

Lincoln College Assessment Report
 Student GELO Ia: Students are able to effectively communicate in ...oral forms.
 Aggregate Results (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) for GELO Ia (Effective Oral Communication)

Performance Indicators	Educational Strategies (Courses or other activities)	Assessment Method(s)	Assessment Source	Year of Data Collection	Pop (N)	Results (Mean Score)	Results (Median Score)	Results (Mode on GELO)	Evaluation of results
1. Organization: Student presentation has organizational pattern which is observable and cohesive.		GELO Rubric Ia	12 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	223	2.64	3.00	3.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
2. Delivery: Student delivery is compelling, polished, and confident.		GELO Rubric Ia	12 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	223	2.53	3.00	3.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
3. Supporting Materials: Student utilizes variety of reliable and relevant supporting materials which establishes credibility on the topic.		GELO Rubric Ia	12 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	223	2.59	3.00	3.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
4. Student can communicate effectively in oral forms: Student presentation effectively executes organizational patterns, delivery techniques, and support.		GELO Rubric Ia	12 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	223	2.59	2.67	3.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee

Table 1.2: Percentage of Students Meeting Capstone, Milestones, and Benchmarks on GELO Ia (Effective Oral Communication)

Definition	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)
1 - Organization	Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern is not observable within the presentation.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	15.2%	42.6%	33.6%	7.6%	0.9%
2 - Delivery	Delivery techniques make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	17%	38.6%	26%	17%	1.3%
3 – Supporting Materials	A variety of types of reliable supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Reliable Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Reliable Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient reliable supporting materials make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	16.6%	38.6%	33.6%	9.9%	1.3%
Aggregate (Percent of students Total Score on Rubric)	Total Score on Rubric = 10-12	Total Score on Rubric = 7-9	Total Score on Rubric = 4-6	Total Score on Rubric = 1-3	Total Score on Rubric = <1
	22.8%	44.4%	27.9%	4%	0.9%
Aggregate (Percent of students Mean Score on Rubric)	Mean Score on Rubric = 4	Mean Score on Rubric = 3-3.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 2-2.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 1-1.99	Mean Score on Rubric = <1
	8.5%	34%	38.2%	18.4%	0.9%

First Cycle Results (direct measures) 2013/2014: A convenience sample of 12 courses representing 223 assessments of student presentations was assessed using the faculty-developed GELO Rubric for the student outcome. Faculty members voluntarily submitted completed assessment rubrics based on embedded course assignments which could be used to measure the outcomes. Courses were not specifically identified for data collection since there was not an established curriculum map at the time (indicating the reason Educational Strategy in Table 1.1 has been left blank on this initial report). The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated a minimum level of milestone for each performance indicator were as follows (mean scores): Indicator 1 – 91.4%, Indicator 2 – 81.6%, Indicator 3 – 88.8%. The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated each level of effective oral communication (aggregate mean score on effective oral communication) were as follows: Capstone (4) – 8.5%, Milestone (2-3) – 72.2%, Benchmark – 18.4%, Did Not Meet – 0.9% (at least “milestone” or above = 80.7%).

Evaluation and Actions (direct measures) 2015-2016: The Assessment Committee analyzed the above data and concluded that curriculum mapping needed to be completed for general education courses to ensure that students were appropriately exposed to effective communication in oral forms. The faculty also concluded that perhaps the oral communication scores on the rubric were inflated since mean scores on similar elements of the writing rubrics (for example, organization and supporting materials) were much lower. This evaluation of the data led to a Faculty Assessment Workshop on norming of the scoring on rubrics and the beginning of evaluation of the rubric itself. The Assessment Committee also determined that specific courses must be targeted for the gathering of assessment data regarding oral communication including adjustments to some master syllabi requiring oral presentations in various courses (to be determined by the divisions). In 2016, the Assessment Committee proposed a change to the General Education Requirements to include the Reinforcement course of CMN 260 (Small Group Discussion) as a requirement in the general education curriculum following the Introductory prerequisite course of CMN 101 (Fundamentals of Speech).

