

GENERAL EDUCATION



ASSESSMENT REPORT 2024

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT 2024

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

Table of Contents

Topic	Page
Executive Summary	3
Assessment Methods	4
Quantitative Literacy (QL)	5
Quantitative Studies (QS)	10
Communication (CM)	14
Human Relations (HR)	18
Acknowledgements	21
References	22



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 QS, CM, and HR courses in AAS programs and QL courses in AS programs are, on average, attaining program learning outcomes. Of the 21 specific learning outcome assessments described in this report, spread over four different General Education designations, students scored satisfactorily on 13 of them. This is great, especially since we set a high bar. Of the remaining learning outcome assessments, the average student scored acceptably well—i.e., above 2.0 on a 1-4 scale that considers the full range of baccalaureate work.
- Areas for improvement include the following:
 - Reflection. Many of the low 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 simultaneously 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. Faculty should work with the ePortfolio Office, which is an excellent resource when it comes to reflective pedagogy. Finally, male students tend to lag behind their female classmates in their capacity (or willingness?) to reflect deeply. There is no reason that this needs to be the case, and faculty should keep this in mind as they introduce reflection to their students.
 - Faculty teaching CM courses should think about how students should be demonstrating in their signature assignments the ability to critically read and analyze primary and secondary sources. Does this aspect of those signature assignments need to be made more transparent to students? Do the assignments require more scaffolding to help students better engage with primary and secondary sources? Faculty should be having conversations centered around these kinds of questions.
 - Similarly, CM faculty should examine how they are asking students to use sources that are appropriate/credible/authoritative for the project. They might want to engage the Library staff to help them develop some practices across our CM courses that could better assist students develop this particular information literacy move.
 - Faculty teaching HR courses should have a conversation about how they want students to take imaginative positions, taking into account the complexities of an issue. One way to approach that might be to examine signature assignments to make sure that they actually give students the latitude to take imaginative positions.
 - We need to have serious conversations among CM faculty, QS faculty, and (especially) HR faculty about use of the required ePortfolio in their General Education courses. Even with an initial pool of 200 AAS graduates, we were not able to find 100 students who 1) had an ePortfolio in our system and 2) had artifacts for the CM, QS, and (especially) HR courses. The fact that this is not a problem with this year's QL sample for AS students suggests that the issue lies with faculty and course design rather than students. This deficit raises two important issues. One is the validity of our attempts to assess General Education learning outcomes for AAS students. The other is that it undercuts the pedagogical reasons we use ePortfolios in General Education, which include their ability to integrate General Education for our students, to promote student intentionality toward achieving General Education learning outcomes, and to help students develop into reflective practitioners.

ASSESSMENT METHODS

Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) has been using ePortfolios as a requirement in General Education courses for fourteen 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 graduating 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 2024, we focused on Quantitative Studies (QS), Communication (CM), and Human Relations (HR), which are requirements in all Associate of Applied Sciences (AAS) degrees. Additionally, our reviewers assessed artifacts and reflections addressing Quantitative Literacy (QL), which is a requirement for all Associate of Science (AS) degrees.

Working with Data Science and Analytics, we pulled two samples with the following parameters:

1. For the QS, CM, and HR assessment, we pulled an initial random sample of 200 students who graduated with an AAS in 2023. This served as our pool from which we randomly selected students who had artifacts and reflection in their ePortfolio for the relevant General Education designation.
2. For the QL assessment, we pulled an initial random sample of 200 students who graduated with an AS in 2023. This served as our pool from which we randomly selected students who had artifacts and reflection in their ePortfolio for the relevant General Education designation.

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 QS, QL, CM, and HR 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.

QUANTITATIVE LITERACY (QL)

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ADDRESSED IN QL COURSES

Gen Ed Learning Outcome	Students can...	Data Table
Quantitative Literacy	Accurately explain and interpret mathematical processes.	1
	Successfully perform attempted calculations.	2
	Effectively use quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of their work.	3
Critical Thinking	Demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions.	4
Reflection	Make links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school.	5
	Make connections between coursework and their personal lives.	6

QL Student Performance on Quantitative Literacy Measures (see Tables 1-3 below)

Students in our sample performed well on all three sub-indices of the quantitative literacy learning outcome. On a 1-4 scale, the mean score for accurately explaining and interpreting mathematical processes was 2.82. The mean score for successfully performing attempted calculations was 3.05, and the mean score for effectively using quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of their work was 2.90.

