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PART ONE – INTRODUCTION

I. COMMITTEE PURPOSE

The General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) coordinates, assesses, and evaluates student learning relative to core curriculum outcomes. The GEAC arrives at data-driven conclusions to guide the improvement of student learning.

I. DEFINITIONS

General Education – General Education at Lamar State College - Orange (LSC-O) is the broad-based foundational course of study essential for all disciplines that develop intellectual competencies needed for students to acquire the breadth of knowledge which is the touchstone for life-long learning and success.

Assessment – the ongoing process of establishing clear, measurable expected outcomes of student learning; ensuring that students have sufficient opportunities to achieve those outcomes; systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well student learning matches our expectations; and using the resulting information to understand and improve student learning.

Evaluation – using assessment information to make an informed judgment on such things as whether students have achieved the learning goals established for them, the relative strengths and weaknesses of teaching and learning strategies, and what changes in goals and teaching-learning strategies might be appropriate.

Artifact – evidence of student work which represents their degree of learning. Examples include a student’s completed exam, research paper, a poster, a recorded speech, scantrons, quiz, web posting. NOTE: If scantrons are submitted as artifacts, a MS Excel Spreadsheet or MS Word table illustrating analysis of correct verses incorrect responses associated with each outcome must also be submitted.

III. REPORT OVERVIEW

In the 2012-2013 General Education Annual Report, it was noted that the initial assessment of communication skills, critical thinking skills, and empirical and quantitative skills took place. However, the results of each outcome and survey results regarding the assessment process were to be analyzed and evaluated in Fall 2013 in order to make evidence-based improvements. Therefore, this annual report will contain information for both the 2012-2013 and the 2013-2014 academic years.
PART TWO – OUTCOMES ATTAINMENT

IV. COMMITTEE OUTCOME ONE

Evaluate the Spring 2013 general education assessment results and implement decisions and actions that lead to evidence of improvement regarding each of the three student learning outcomes assessed including: 1.) communication skills, 2.) critical thinking skills, and 3.) empirical and quantitative skills.

A. COMMUNICATION SKILLS STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME

NOTES: The communication skills student learning outcome is referred to by the THECB as the communication skills core objective. The 2012-2013 assessment of communication skills includes evaluation and data-driven improvements in the 2013-2014 academic year.

1. Description of Assessment.

The LSC-O Communication Rubric (direct measure of assessment), was used to assess student course-level artifacts related to communication skills.

Definition of Communication Skills: Communication involves the clear expression of purposefully developed oral, written, and visual information designed to increase knowledge, foster understanding, and/or influence the audience’s attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.


Explanation of Measure: The LSC-O Communication Rubric was based on the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Oral Communication and Written Communication VALUE Rubrics (VALUE is an acronym for Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) and aligned with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s communication skills core objective.

Methodology: Course-level student artifacts were randomly sampled from the LSC-O Foundational Component Areas of Communication, Component Area Options, Creative Arts, Government/Political Science, Mathematics, Language, Philosophy and Culture, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Life and Physical Sciences, and American History. The student artifacts were gauged against the LSC-O Communication Rubric by faculty and peer reviewers from McNeese State University in Lake Charles, Louisiana and Lamar State College – Port Arthur in Port Arthur, Texas.
Frequency: Every two years.


Criteria: The LSC-O Communication Rubric criteria, identified on the rubric as “Specific Outcomes,” includes 1.) context and purpose of communication, 2.) central message/thesis/theme, 3.) content development: sources, evidence, and supporting materials, 4.) organization and coherence, 5.) control of syntax, mechanics, and various conventions, specific to genre and discipline, and 6.) delivery: language and/or non-verbal expression.

Targets: Student artifacts are to “meet” or “exceed” expectations with a mean score of 2.6 or higher.

4. Analysis: Analysis and Interpretation of Assessment Information.

Results: Reviewers found that student artifacts did not meet expectations with a mean score of 1.80 out of the 3.0 scale. The committee had set a threshold of acceptability of 2.6.