- **Appendix: Courses Submitting GELOs by division: N=12**

Language/Humanities	Fine Arts/Communication	Social Sciences	Math and Science	Business Programs
	MUS 116 (24 students) SPE 101 (CMN 101) (73) THE 211 (10)	CJS 472 (5 students) CJS 490 (10) SIT 491 (6)	BIO 301 (8 students)	BUS 166 (19 students) BUS 200 (22) BUS 301 (7) BUS 310 (33) BUS 413 (6)
0 courses, 0 students	3 courses, 107 students	3 courses, 21 students	1 course, 8 students	5 courses, 87 students

Lincoln College Assessment Report
 Student GELO Ia: Students are able to effectively communicate in ...oral forms.
 Comparison Report (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean (SD) and % at each level for GELO Ia (Effective Oral Communication) -2013/2014

Course Levels	Pop (N)		Organization: Student presentation has organizational pattern which is observable and cohesive.	Delivery: Student delivery is compelling, polished, and confident.	Supporting Materials: Student utilizes variety of reliable and relevant supporting materials which establishes credibility on the topic.	Student can communicate effectively in oral forms: Student effectively executes organizational patterns, delivery techniques, and support.
100 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MUS 116 (n=24) • CMN 101 (n=73) • BUS 166 (n=19) 	116	Mean, S.D.	m = 2.57	m = 2.53	m = 2.47	m = 2.53
		% at 0	1.7	2.6	2.6	1.7
		% at 1	11.2	17.2	13.8	18.9
		% at 2	32.8	25.9	35.3	39.6
		% at 3	37.1	32.8	30.2	30.1
		% at 4	17.2	21.6	18.1	9.5
200 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THE 211 (n=10) • BUS 200 (n=22) 	32	Mean, S.D.	m = 2.38	m = 2.00	m = 2.28	m = 2.22
		% at 0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		% at 1	6.3	43.8	12.5	43.8
		% at 2	62.5	21.9	62.5	34.4
		% at 3	18.8	25.0	9.4	15.7
		% at 4	12.5	9.4	15.6	6.3
300 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BIO 301 (n=8) • BUS 301 (n=7) • BUS 310 (n=33) 	48	Mean, S.D.	m = 2.65	m = 2.48	m = 2.73	m = 2.62
		% at 0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		% at 1	4.2	8.3	4.2	10.4
		% at 2	27.1	35.4	18.8	39.6
		% at 3	68.8	56.3	77.1	50.0
		% at 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
400 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CJS 472 (n=5) • CJS 490 (n=10) • SIT 491 (n=6) • BUS 413 (n=6) 	27	Mean, S.D.	m = 3.22	m = 3.22	m = 3.22	m = 3.22
		% at 0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		% at 1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		% at 2	14.8	14.8	18.5	33.3
		% at 3	48.1	48.1	40.7	44.4
		% at 4	37.0	37.0	40.7	22.2
Aggregate Scores	223	Mean, S.D.	m = 2.64	m = 2.53	m = 2.59	m = 2.59
		% at 0	0.9	1.3	1.3	0.9
		% at 1	7.6	17.0	9.9	18.4
		% at 2	33.6	26.0	33.6	38.2
		% at 3	42.6	38.6	38.6	34.0
		% at 4	15.2	17.0	16.6	8.5

Lincoln College Assessment Report
 Student GELO Ib: Students are able to effectively communicate in ...written forms.
 Aggregate Results (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) for GELO Ib (Effective Written Communication)

Performance Indicators	Educational Strategies (Courses or other activities)	Assessment Method(s)	Assessment Source	Year of Data Collection	Pop (N)	Results (Mean Score)	Results (Median Score)	Results (Mode on GELO)	Evaluation of results
5. Context and Purpose: Student writing demonstrates understanding of context, audience and purpose in writing.		GELO Rubric Ib	30 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	876	1.69	2.00	2.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
6. Content Development: Student writing synthesizes appropriate and relevant content in shaping the work.		GELO Rubric Ib	30 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	876	1.61	2.00	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
7. Genre/Disciplinary Conventions: Student writing executes a range of writing conventions specific to a particular discipline.		GELO Rubric Ib	30 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	876	1.55	1.00	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
8. Student can communicate effectively in written forms: Student writing effectively executes context/purpose, content development, and disciplinary conventions.		GELO Rubric Ib	30 courses*	2013/2014, Fall and Spring	876	1.61	1.67	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee

Table 1.2: Percentage of Students Meeting Capstone, Milestones, and Benchmarks on GELO Ib (Effective Written Communication)

Definition	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)
1 - Context/Purpose	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context)	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose to the assigned task(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned task(s) (e.g. expectation of instructor or self as audience.)	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	3.3%	15%	37.5%	35.8%	8.5%
2 - Content Development	Synthesizes appropriate, relevant, and compelling content, in an ethical manner, to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Synthesizes appropriate, relevant, and compelling content, in an ethical manner, to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Synthesizes appropriate and relevant content, in an ethical manner, to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content, in an ethical manner, to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	2.4%	12.6%	37%	38.8	9.1 %
3 - Genre/Disciplinary Convention	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	2.6%	12.9%	29.5%	46.3 %	8.7%
Aggregate (Percent of students Total Score on Rubric)	Total Score on Rubric = 10-12	Total Score on Rubric = 7-9	Total Score on Rubric = 4-6	Total Score on Rubric = 1-3	Total Score on Rubric = <1
	3.9%	17.1%	38.1%	37.3 %	3.4%
Aggregate (Percent of students Mean Score on Rubric)	Mean Score on Rubric = 4	Mean Score on Rubric = 3-3.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 2-2.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 1-1.99	Mean Score on Rubric = <1
	1.7%	10.2%	30%	43.2 %	14.9%

First Cycle Results (direct measures) 2013/2014: A convenience sample of 30 courses representing 876 assessments of student work was assessed using the faculty-developed GELO Rubric for the student outcome. Faculty members voluntarily submitted completed assessment rubrics based on embedded course assignments which could be used to measure the outcomes. Courses were not specifically identified for data collection since there was not an established curriculum map at the time (indicating the reason Educational Strategy in Table 1.1 has been left blank on this initial report). The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated a minimum level of milestone for each performance indicator were as follows (mean scores): Indicator 1 - 55.8 %, Indicator 2 - 52 %, Indicator 3 – 45%. The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated each level of effective written communication (aggregate mean score on effective written communication) were as follows: Capstone (4) – 1.7 %, Milestone (2-3) – 40.2 %, Benchmark – 43.2%, Did Not Meet – 14.9% (at least “milestone” or above = 41.9%).

Evaluation and Actions (direct measures) 2015-2016: The Assessment Committee analyzed the above data and concluded that curriculum mapping needed to be completed for general education courses to ensure that students were appropriately exposed to effective communication in oral forms. Faculty also concluded that identification of specific courses for assessment of writing needed to occur in order to ensure that students were progressing at an appropriate level. The Assessment Committee and faculty also noted that there was not a significant increase in scores between 100-level and 200-level courses. Consequently, the Language and Humanities department proposed to the Academic Committee the creation of an ENG 099 (Introduction to Academic English), the elimination of ENG 100 (Writing Fundamentals), and the establishment of 5-day/week ENG 101 sections to strengthen the introduction of academic writing. Many faculty members have expressed a desire to expand required writing throughout the curriculum, though they also want to see the results of the next round of GELO data. The Assessment Committee did agree that specific courses (aside from ENG 101 and 102) should be identified which require writing (through the current master syllabi or by revising existing master syllabi) in order to gather more data to establish benchmarks for student written communication skills.