There are no concerning gender differences in student scores on the quantitative literacy sub-indices. With respect to ethnicity, we note that Hispanic students scored better on explaining and interpreting mathematical processes than did non-Hispanic students, but the opposite was true for performing calculations and using quantitative information in connection with an argument. Interestingly, on average our 1st Generation students scored better on all three sub-indices of quantitative literacy than did their non-1st Generation classmates.

QL Student Performance on a Critical Thinking Measure (see Table 4 below)

Reviewers also examined the QL assignments and reflections to determine whether students demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions. Overall, students scored 3.11 on this indicator of critical thinking. Women scored better than did men. Hispanic students scored better than did non-Hispanic students. First Generation students scored lower than students who are not First Generation.

QL Student Performance on Reflection (see Tables 5-6 below)

Students in our sample performed well on reflection, but not as well as they did for overtly quantitative and critical thinking skills. When it came to making links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school, the mean score was 2.58. Hispanic students scored noticeably higher than did non-Hispanic students, and 1st Generation students scored noticeably lower than did their non-1st Generation classmates.

Students were least able to make connections between coursework and their personal lives. The mean score was 2.42, and scores below 2.5 give us pause. Female students performed better on this aspect of reflection than did males. Hispanic students performed better than non-Hispanic students.

Examples of Student Work in QL Courses

Students can choose from ten courses to satisfy SLCC's QL 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 QL courses.

In MATH1040, Introduction to Statistics, students completed a Skittles project. In their signature assignment, one student described it this way: *"We started with purchasing a 2.17 ounce bag of Skittles and recorded our data combining those numbers with the entire class data. From there we built onto by organizing the categorical data, quantitative data, creating a pie chart, Pareto chart, histogram and a box plot. From there we constructed a 90% and 99% confidence interval for the population of yellow candies. Take a look at our team project!"* 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 admit to starting out the project feeling *"freaked out . . . because I had no idea what I was doing."* Their reflection illustrates 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 MATH 1050, College Algebra, might do a credit card debt assignment in which they respond to structured questions about a \$2,000 balance on their credit card. While completing their assignment, one student definitely realized that making the minimum monthly payment was not a good way to knock down the principal. This kind of assignment forces students to calculate their way through financial scenarios that improve their skills and help them realize how the real world works. In their reflection, this particular student talked about how the assignment reinforced what they were taught at home: *"I was always taught from an early age to be wary of the consequences that signing up for a credit card could bring. I always knew that using credit was a quick way to rack up debt and find yourself stuck paying off the same bill for years. And completing this assignment only solidified everything that was told to me."*

Students in MATH 1210, Calculus I, might be given the task of calculating the optimal route for an oil pipeline near Vernal, Utah. This student effectively used the skills they learned in class to explore several options and recommend the one that takes *"the most cost efficient route."* This student's reflection was not particularly strong. Still, they showed an appreciation for how calculus makes solving these kinds of problems easier than other approaches. Further, the student connected this work with their future plans: *"I want to become a chemical engineer, so I can definitely see myself using almost all of the concepts I learned, particularly when dealing with decay rates."*

Aside from the strictly quantitative skills emphasized in QL courses offered by the Math department, signature assignments also address a particular form of critical thinking—the ability to demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions. In all signature assignments in QL, students are asked to collect data/information and use it to test hypotheses or alternatives, whether that be the number of a certain color of Skittles in a large sample or the length of time (and money spent) paying off a debt under varying conditions. This is strong assignment design that illustrates how one multi-step assignment can address several important General Education program outcomes.

QL ASSESSMENT DATA TABLES

Table 1: Accurately explain and interpret mathematical processes			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
95	All	2.82	0.56
37	Female	2.81	0.56
58	Male	2.83	0.56
11	Hispanic or Latinx	2.91	0.44
83	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.81	0.57
1	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.50	NA
42	1st Generation	2.93	0.60
48	Not 1st Generation	2.77	0.50
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.40	0.42

Table 2: Successfully perform attempted calculations			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
94	All	3.05	0.59
35	Female	2.99	0.52
59	Male	3.09	0.63
11	Hispanic or Latinx	2.86	0.45
82	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.07	0.60
1	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.50	NA
41	1st Generation	3.12	0.55
48	Not 1st Generation	3.08	0.55
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.20	0.76

Table 3: Effectively use quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of their work.			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
96	All	2.90	0.61
37	Female	2.86	0.64
59	Male	2.92	0.59
11	Hispanic or Latinx	2.68	0.40
84	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.93	0.63