The main themes arising from reviewer feedback included:
- inadequate assignment instructions
- lack of documentation of reliable sources to substantiate claims in student work.
5. **Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.**

**Actions Completed:** In order to address the major themes of the assessment results, the committee developed an Assignment Development Checklist for the general education faculty to utilize against one of their upcoming assignments.

The Arts and Sciences Division Director sent out a memo with the Spring 2013 assessment results including a link to the Assignment Development Checklist. The Assignment Development Checklist Report indicates twenty-two general education faculty members completed the checklist.

**NOTES:** In Fall 2013, there were twenty-two full-time faculty and twenty-seven adjunct faculty members. The Assignment Development Checklist also addresses the critical thinking and empirical and quantitative skills outcome assessment results.

### B. CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

**NOTES:** The critical thinking skills student learning outcome is referred to by the THECB as the critical thinking skills core objective. The 2012-2013 assessment of critical thinking includes evaluation and data-driven improvements in the 2013-2014 academic year.

1. **Description of Assessment.**

The LSC-O Critical Thinking Rubric (direct measure of assessment), was used to assess course-level student artifacts related to communication skills.

**Definition of Critical Thinking Skills:** Critical thinking is the intellectual practice characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.
2. **Assessment Methods: Explanations of Measure, Methodology, Frequency, and Timeline of Assessment Activities.**

   **Explanation of Measure:** The LSC-O Critical Thinking Rubric was based on the AAC&U’s Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric and aligned with the THECB’s critical thinking core objective.

   **Methodology:** Student artifacts were randomly sampled from the LSC-O Foundational Component Areas of American History, Communication, Component Area Options, Creative Arts, Government/Political Science, Language, Philosophy, and Culture, Life and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. The artifacts were gauged against the LSC-O Critical Thinking Rubric by faculty and peer reviewers.

   **Frequency:** Every two years.

   **Timeline of Assessment:** Fall 2016, 2017, 2020, and 2021.

3. **Criteria/Targets: Explanation of Targets Used to Benchmark the Attainment of Critical Thinking Skills.**

   **Criteria:** The LSC-O Critical Thinking Rubric criteria, identified on the rubric as “Specific Outcomes,” includes 1.) issue identification, 2.) evidence and support, 3.) context and assumptions, 4.) perspective, thesis/hypothesis, 5.) conclusion, consequences and implications.

   **Targets:** Student artifacts are to “meet” or “exceed” expectations with a mean score of 2.6 or higher.

4. **Analysis: Analysis and Interpretation of Assessment Information.**

   **Results:** Reviewers found that student artifacts met expectations with an average score of 2.35 out of the 3.0 scale. The results, however, did not meet the expectations of the committee as their threshold of acceptability was a score of a 2.6.

   The main themes arising from reviewer feedback included:
   - lack of documentation of reliable sources to substantiate claims in student work
   - students lack of examination of multiple viewpoints to substantiate claims.
5. Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.

Actions Completed: In order to address the major themes arising from the assessment, the committee created an Assignment Development Checklist for the general education faculty to utilize against one of their upcoming assignments.

The Arts and Sciences Division Director sent out a memo with the Spring 2013 assessment results including a link to the Assignment Development Checklist. Based on the Assignment Development Checklist Report, twenty-two general education faculty members completed the checklist.

NOTE: In Fall 2013, there were twenty-two full-time faculty and twenty-seven adjust faculty members.
C. EMPIRICAL AND QUANTITATIVE SKILLS STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME

NOTES: The LSC-O empirical and quantitative skills student learning outcome is referred to by the THECB as the critical thinking skills core objective. The 2012-2013 assessment of empirical and quantitative skills includes evaluation and data-driven improvements in the 2013-2014 Academic Year.

1. Description of Assessment.

The LSC-O Empirical and Quantitative Rubric (direct measure of assessment), was used to assess the empirical and quantitative skills of students.