- **Appendix: Courses Submitting GELOs by division: N=30**

Language/Humanities	Fine Arts/Communication	Social Sciences	Math and Science	Business Programs
ENG 100 (35 students) ENG 101 (114) ENG 102 (165) ENG 105 (13) ENG 106 (17) ENG 137 (16) ENG 207 (18) HUM 108 (37)	THE 105 (28 students)	CRM 110 (44 students) CRM 204 (24) CRM 206 (26) CRM 213 (22) CJS 490 (10) EDU 117 (7) HEL 101 (58) PSY 101 (13)	BIO 101 (14 students) BIO 102 (31) BIO 103 (10) BIO 106 (15) GEL 101 (18)	BUS 166 (18 students) BUS 200 (22) BUS 301 (6) BUS 310 (33) BUS 314 (10) BUS 318 (33) BUS 410 (13) BUS 413 (6)
8 courses, 415 students	1 course, 28 students	8 courses, 204 students	5 courses, 88 students	8 courses, 141 students

Lincoln College Assessment Report
Student GELO Ib: Students are able to effectively communicate in ...written forms.
 Comparison Report (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean (SD) and % at each level for GELO Ib (Effective Written Communication) -2013/2014

Course Levels	Pop (N)		Context/Purpose: Student writing demonstrates understanding of context, audience, and purpose in writing.	Content Development: Student writing synthesizes appropriate and relevant content in shaping the work.	Genre/Disciplinary Conventions: Student writing executes a range of writing conventions specific to a particular discipline.	Student can communicate effectively in written forms: Student writing effectively executes context/purpose, content development, and disciplinary conventions.
100 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L/H (n=397) • FA/CMN (n=28) • SOC SCI (n=122) • Math/SCI (n=88) • BUS (n=18) 	653	Mean, S.D.	m = 1.48	m = 1.40	m = 1.33	m = 1.40
		% at 0	7.8	8.9	9.2	17.3
		% at 1	45.0	48.9	56.7	52.2
		% at 2	39.1	35.6	27.1	25.1
		% at 3	6.9	5.2	5.4	4.5
		% at 4	1.2	1.4	1.5	0.9
200 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENG 207 (n=18) • CRM 204 (n=24) • CRM 206 (n=26) • CRM 213 (n=22) • BUS 200 (n=22) 	112	Mean, S.D.	m = 1.58	m = 1.68	m = 1.58	m = 1.61
		% at 0	14.3	8.9	8.9	16.2
		% at 1	21.4	25.0	33.9	30.4
		% at 2	57.1	56.3	48.2	51.8
		% at 3	6.3	8.9	8.0	0.9
		% at 4	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
300 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BUS 301 (n=6) • BUS 310 (n=33) • BUS 314 (n=10) • BUS 318 (n=33) 	82	Mean, S.D.	m = 2.96	m = 2.73	m = 2.78	m = 2.83
		% at 0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		% at 1	3.7	3.7	1.2	3.6
		% at 2	8.5	24.4	24.4	35.4
		% at 3	75.6	67.1	69.5	58.6
		% at 4	12.2	4.9	4.9	2.4
400 Level Courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CJS 490 (n=10) • BUS 410 (n=13) • BUS 413 (n=6) 	29	Mean, S.D.	m = 3.28	m = 2.86	m = 2.90	m = 3.01
		% at 0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		% at 1	0.0	0.0	6.9	3.4
		% at 2	6.9	37.9	24.1	37.9
		% at 3	58.6	37.9	41.4	37.8
		% at 4	34.5	24.1	27.6	20.7
Aggregate Scores	223	Mean, S.D.	m = 1.69	m = 1.61	m = 1.55	m = 1.61
		% at 0	3.3	9.1	8.7	14.9
		% at 1	15.0	38.8	46.3	43.2
		% at 2	37.5	37.0	29.5	30.0
		% at 3	35.8	12.6	12.9	10.2
		% at 4	8.5	2.4	2.6	1.7

coln College Assessment Report

Student GELO II: Students are able to produce solutions to problems using critical reasoning. Aggregate Results (ALL Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) for GELO II (Analytical Skills)