1	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.50	NA
42	1st Generation	2.96	0.64
48	Not 1st Generation	2.89	0.59
6	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.50	0.32

Table 4: Demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
97	All	3.11	0.58
37	Female	3.22	0.58
60	Male	3.05	0.57
11	Hispanic or Latinx	3.27	0.61
85	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.08	0.57
1	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	4.00	NA
43	1st Generation	3.10	0.60
48	Not 1st Generation	3.19	0.53
6	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.58	0.58

Table 5: Making links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
95	All	2.58	0.68
35	Female	2.53	0.61
60	Male	2.62	0.72
11	Hispanic or Latinx	2.77	0.56
83	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.57	0.69
1	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.00	NA
42	1st Generation	2.55	0.68
47	Not 1st Generation	2.62	0.65
6	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.58	0.97

Table 6: Make connections between coursework and their personal lives.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
95	All	2.42	0.79
35	Female	2.53	0.80

60	Male	2.36	0.79
11	Hispanic or Latinx	2.73	0.56
83	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.39	0.81
1	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	1.50	NA
42	1st Generation	2.44	0.79
47	Not 1st Generation	2.48	0.77
6	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	1.58	0.88

QUANTITATIVE STUDIES (QS)

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ADDRESSED IN QS COURSES

Gen Ed Learning Outcome	Students can...	Data Table
Quantitative Literacy	Accurately explain and interpret mathematical processes.	7
	Successfully perform attempted calculations.	8
	Effectively use quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of their work.	9
Critical Thinking	Demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions.	10
Reflection	Make links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school.	11
	Make connections between coursework and their personal lives.	12

QS Student Performance on Quantitative Literacy Measures (see Tables 7-9 below)

Students in our sample performed well on all three sub-indices of the quantitative literacy learning outcome. On a 1-4 scale, the mean score for accurately explaining and interpreting mathematical processes was 2.85. The mean score for successfully performing attempted calculations was 3.04, and the mean score for effectively using quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of their work was 2.83. Given 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, scores in the 2.5 to 3.0 range mean our students are well placed to develop their quantitative skills when they transfer to upper-division courses.

There are some concerning gender differences in student scores on two of the quantitative literacy sub-indices, with women outscoring their male classmates. With respect to ethnicity, we note that Hispanic students scored lower on all quantitative literacy sub-indices than did non-Hispanic students.

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

Reviewers also examined the QL assignments and reflections to determine whether students demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions. Overall, students scored 2.90 on this indicator of critical thinking. Women scored better than did men. Non-Hispanic students scored better than did Hispanic students.

QS Student Performance on Reflection (see Tables 11-12 below)

Students in our sample performed well on reflection, but not as well as they did for overtly quantitative and critical thinking skills. When it came to making links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school, the mean score was 2.29. When making connections between coursework and their personal lives,

the mean score was 2.36. Female students performed better on reflection than did males. First Generation students scored less well on reflection than did their non-First Generation classmates. Students need more practice with reflection in Math courses.

Examples of Student Work in QS Courses

Students can choose from fourteen courses to satisfy SLCC’s QS General Education requirement for AAS degrees, although MATH 1010 accounts for over 90 percent of enrollment. 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 QS courses.

In MATH 1010, Intermediate Algebra, some students are given information about NASA’s “vomit comet” flights that create up to 20 seconds of weightlessness to trainees. This is accomplished by having a jet perform an exaggerated parabolic flight. In a very structured assignment—befitting the level of the class—students are then asked to develop a mathematical model for the parabolic path. Here is an example from one student. In their reflection, this student wrote about the unexpected relevance of the assignment: *“When most people think of math, they think that it is only something that you do in school because your teacher makes you do it. . . There are a lot of things that go into everyday life that have to deal with math. We just never think about the situations where they apply.”* After talking a bit about several examples of math being used outside of school, the student concluded their reflection this way: *“This assignment really did change my outlook on math. It gave me an example that I can use in my everyday life. Sometimes we just have to slow down and look to see where math is being applied. It happens all around us.”*

In IND 1120, Math for Industry, students are introduced to the concepts of industrial mathematics geared to careers in the automotive, diesel and welding fields. As you can see from this student’s work, students are asked to tackle some difficult problems. The signature assignment is not outlined as well in this course as Math assignments are, but one can extrapolate from the student’s work that they were asked to calculate engine horsepower given certain information, calculate the trajectory of a bullet (at a crime scene?), the amount of force on a piston, and the distance covered by a tire of a particular circumference. The real world applications are manifest. This student’s reflection is interesting, because they are already working as a heavy-duty vehicle technician. They revealed that they hadn’t *“had a math class since I was in high school so I was slightly worried how well some of it would come back to me. I am glad to say I do feel like all of it came back to me and I ended up enjoying the course and do feel like it has helped me and will continue to help me, especially when it comes to understanding how and why I perform certain tasks at work.”*

