about each piece I saw.”

FA ASSESSMENT DATA TABLES

Table 14: Critically watch/observe and analyze visual material.			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.54	0.72
63	Female	3.56	0.74
13	Male	3.46	0.69
5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.60	0.42
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.55	0.74
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.47	0.79
50	1st Generation	3.60	0.68
26	Not 1st Generation	3.42	0.74
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.50	0.73
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.55	0.73

Table 15: Follow the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields.			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.33	0.84
63	Female	3.35	0.86
13	Male	3.23	0.75

5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.60	0.22
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.31	0.86
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.30	0.92
50	1st Generation	3.38	0.79
26	Not 1st Generation	3.23	0.85
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.37	0.83
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.32	0.85

Table 16: Employ fundamental discipline-specific principles, terminology, skills, technology, and/or methods through the study of literary, performing, and/or visual arts.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.49	0.87
63	Female	3.51	0.90
13	Male	3.38	0.71
5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.50	0.61
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.46	0.92
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.60	0.78
50	1st Generation	3.45	0.88
26	Not 1st Generation	3.56	0.79
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.58	0.75
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.46	0.91

Table 17: Use appropriate methods and tools to analyze, interpret, and/or critique creative processes, works, and/or presentations.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.47	0.83
63	Female	3.49	0.85
13	Male	3.35	0.72
5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.40	0.65
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.47	0.86
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.47	0.79
50	1st Generation	3.44	0.86

26	Not 1st Generation	3.52	0.71
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.45	0.76
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.47	0.85

**Table 18: State the intended audience/purpose of their research.
Contribute original thoughts/ideas (inference, connections, plans, recommendations, etc.)**

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.38	0.94
63	Female	3.38	0.97
13	Male	3.35	0.83
5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.70	0.45
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.35	0.98
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.37	0.95
50	1st Generation	3.45	0.89
26	Not 1st Generation	3.23	0.94
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.45	0.88
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.35	0.97

Table 19: Select and use information to investigate a point of view or conclusion.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.33	0.91
63	Female	3.35	0.94
13	Male	3.23	0.75
5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.50	0.35
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.32	0.96
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.30	0.86
50	1st Generation	3.40	0.86
26	Not 1st Generation	3.19	0.91
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.34	0.78
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.32	0.95

Table 20: Take imaginative positions.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.33	0.93
63	Female	3.37	0.94
13	Male	3.15	0.90
5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.40	0.55
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.32	0.98
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.33	0.88
50	1st Generation	3.39	0.89
26	Not 1st Generation	3.21	0.94
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.34	0.82
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.32	0.97

Table 21: Reflection [Scored with appropriate rubric]

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
76	All	3.11	1.02
62	Female	3.19	1.02
14	Male	2.79	0.99
5	Hispanic or Latinx	3.70	0.27
56	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.04	1.07
15	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.17	0.96
50	1st Generation	3.17	0.99
26	Not 1st Generation	3.00	1.08
0	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	N/A	N/A
19	Concurrent Enrollment	3.29	0.89
57	Not Concurrent Enrollment	3.05	1.06

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Reviewers for the 2025 General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment

Anamaye Lanayru, Faculty in Visual Arts and Design

Robinson Valenzuela, Faculty in Visual Arts and Design

Ann Fillmore, Faculty in English, Linguistics, and Writing Studies

Sahar Al-Shoubaki, Faculty in Humanities

Heather Schumacker, Faculty in Economics

Stephanie Hoffman, Faculty in Criminal Justice

Special Acknowledgment for

Yana Yan, Administrative Assistant, Academic Operations/General Education

Amanda Rubino, Administrative Assistant, Office of Learning Advancement

REFERENCES

Association of American Colleges and Universities, Value Rubrics. (No date). Retrieved on July 11, 2024 from <https://www.aacu.org/initiatives/value-initiative/value-rubrics/value-rubrics-reading>

Schneider, C., & Rhodes, T. (2011). "Forward" in Sternberg, R. J., Penn, J., & Hawkins, C. *Assessing College Student Learning: Evaluating Alternative Models, Using Multiple Methods*. Washington, DC: The American Association of Colleges and Universities.