Performance Indicators	Educational Strategies (Courses or other activities)	Assess. Method	Assess. Source	Year of Data Collection	Pop (N)	Results (Mean Score)	Results (Std. Dev.)	Results (Median Score)	Results (Mode on GELO)	Evaluation of results
Critical Reasoning: Student develops logical solution and recognizes consequences of solution.		GELO Rubric II	11 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	250	1.36	.816	1.00	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Data Interpretation: Accurate explanation of quantitative or qualitative data with appropriate inference from data.		GELO Rubric II	11 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	250	1.38	.843	1.00	2.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Analysis of Data: Student uses quantitative and/or qualitative analysis as basis for forming judgments and drawing conclusions.		GELO Rubric II	11 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	250	1.13	.990	1.00	0.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Student can produce solutions to problems using critical reasoning: Student produces solutions to problems using critical reasoning, data interpretation, and analysis of data.		GELO Rubric II	11 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	250	1.29	.831	1.00	2.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee

Table 1.2: Percentage of Students Meeting Capstone, Milestones, and Benchmarks on GELO II (Analytical Skills)

Definition	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)
1 – Critical Reasoning	Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve a problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate the reason for choosing the solution	Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan to solve a problem	Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving a problem.	Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	.4%	7.2%	33.6%	45.6%	13.2%
2 – Data Interpretation	Provides accurate explanation of information presented in mathematical or qualitative forms. Makes appropriate inference based on that information.	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical or qualitative forms.	Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical or qualitative forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations/units or qualitative analysis.	Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical or qualitative forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	0%	7.2%	40.0%	36.4%	16.4%
3 – Analysis of Data	Uses the quantitative and/or qualitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative and/or qualitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative and/or qualitative analysis of data as the basis for workmanlike (without inspiration or nuance, ordinary) judgments, drawing plausible conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative and/or qualitative analysis of data as the basis for tentative, basic judgments, although is hesitant or uncertain about drawing conclusions from this work.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	.4%	6.0%	35.6%	22.0%	36.0%
Aggregate (Percent of students Total Score on Rubric)	Total Score on Rubric = 10-12	Total Score on Rubric = 7-9	Total Score on Rubric = 4-6	Total Score on Rubric = 1-3	Total Score on Rubric = <1
	.4%	8.8%	35.6%	43.2%	12%
Aggregate (Percent of students Mean Score on Rubric)	Mean Score on Rubric = 4	Mean Score on Rubric = 3-3.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 2-2.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 1-1.99	Mean Score on Rubric = <1
	0.0%	4.8%	34.0%	30.0%	31.2%

First Cycle Results (direct measures) 2014/2015: A convenience sample of 11 courses representing 250 assessments of student assignments requiring analytical skills was assessed using the faculty-developed GELO Rubric for the student outcome. Faculty members voluntarily submitted completed assessment rubrics based on embedded course assignments which could be used to measure the outcomes. Courses were not specifically identified for data collection since there was not an established curriculum map at the time (indicating the reason Educational Strategy in Table 1.1 has been left blank on this initial report). The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated a minimum level of milestone for each performance indicator was as follows (mean scores): Indicator 1 – 41.2%, Indicator 2 – 47.2%, Indicator 3 – 42%. The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated each level of producing solutions to problems using critical reasoning (aggregate mean score on analytical skills) were as follows: Capstone (4) – 0.0%, Milestone (2-3) – 38.8%, Benchmark – 30.0%, Did Not Meet – 31.2% (at least “milestone” or above = 38.8%).

Evaluation and Actions (direct measures) 2015/2016: The Assessment Committee evaluated this first round of initial data and concluded that specific courses should be identified through which to gather this data since the number of courses submitting rubrics for assignments was far lower than for GELO I – especially on the 300- and 400- level. Particularly troublesome was the low percentage of students at the junior and senior level who were assessed for these outcomes and the generally lower mean scores on the 100-level with no mean score achieving a 2. Benchmarks should be established after the second round of data gathering in the 2016/2017 academic year. The Assessment Committee also proposed changes to the general education curriculum requirements to require a Reinforcing course after three Introductory courses (one math, one life science, and one physical science).