QS ASSESSMENT DATA TABLES

Table 7: Accurately explain and interpret mathematical processes

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
56	All	2.85	0.72
31	Female	2.98	0.63
25	Male	2.68	0.80
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.57	0.73
40	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.94	0.72

2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.00	0.00
30	1st Generation	2.85	0.76
21	Not 1st Generation	2.79	0.68
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.10	0.74

Table 8: Successfully perform attempted calculations

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
56	All	3.04	0.82
31	Female	3.06	0.91
25	Male	3.02	0.70
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.64	0.66
40	Not Hispanic or Latinx	3.16	0.84
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.50	0.00
30	1st Generation	3.07	0.86
21	Not 1st Generation	2.98	0.83
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.20	0.57

Table 9: Effectively use quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of their work.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
56	All	2.83	0.76
31	Female	2.95	0.78
25	Male	2.68	0.73
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.57	0.58
40	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.93	0.82
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.75	0.35
30	1st Generation	2.77	0.86
21	Not 1st Generation	2.88	0.63
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.00	0.79

Table 10: Demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
57	All	2.90	0.65
31	Female	2.95	0.49

26	Male	2.85	0.81
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.75	0.38
41	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.94	0.73
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.25	0.35
30	1st Generation	2.88	0.65
22	Not 1st Generation	2.89	0.71
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	3.10	0.42

Table 11: Making links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
57	All	2.29	0.94
31	Female	2.47	0.93
26	Male	2.08	0.91
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.21	0.96
41	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.30	0.95
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.50	0.71
30	1st Generation	2.13	0.90
22	Not 1st Generation	2.57	0.93
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.00	1.06

Table 12: Make connections between coursework and their personal lives.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
57	All	2.36	1.05
31	Female	2.47	1.01
26	Male	2.23	1.11
14	Hispanic or Latinx	2.25	1.09
41	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.38	1.04
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.75	1.77
30	1st Generation	2.27	1.06
22	Not 1st Generation	2.61	1.03
5	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	1.80	0.91

COMMUNICATION (CM)

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ADDRESSED IN CM COURSES

Gen Ed Learning Outcome	Students can...	Data Table
Effective Communication	Critically read and analyze primary and secondary sources.	13
	Adapt communication for context, purpose, and audience.	14
Information Literacy	Use sources that are appropriate/credible/authoritative for the project.	15
	Create work with a clear purpose.	16
	Contribute original thoughts/ideas (inferences, connections, plans, recommendations, etc.)	17
Reflection	Make links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school.	18

CM Student Performance on Effective Communication Measures (see Tables 13 and 14 below)

Students in our sample performed a bit below what we would hope for on critically reading and analyzing primary and secondary sources. The mean score was 2.21 for that dimension of communication. Students did better when adapting communication for context, purpose, and audience—scoring on average 2.99. Female students performed better than males on both indices.

CM Student Performance on Information Literacy Measures (see Tables 15-17 below)

In the information literacy domain, students in CM courses did very well creating work with a clear purpose (mean 2.69) and contributing their own ideas rather than relying solely on sources (mean 2.67), but they need more work on using credible or appropriate sources in their work (mean 2.14). We see some interesting demographic differences—for instance, male students scored noticeably better than their female classmates in creating work with a clear purpose and non-Hispanic students using appropriate or credible sources with greater facility than Hispanic students.

CM Student Performance on Reflection (see Table 18 below)

With a mean score of 2.25, students in CM courses could do better on making links in their reflections between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school. Female students outscored their male counterparts on reflection, as did non—Hispanic students compared to their Hispanic classmates.

Examples of Student Work in CM Courses

Students can choose from eleven courses to satisfy SLCC's CM General Education requirement for AAS 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 goes beyond the quantitative assessment results to share the kinds of work and reflection students actually do in CM courses.