Definition of Empirical and Quantitative Skills: Empirical and Quantitative skills are the formulation, analysis, and applications of scientific and mathematical concepts.


Explanation of Measure: The LSC-O Empirical and Quantitative Rubric was based on the AAC&U’s Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric and aligned with the THECB’s critical thinking core objective.

Methodology: Course-level student artifacts were randomly sampled from the LSC-O Foundational Component Areas of Life and Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. The student artifacts were gauged against the LSC-O Empirical and Quantitative Rubric by faculty and peer reviewers.

Frequency: Every two years.


Criteria: The LSC-O Empirical and Quantitative Skills Rubric criteria, noted as “Specific Outcomes,” includes 1.) problem and methodology identification, 2.) information collection and integration, 3.) methodology implementation, and 4.) analysis, application, and conclusions.
Targets: Student artifacts are to “meet” or “exceed” expectations with a mean score of 2.6 or higher.

4. **Analysis: Analysis and Interpretation of Assessment Information.**

**Results:** Reviewers found that student artifacts “Met Expectations” with an average score of 2.51 out of the 3.0 scale.

**Analysis:** Even though the reviewers found that artifacts met expectations, the committee’s target was a 2.6 or higher.

The main themes arising from reviewer feedback included:
- lack of raw data provided by students to substantiate research results
- lack of documentation of reliable sources to substantiate claims in student work.

5. **Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.**

**Actions Completed:** In order to address the major themes arising from the assessment, the committee developed an Assignment Development Checklist for the general education faculty to utilize against one of their upcoming assignments.

The Arts and Sciences Division Director sent out a memo on November 4, 2013 with the Spring 2013 assessment results including a link to the Assignment Development Checklist. Based on the Assignment Development Checklist Report, twenty-two general education faculty members completed the checklist.

**NOTE:** In Fall 2013, there were twenty-two full-time faculty and twenty-seven adjunct faculty members.
IV. COMMITTEE OUTCOME TWO

Evaluate the Spring 2013 General Education Assessment Committee Survey Results and implement decisions/actions that lead to evidence of improvement regarding the assessment process.

A. Evaluation of the Assessment Process (Description of the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment process. Possible actions planned to improve the assessment process.)

Description of strengths of the assessment process: Responses included:

- Off-campus assessment site creates a more relaxed atmosphere.
- It was fun, and different disciplines had to interact.
- An opportunity to use the rubric for General Education.
- The team was able to sit down together and reason with one another.
- Good communication. Understanding was clarified. Good job dividing groups into course outcomes. Better focus on each evaluation.
- Good to have small groups discuss the various artifacts specifically and good descriptive assignment pages.
- It helped us all to understand what we were doing.
- We were able to sit together and discuss the process.
- Allowing us to meet in a group setting let us communicate understandings and confusions.

Description of the weaknesses of the assessment process. Responses included:

- Very hard to evaluate speeches without seeing the speech. Timing (grading and finals) is bad.
- Faculty should know about artifacts to be submitted before semester begins.
- Norm as a group before separating, and maybe (now that we have some experience) offer examples before the assessment.
- I also think the assignments should be anonymous to reviewers.
- Need clear communication channels.
- Provide training during convocation and have new faculty get trained by colleagues in their field on doing the PLO rubrics, making good submission forms, etc...
- Provide information to the faculty early in the school year. Specific information on what to do. Utilize convocation and faculty meetings.
**Actions Completed to Improve the Assessment Process:**

The major themes from the 2012-2013 LSC-O General Education Assessment Committee’s Discussion Questions & Survey regarding the assessment process included:

- the assessment process should take place off campus
- faculty need clarification about what constitutes an artifact
- faculty need clearer instructions regarding the assessment process.

In response to the major themes arising from the discussion questions and survey, the General Education Assessment Committee decided to:

1. continue the assessment of course-level student artifacts at The Brown Estate, and
2. develop a presentation at a faculty meeting regarding the definition of an artifact, as well as artifact selection.