- **Appendix: Courses Submitting GELOs by division: N=11**

Language/Humanities	Fine Arts/Communication	Social Sciences	Math and Science	Business Programs
ENG 106 (23 students)			BIO 101 (55 students) BIO 102 (71) MAT 119 (47) MAT 123 (6) MAT 130 (8) MAT 231 (4)	BUS 205 (19 students) BUS 301 (5) BUS 413 (4) SPM 302 (8)
1 courses, 23 students	0 courses, 0 students	0 courses, 0 students	6 course, 191 students	4 courses, 36 students

Lincoln College Assessment Report

Student GELO III: Students are able to critique and evaluate diverse perspectives/ideas.

Aggregate Results (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) for GELO II (Appreciate Diversity)

Performance Indicators	Educational Strategies (Courses or other activities)	Assess. Method	Assess. Source	Year of Data Collection	Pop (N)	Results (Mean Score)	Results (Std. Dev.)	Results (Median Score)	Results (Mode on GELO)	Evaluation of results
Community Diversity: Student demonstrates evidence of adjustment in attitude and beliefs regarding diversity of communities.		GELO Rubric III	3 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	114	3.21	1.353	4.00	4.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Cultural Diversity: Adapts and applies multiple worldviews while initiating interaction with other cultures to solve problems.		GELO Rubric III	3 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	114	3.18	1.386	4.00	4.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Cultural Self-Awareness: Student articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases.		GELO Rubric III	3 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	114	3.18	1.393	4.00	4.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Empathy: Student interprets intercultural experience in a way which demonstrates acting in a supportive manner that recognizes feelings and perspectives of other cultural groups.		GELO Rubric III	3 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	114	3.17	1.395	4.00	4.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Student can critique and evaluate diverse perspectives: Student demonstrates evidence of community and cultural diversity, cultural self-awareness, and empathy.		GELO Rubric III	3 courses *	2014/2015, Fall and Spring	114	3.18	1.370	4.00	4.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee

Table 1.2: Percentage of Students Meeting Capstone, Milestones, and Benchmarks on GELO III (Appreciate Diversity)

Definition	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)
1 – Community Diversity	Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of learning about the diversity of communities and cultures.	Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities.	Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities.	Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	71.9%	0.0%	14.0%	5.3%	8.8%
2 – Cultural Diversity	Adapts and applies a deep understanding of multiple worldviews, experiences, and power structures while initiating meaningful interaction with other cultures to address significant social problems	Analyzes substantial connections between the worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts, incorporating respectful interactions with other cultures.	Explains and connects two or more cultures historically or in contemporary contexts with some acknowledgement of power structures, demonstrating respectful interaction with varied cultures and world views.	Describes the experiences of others historically or in contemporary contexts primarily through one cultural perspective, demonstrating some openness to varied cultures and world views.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	71.9%	0.0%	11.4%	7.9%	8.8%
3 – Cultural Self-Awareness	Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.)	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	71.9%	0.0%	12.3%	6.1%	9.6%
4 – Empathy	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	71.9%	0.0%	9.7%	10.6%	8.0%
Aggregate (Percent of students Total Score on Rubric)	Total Score on Rubric = 13-16	Total Score on Rubric = 9-12	Total Score on Rubric = 5-8	Total Score on Rubric = 1-4	Total Score on Rubric = <1
	71.1%	0.9%	14.0%	6.2%	7.9%
Aggregate (Percent of students Mean Score on Rubric)	Mean Score on Rubric = 4	Mean Score on Rubric = 3-3.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 2-2.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 1-1.99	Mean Score on Rubric = <1
	71.1%	0.9%	7.0%	11.4%	9.7%

First Cycle Results (direct measures) 2014/2015: A convenience sample of 3 courses representing 114 assessments of student assignments examining appreciation of diversity was assessed using the faculty-developed GELO Rubric for the student outcome. Faculty members voluntarily submitted completed assessment rubrics based on embedded course assignments which could be used to measure the outcomes. Courses were not specifically identified for data collection since *there was not an established curriculum map at the time* (indicating the reason Educational Strategy in Table 1.1 has been left blank on this initial report). The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated a minimum level of milestone for each performance indicator was as follows (mean scores): Indicator 1 – 85.9%, Indicator 2 – 83.3%, Indicator 3 – 84.2%, Indicator 4 – 81.6%. The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated each level of critiquing and evaluating diverse perspectives/ideas (aggregate mean score on appreciation of diversity) were as follows: Capstone (4) – 71.1%, Milestone (2-3) – 7.9%, Benchmark – 11.4%, Did Not Meet – 9.7% (at least “milestone” or above = 79%).