In COMM 1020, Public Speaking, students practice designing and giving speeches. In one student’s signature assignment, they outlined a persuasive speech in which *“my audience will understand and agree [with] the need of livable wage jobs for recently released inmates and my proposal for a Cosmetology/ Barbering School within the fences at Utah State Prison.”* The assignment asked students to assess their audience and adapt their message to the audience’s attitude to incarcerated people. Then the student must outline the speech and support their main points with evidence. This student’s reflection articulated the personal importance of the course: *“This class has taught me to have confidence in myself. To be able to speak in front of a crowd that I am a stranger to and learn about a variety of topics I would have never normally known had it not been for my classmates and professor. It made me open my eyes to new things and to also learn how to present myself well to others.”* The student grew as a result of this class, and it’s important for them to know about that growth now instead of realizing it years in the future.

The COMM 2110 course is called Interpersonal Communication. After they’ve read about barriers to effective interpersonal communication, students in this class might be asked to make a proposal to change something about their own communication style. For their signature assignment, this student first wrote a proposal in which they would strive to *“not answer in a defensive way”* when talking with their partner. They were practicing something they learned from their textbook—in this case, how to be a relational listener instead of an ambush listener. After their proposal is accepted by the faculty, they put it into effect and write a personal change project final report. In the report they outline their strategies, which are grounded in the literature of interpersonal communication, and report their results. In this case, the student wrote *“I am satisfied with the changes I’ve seen so far. I know I still have some work to do but I’m proud of myself for being able to make some changes, even if they’re small right now. I know my partner is proud of me too and knows how hard it can be for me to let go of my stubbornness and admit when I’m in the wrong.”* In their reflection, this student made connections between their Interpersonal Communication class and a Psychology course they took earlier: *“In my psychology class, I noticed that several concepts from both of these classes have meshed together. My psychology class would discuss how the brain takes in communications and how it filters it to decide the best way to react. I think that communication and psychology go hand in hand, how we talk to someone affects how they feel and affects what they do with the information they were provided.”* This is important! This student is seeing how General Education courses are connected as opposed to fragmented.

CM ASSESSMENT DATA TABLES

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
67	All	2.21	1.03
34	Female	2.26	1.15
33	Male	2.15	0.90
17	Hispanic or Latinx	2.18	1.10
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.25	1.02
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	1.50	0.71
27	1st Generation	2.30	0.98

32	Not 1st Generation	2.25	1.10
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	1.75	0.85

Table 14: Adapt communication for context, purpose, and audience.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
67	All	2.88	0.66
34	Female	3.04	0.66
33	Male	2.71	0.63
17	Hispanic or Latinx	2.88	0.52
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.84	0.69
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.75	0.35
27	1st Generation	2.74	0.58
32	Not 1st Generation	3.00	0.73
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.88	0.58

Table 15: Use sources that are appropriate/credible/authoritative for the project.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
67	All	2.14	1.10
34	Female	2.18	1.16
33	Male	2.11	1.05
17	Hispanic or Latinx	2.06	1.09
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.20	1.12
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	1.50	0.71
27	1st Generation	2.30	1.15
32	Not 1st Generation	2.14	1.11
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	1.63	0.83

Table 16: Create work with a clear purpose.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
68	All	2.69	0.73
35	Female	2.49	0.70
33	Male	2.91	0.71
17	Hispanic or Latinx	2.41	0.81

49	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.76	0.68
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.50	0.71
27	1st Generation	2.61	0.91
33	Not 1st Generation	2.77	0.61
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.63	0.52

Table 17: Contribute original thoughts/ideas (inferences, connections, plans, recommendations, etc.)

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
68	All	2.67	0.56
35	Female	2.61	0.54
33	Male	2.73	0.59
17	Hispanic or Latinx	2.56	0.70
49	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.68	0.51
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	3.25	0.35
27	1st Generation	2.61	0.61
33	Not 1st Generation	2.70	0.53
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.75	0.60

Table 18: Make links between coursework and its broader applicability outside of school.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
68	All	2.25	0.69
35	Female	2.40	0.67
33	Male	2.09	0.68
18	Hispanic or Latinx	2.11	0.74
48	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.29	0.68
2	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.50	0.00
27	1st Generation	2.23	0.69
33	Not 1st Generation	2.30	0.74
8	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.13	0.52

HUMAN RELATIONS (HR)

GENERAL EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES ADDRESSED IN HR COURSES

Gen Ed Learning Outcome	Students can...	Data Table
Effective Communication	Develop appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work.	19
Critical Thinking	Take imaginative positions (perspective, thesis/hypothesis), taking into account the complexities of an issue.	20
Reflection	Make connections between coursework and their personal lives.	21

HR Student Performance on an Effective Communication Measure (see Table 19 below)

Our sample from HR courses is quite small, so we cannot make compelling assertions about AAS graduates on any of the general education learning outcomes addressed in HR courses. Students in our sample performed close to what we would hope for on developing appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work. The mean score was 2.44 for that dimension of communication. Male students performed better than females, Hispanic students performed better than non-Hispanic students, and 1st Generation students performed better than students who are not 1st Generation.