The committee developed a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation in response to the major themes from the discussion and questions survey. On October 22, 2013, a faculty meeting was held and a member of the General Education Assessment Committee gave the presentation which was in regards to LSC-O’s upcoming Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) Reaffirmation. The term *artifact* was clearly defined, and examples were provided along with information regarding the submission of artifacts for assessment purposes.
IV. COMMITTEE OUTCOME THREE

Perform the 2013-2014 general education assessment concerning personal responsibility, teamwork, and social responsibility.

A. PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

NOTE: The LSC-O personal responsibility student learning outcome is referred to by the THECB as the personal responsibility core objective.

1. Description of Assessment.

The LSC-O Personal Responsibility Rubric (direct measure of assessment), was used to assess course-level student artifacts related to personal responsibility.

Definition of Personal Responsibility: Personal Responsibility is the concept that individuals develop and make choices, take actions, and accept consequences to enhance lifelong skills necessary for physical, social, mental, emotional, and/or economic health. Student’s ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on personal ethical issues.

2. Assessment Methods: Explanation of Measure, Methodology, Frequency, and Timeline of Assessment Activities.

Explanation of Measure: The LSC-O Personal Responsibility Rubric was based on the AAC&U’s Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric and aligned with the THECB’s Personal Responsibility Core Objective.

Methodology: Course-level student artifacts were randomly sampled from the LSC-O Foundational Component Areas of American History, Communication, Component Area Options, Government/Political Science, and Language, Philosophy, and Culture.

Frequency: Every two years.

3. **Criteria/Targets: Explanation of Targets Used to Benchmark the Attainment of Personal Responsibility.**

Criteria: The LSC-O Personal Responsibility Rubric criteria, noted as “Specific Outcomes,” includes 1.) commitment to instruction, 2.) commitment to learning, 3.) commitment to positive learning environment, 4.) commitment to academic integrity, and 5.) commitment to reflective, personal decision making.

Targets: Student artifacts are to “meet” or “exceed” expectations with a mean score of 2.0 or higher.

4. **Analysis: Analysis and Interpretation of Assessment Information.**

Results: Reviewers found that student artifacts “Met Expectations” with an average mean of 2.12 out of the 3.0 scale.

Analysis: Even though the reviewers found that artifacts met expectations, the committee’s target was a 2.6 or higher.

The main theme arising from reviewer feedback included:
- the Exercise Log developed by the physical education instructor worked as a nice assessment tool for this outcome.

5. **Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.**

Actions Planned: The committee will review the current LSC-O Personal Responsibility Rubric, and discuss the development and delivery of training to faculty on the definition of personal responsibility and on how to create assignments to serve as measures.
B. TEAMWORK STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

NOTE: The LSC-O teamwork student learning outcome is referred to by the THECB as the teamwork core objective.

1. Description of Assessment.

The LSC-O Teamwork Rubric (direct measure of assessment), was used to assess course-level student artifacts related to personal responsibility.

Definition of Teamwork: Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner in interacting with others on team, and quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.

2. Assessment Methods: Explanation of Measure, Methodology, Frequency, and Timeline of Assessment Activities.

Explanation of Measure: The LSC-O Teamwork Rubric was based on the AAC&U’s Teamwork VALUE Rubric and aligned with the THECB’s Teamwork Core Objective.

3. Criteria/Targets: Explanation of Targets Used to Benchmark the Attainment of Teamwork.

Criteria: The LSC-O Teamwork Rubric criteria, noted as “Specific Outcomes,” includes 1.) individual contributions, 2.) facilitation, 3.) task completion, 4.) constructive team climate, and 5.) response to conflict.

Targets: Student artifacts are to “meet” or “exceed” expectations with a mean score of 2.6 or higher.

4. Analysis: Analysis and Interpretation of Assessment Information.

Results: Reviewers found that student artifacts “Did Not Meet Expectations” with an average mean of 1.26 out of the 3.0 scale.

The main theme arising from reviewer feedback included:

- the Teamwork Rubric needs to be reexamined and refined, and
- student artifacts did not fully support the rubric.