Evaluation and Actions (direct measures) 2015/2016: Initial evaluation of the data indicates that the rubric may be flawed. The extremely high percentage of freshmen and sophomore who scored a 4 suggests that: 1) continued norming of rubric completion among faculty should occur, 2) identification of specific assignments which meet the rubric definitions of the outcome may be needed through master syllabi, and 3) gathering of further data (more than just three courses) from two faculty members is needed in order for the data to be meaningful for faculty members. Moreover, the small sample size (drawn from only three courses) could suggest that: 1) a completed curriculum map which aligns specific courses with the outcome through adjusted master course syllabi with specific assignments is needed, and/or 2) faculty members were unclear on how to apply the rubric definitions to their specific assignments and thus did not submit a GELO, and/or 3) the curriculum at the college in general education does not really deliver students the learning outcome of appreciation of diversity and thus more intentional curricular design is needed or the GELO should be eliminated as an outcome of the College.

Actions: The General Education Requirements were revised in 2016/2017 to require an Introductory Course in Appreciation of Diversity (IDS 105 Freshman Seminar) and at least one additional course which Reinforces the Learning Outcome. Faculty Members teaching the required courses in 2017/2018 will be required to submit a GELO rubric for an assignment aligned to this Learning Outcome. In this respect the data will reflect specific courses specifically intended to be aligned to Appreciate Diversity.

Appendix: Courses Submitting GELOs by division: N=3

Language/Humanities	Fine Arts/Communication	Social Sciences	Math and Science	Business Programs
ENG 106 (23 students)			BIO 101 (46 students) BIO 102 (45)	
1 courses, 23 students	0 courses, 0 students	0 courses, 0 students	2 courses, 91 students	0 courses, 0 students

Lincoln College Assessment Report
Student GELO III: Students are able to critique and evaluate diverse perspectives/ideas.
 Comparison Report (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean (SD) and % at each level for GELO III (Appreciate Diversity) -2014/2015

Course Levels	Pop (N)		Community Diversity: Student demonstrates evidence of adjustment in attitude and beliefs regarding diversity of communities.	Cultural Diversity: Adapts and applies multiple worldviews while initiating interaction with other cultures to solve problems.	Cultural Self-Awareness: Student articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases.	Empathy: Student interprets intercultural experience in a way which demonstrates acting in a supportive manner that recognizes feelings and perspectives of other cultural groups.	Student can critique and evaluate diverse perspectives: Student demonstrates evidence of community and cultural diversity, cultural self-awareness, and empathy.
100 Level Courses	114	Mean, S.D.	m = 3.21, SD=1.353	m = 3.18, SD=1.386	m = 3.18, SD=1.393	M=3.17, SD=1.395	m = 3.18, SD=1.370
		% at 0	8.8	8.8	9.6	8.0	9.7
		% at 1	5.3	7.9	6.1	10.6	11.4
		% at 2	14.0	11.4	12.3	9.7	7.0
		% at 3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
		% at 4	71.9	71.9	71.9	71.9	71.1
200 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.					
		% at 0					
		% at 1					
		% at 2					
		% at 3					
		% at 4					
300 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.					
		% at 0					
		% at 1					
		% at 2					
		% at 3					
		% at 4					
400 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.					
		% at 0					
		% at 1					
		% at 2					
		% at 3					
		% at 4					
Aggregate Scores	114	Mean, S.D.	m = 3.21, SD=1.353	m = 3.18, SD=1.386	m = 3.18, SD=1.393	M=3.17, SD=1.395	m = 3.18, SD=1.370
		% at 0	8.8	8.8	9.6	8.0	9.7
		% at 1	5.3	7.9	6.1	10.6	11.4
		% at 2	14.0	11.4	12.3	9.7	7.0
		% at 3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
		% at 4	71.9	71.9	71.9	71.9	71.1

Lincoln College Assessment Report

Student GELO IV: Students are able to articulate core values in making ethical choices.