HR Student Performance on a Critical Thinking Measure (see Table 20 below)

Our sample from HR courses is quite small, so we cannot make compelling assertions about AAS graduates on any of the general education learning outcomes addressed in HR courses. Students in our sample performed below what we would hope for on taking imaginative positions in their work, considering the complexities of an issue. The mean score was 2.27 for that dimension of communication. Female students performed better than males and 1st Generation students performed better than students who are not 1st Generation.

HR Student Performance on Reflection (see Table 21 below)

Our sample from HR courses is quite small, so we cannot make compelling assertions about AAS graduates on any of the general education learning outcomes addressed in HR courses. Students in our sample performed well when reflecting in ways that make connections between coursework and their personal lives. The mean score was 2.65 for that aspect of reflection. Female students performed better than males, and Hispanic students performed better than non-Hispanic students.

Examples of Student Work in HR Courses

In a BUS 1010, Introduction to Business class, students might complete a signature assignment in which they assess a career in business, looking at the training for and demands of the job, and doing a mini-profile of an actual person who holds a position in the career the student assessed. This student looked at becoming a Chief Financial Officer, and realized that it is a difficult but doable thing: *“Becoming a CFO is difficult. Just like*

any other high caliber, well paying job, becoming a CFO takes a lot of education, training, and time in the career field. With determination and hard work, anybody could become a CFO.” This student’s reflection, while not strong, nevertheless helped them clarify that this career route was not for them: “The educational requirements added to the amount of experience most Chief Financial Officers must have in order to qualify for the great paying jobs, is something I’m not interested in.” Ideally, we would like deeper reflection where you can really see the student thinking as they work things out. Still, it’s important for this student to come to this realization as a result of the assignment and because they were asked to think about it after they submitted it.

In a MKTG 1010 Customer Service course, students might be asked to create documents pertaining to staff development in customer service and also to a variety of strategies to promote customer service within a company. This student created two PowerPoints for a fictional hospitality company named Crash and Dine. One presentation summarized the company’s mission and vision and other topics such as its customer relations strategy and its social media strategy. The second presentation was a series of slides that could be used in a staff development workshop. This student’s reflection was far below what we would hope for our students.

HR ASSESSMENT DATA TABLES

Table 19: Develop appropriate, relevant, and compelling content in their work.			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
24	All	2.44	0.80
11	Female	2.23	0.78
13	Male	2.68	0.78
6	Hispanic or Latinx	2.67	0.91
15	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.47	0.83
3	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	1.83	0.76
12	1st Generation	2.67	0.91
8	Not 1st Generation	2.38	0.58
4	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	1.88	0.63

Table 20: Take imaginative positions, taking into account the complexities of an issue.			
n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
24	All	2.27	0.81
11	Female	2.55	0.93
13	Male	2.04	0.63
6	Hispanic or Latinx	2.33	1.03
15	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.37	0.72
3	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	1.67	0.76

12	1st Generation	2.46	0.92
8	Not 1st Generation	2.13	0.69
4	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.00	0.71

Table 21: Make connections between coursework and their personal lives.

n=	Demographic Group	Score	Std Deviation
24	All	2.65	0.81
11	Female	2.73	0.98
13	Male	2.58	0.67
6	Hispanic or Latinx	3.00	0.71
15	Not Hispanic or Latinx	2.53	0.90
3	Prefer Not to Say Hispanic/Not Hispanic	2.50	0.50
12	1st Generation	2.71	1.01
8	Not 1st Generation	2.63	0.69
4	Unknown 1st/Not 1st Generation	2.50	0.41

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Reviewers for the 2024 General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment

Rachel Aubrey, Instructor of Communication

Cindy Denos, Adjunct Faculty of Visual Art and Design

Stephanie Kelly, Assistant Professor of Mortuary Science

Shirene McKay, Associate Professor of Communication

Camille Paxman, Assistant Professor of Math

Neal Reiland, Professor of Visual Art and Design

Suda Satcunasingam, Associate Professor of Math

Lon Schiffbauer, Associate Professor of Business

John Schweitzer, Associate Professor of Math

Zeph Smith, Associate Professor of Math

Bryan Wilson, Assistant Professor of Math

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.