Analysis: Faculty members have a hard time providing a direct artifact from team assignments.
5. **Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.**

**Actions Planned:** Committee members researched best practices in assessing teamwork within the classroom. The committee reviewed a teamwork assessment measure received at the 2012 Texas A&M Assessment Conference.

**Actions Completed:** The LSC-O Teamwork Rubric was revised. A Teamwork Assignment & Evaluation Construct was also developed, aligned with the new LSC-O Teamwork Rubric, and shared with the faculty.
C. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENT (2013-2014)

NOTE: The LSC-O social responsibility student learning outcome is referred to by the THECB as the teamwork core objective.

1. Description of Assessment.

The LSC-O Social Responsibility Rubric (direct measure of assessment), was used to assess course-level student learning artifacts related to social responsibility.

Definition of Social Responsibility: Social Responsibility is the obligation to develop knowledge, skills, values, and motivations concerning intercultural competence, involvement, and other activities essential to improving the quality of life within local, regional, national, and/or global communities.

2. Assessment Methods: Explanation of Measure, Methodology, Frequency, and Timeline of Assessment Activities.

Explanation of Measure: The LSC-O Social Responsibility Rubric was based on the AAC&U’s Civic Engagement and Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubrics and aligned with the THECB’s Teamwork Core Objective.


Criteria: The LSC-O Social Responsibility Rubric criteria, noted as “Specific Outcomes,” includes 1.) issues identification and analysis, 2.) community impact, and 3.) personal impact.

Targets: Student artifacts are to “meet” or “exceed” expectations with a mean score of 2.0 or higher.

4. Analysis: Analysis and Interpretation of Assessment Information.

Results: Reviewers found that student artifacts “Did Not Meet Expectations” with an average mean of 1.59 out of the 3.0 scale.

Analysis: The main theme arising from reviewer feedback included:
- student claims were not supported by analysis
- the Social Responsibility Rubric needs to be re-examined and refined.
5. **Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.**

**Actions Planned:** Committee members decided to revise the rubric in order to align it more clearly with the THECB’s definition of the outcome.

**Actions Completed:** The LSC-O Social Responsibility Rubric was revised and shared with the faculty.
V. COMMITTEE OUTCOME FOUR

Evaluate the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) results and implement decisions/actions that lead to evidence of improvement regarding each of the six core learning outcomes.

A. 2011-2013 Assessment of the CCSSE Results

1. Description of Assessment.

   The CCSSE is a research-based indirect assessment measure that asks student about their college experiences – how they spend their time, what they feel they have gained from their classes, how they assess their relationships and interactions with faculty, counselors, and peers, what kinds of work they are challenged to do, and how the college supports their learning.

2. Assessment Method.

   Explanation of measure: Questions related to the six core outcomes of communication, critical thinking, empirical and quantitative skills, teamwork, personal responsibility, and social responsibility were identified in the survey. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness created the CCSSE Means Report 2011-2013 in order for the General Education Assessment Committee to evaluate the data.

   Methodology: The CCSSE was administered to students in randomly selected courses in 2011 and 2013. The mean scores from LSC-O students were compared to the small colleges mean.

   Frequency: Every two years.

3. **Criteria/Targets: Explanation of Targets Used to Benchmark the Attainment of the six core student learning outcomes.**

**Criteria:**
Communication Skills – Items 4b, 4c, 6c, 12c, and 12d.
Critical Thinking Skills – Items 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, and 12e.
Empirical and Quantitative Skills - Items 4d, 5c, 5e, and 12f.
Teamwork – Items 4f, 4g, and 12h.
Personal Responsibility – Items 4e, 4l, 4m, 4p, 4u, 9a, 10a, and 12l.
Social Responsibility – Items 4s, 4t, 9c, 12k, and 12m.

**Targets:** Mean scores that “meet” or “exceed” the small colleges mean.

4. **Analysis: Analysis and interpretation of assessment information.**

**Analysis:** When compared to the small college means, LSC-O measured lower in at least one aspect of each of the core student learning outcomes except in regards to critical thinking skills.

**Interpretation:** Specifically to each outcome, LSC-O has the greatest opportunity for improvement in the following student learning outcomes:

- Communication Skills – response to question 6c in regards to the number of written papers or reports of any length.
- Empirical and Quantitative Skills – response to question 12f in regards to solving numerical problems.
- Teamwork – response to question 4f in regards to working with other students on projects during class.
- Personal Responsibility – response to question 10a in regards to preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, doing homework, or other activities related to the student’s program).
5. **Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.**

**Actions Completed:** The General Education Assessment Committee targeted one specific item within each of the core student learning outcome areas for improvement and created the Syllabus and Course Development Checklist for the general education faculty to utilize.

On 12/16/2013, the Arts and Sciences Division Director sent out a memo regarding the CCSSE information along with a link to the Syllabus and Course Development Checklist. Based on the Syllabus and Course Development Checklist Report, twenty general education faculty members completed the checklist.

**NOTE:** In Fall 2013, there were twenty-two full-time faculty and twenty-seven adjunct faculty members.

---

VI. **COMMITTEE OUTCOME FIVE**

Evaluate the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) results and implement decisions/actions that lead to evidence of improvement.

**A. 2010-2013 Assessment of the CAAP Results**

1. **Description of Assessment.** The CAAP is the standardized, nationally normed assessment program from ACT that enables postsecondary institutions to assess, evaluate, and enhance student learning outcomes and general education program outcomes.

2. **Assessment Methods: Explanation of Measure, Methodology, Frequency, and Timeline of Assessment Activities.**

   **Explanation of Measure:**

   The CAAP Reading Test is a 36-item, 40-minute test that measures reading comprehension as a combination of skills that can be conceptualized in two broad categories: referring skills and reasoning skills.
The CAAP Writing Essay Test is predicated on the assumption that the skills most commonly taught in college-level writing courses and required in upper-division college courses across the curriculum include:
- formulating an assertion about a given issue,
- supporting that assertion with evidence appropriate to the issue, position taken, and a given audience,
- organizing and connecting major ideas, and
- expressing those ideas in clear, effective language.

The model developed by ACT for the Writing Essay Test is designed to elicit responses that demonstrate a student's ability to perform these skills. Two 20-minute writing tasks are defined by a short prompt that identifies a specific hypothetical situation and audience.

The CAAP Writing Skills Test is a 72-item, 40-minute test measuring students' understanding of the conventions of standard written English in punctuation, grammar, sentence structure, strategy, organization, and style. Spelling, vocabulary, and rote recall of rules of grammar are not tested.

The CAAP Mathematics Test is a 35-item, 40-minute test designed to measure students' proficiency in mathematical reasoning. The test assesses students' proficiency in solving mathematical problems encountered in many postsecondary curricula. It emphasizes quantitative reasoning rather than the memorization of formulas. The content areas tested include pre-algebra; elementary, intermediate, and advanced algebra; coordinate geometry; and trigonometry.

The CAAP Science Test is a 45-item, 40-minute test designed to measure students' skills in scientific reasoning. The contents of the Science Test are drawn from biological sciences (e.g., biology, botany, and zoology), chemistry, physics, and the physical sciences (e.g., geology, astronomy, and meteorology). The test emphasizes scientific reasoning skills rather than recall of scientific content or a high level of skill in mathematics or reading. A total score is provided for the Science Test; no sub-scores are provided.

The CAAP Critical Thinking Test is a 32-item, 40-minute test that measures students' skills in clarifying, analyzing, evaluating, and extending arguments. An argument is defined as a sequence of statements that includes a claim that one of the statements, the conclusion, follows from the other statements. The Critical Thinking Test consists of four passages that are representative of the kinds of issues commonly encountered in a postsecondary curriculum.

Methodology: The CAAP is administered to students enrolled in the Associate of Science and Associate of Arts in Teaching degree programs prior to graduation.

Frequency: Annually.
Timeline of Assessment: 2013-2023. The Writing Skills, Essay 1, Essay 2, and Reading Modules are administered each spring semester. The Critical Thinking, Science, and Mathematics modules are utilized each fall semester.

3. Criteria/Targets: Explanation of Targets Used to Benchmark the Attainment of the six core student learning outcomes.

Targets: A CAAP Institutional Summary Report mean score that “meets” or “exceeds” the national average of similar institutions for student learning outcomes regarding 1.) communication skills, 2.) critical thinking, 3.) empirical and quantitative skills.


Analysis:

From Spring 2010-2013:

- Writing Skills – LSC-O students exceeded national averages except in 2010.
- Essay 1 – LSC-O students exceeded national averages in all years.
- Essay 2 – LSC-O students exceeded national averages in all years.
- Science – LSC-O students exceeded national averages except in 2012.
- Critical Thinking – LSC-O students exceeded national averages in all years.

From Fall 2010- 2012:

- Critical Thinking – LSC-O students exceeded national averages except in 2010.
- Mathematics – LSC-O students did not meet national averages in any years.
- Reading – LSC-O students exceeded national averages in all years.
5. **Actions and Follow-Ups: Actions Planned or Completed, Based on Assessment Results, for the Improvement of Student Learning and Achievement.**

**Actions Completed:** The committee reviewed current documents related to administering the CAAP to students and checked with Testing Administrator and Graduation Clerk regarding the processes taken to register and administer the exam to students.

In an effort to provide students more information about the CAAP and allow them time and a means to prepare for the exam, the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science Degree CAAP Graduation Requirement information sheet was improved upon and retitled the CAAP Graduation Requirement Info Sheet, which specifically notes where students can go to prepare for the exam. The LSC-O Learning Center is involved and will provide students assistance regarding review of the CAAP Study Guide.

The CAAP Testing Registration Form was also updated. After speaking with the Graduation Clerk and Testing Administrator, it was discovered that the registration form was inaccurate. Not only was the form’s wording improved, the registration procedure of using a three-part carbonless form was also improved. The department will no longer need to utilize the three-part form which was thirty-seven dollars per ream. The form was converted to a single page and saved the department funds.

CAAP Assessment results were brought to the attention of the Arts and Sciences Division Director, the Dean of Instruction, and the College Success Division Director and they are researching and discussing possible improvements.

The committee will also continue to monitor CAAP results and provide pertinent information to faculty and administration.

The committee will address improvements to CAAP mathematics scores in the 2014-2015 outcome assessment plan.
VII. COMMITTEE OUTCOME SIX

Develop and submit the General Education Core Outcome Assessment Plan to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB).

A. Development & Submission of the General Education Core Outcome Assessment Plan

Three assessment measures will be used to evaluate each of the six general education outcomes. LSC-O developed rubrics based upon the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics and the CCSSE, which are two forms of measurement which can address all six of the learning outcomes. However, a third assessment measure was needed to address the outcomes of teamwork, social responsibility, and personal responsibility.

Questions were added to the LSC-O internally-developed Exit Interview to address the assessment of teamwork, social responsibility, and personal responsibility. **NOTE:** The title of the ‘Exit Interview’ has been changed to ‘Exit Survey.’

These questions included:
“Did your educational experience at LSC-O help improve:
- your teamwork skills?
- your understanding of social responsibility (in regards to understanding and analyzing social issues from distinct cultural perspectives, identifying and evaluating the social political and/or economic impact of issues, and assessing issue impacts on attitudes and behaviors)?
- your understanding of personal responsibility (in regards to exemplary commitment to attendance, punctuality, engagement, learning, a positive learning environment, academic integrity, and reflective, personal decision making)?”

The LSC-O General Education Outcome Assessment Plan 2013-2023 (see Appendix) was submitted to the THECB and approved on February, 28, 2014.
APPENDIX