Aggregate Results (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) for GELO IV (Ethical Decision-Making)

Performance Indicators	Educational Strategies (Courses or other activities)	Assess. Method	Assess. Source	Year of Data Collection	Pop (N)	Results (Mean Score)	Results (Std. Dev.)	Results (Median Score)	Results (Mode on GELO)	Evaluation of results
Ethical Issue Recognition: Student can recognize complex ethical issues..		GELO Rubric IV	1 course*	2015/2016, Spring	16	2.44	N/A (n too small)	2.00	3.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Core Value Development: Student takes a specific position which is imaginative and recognizes complexities		GELO Rubric IV	1 course*	2015/2016, Spring	16	2.25	N/A (n too small)	2.00	2.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Value Articulation: Student articulates own value-system and biases related to that system.		GELO Rubric IV	1 course*	2015/2016, Spring	16	1.94	N/A (n too small)	2.00	2.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Student can articulate core values in making ethical choices: Student demonstrates evidence of ethical issue recognition, core value development, and value articulation.		GELO Rubric IV	1 course*	2015/2016, Spring	16	2.21	N/A (n too small)	2.00	2.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee

Table 1.2: Percentage of Students Meeting Capstone, Milestones, and Benchmarks on GELO III (Appreciate Diversity)

Definition	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)
1 - Ethical Issue recognition	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	6.3%	43.8%	37.5%	12.5%	0.0%
2 - Core Value Development	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	6.3%	31.3%	43.8%	18.8%	0.0%
3 – Value Articulation	Articulates insights into own value-system and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these values, and how to recognize and respond to value biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)	Recognizes new perspectives about own value-system and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Identifies own value-system and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those values shared with like-minded others and seeks the same in others.)	Shows minimal awareness of own value-system and biases (even those shared with like-minded individuals) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible values differences with others.)	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	0.0%	18.8%	56.3%	25.0%	0.0%
Aggregate (Percent of students Total Score on Rubric)	Total Score on Rubric = 13-16	Total Score on Rubric = 9-12	Total Score on Rubric = 5-8	Total Score on Rubric = 1-4	Total Score on Rubric = <1
	0.0%	18.8%	62.5%	18.8%	0.0%
Aggregate (Percent of students Mean Score on Rubric)	Mean Score on Rubric = 4	Mean Score on Rubric = 3-3.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 2-2.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 1-1.99	Mean Score on Rubric = <1
	0.0%	18.8%	50.0%	31.3%	0.0%

First Cycle Results (direct measures) 2015/2016: A convenience sample of only 1 course representing 16 assessments of student assignments examining ethical decision-making was assessed using the faculty-developed GELO Rubric for the student outcome. Only one faculty member voluntarily submitted completed an assessment rubrics based on an embedded course assignment which could be used to measure the outcomes. Courses *were not specifically identified* for data collection since *there was not an established curriculum map at the time* (indicating the reason Educational Strategy in Table 1.1 has been left blank on this initial report). The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated a minimum level of milestone for each performance indicator was as follows (mean scores): Indicator 1 – 88.5%, Indicator 2 – 82.2%, Indicator 3 – 75.0%. The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated each level of articulating core values in making ethical decisions (aggregate

mean score on ethical decision-making) were as follows: Capstone (4) – 0.0%, Milestone (2-3) – 68.8%, Benchmark – 31.3%, Did Not Meet – 0.0% (at least “milestone” or above = 68.8%).

Evaluation and Actions (direct measures) 2016/2017: Initial evaluation of the data clearly demonstrates that faculty members have not identified assignments which meet the learning outcomes of ethical decision-making as only one course (Business Ethics) submitted a GELO rubric on an assignment. This extremely small sample size (drawn from only one courses) could suggest that: 1) a completed curriculum map which aligns specific courses with the outcome through adjusted master course syllabi with specific assignments is needed, and/or 2) faculty members were unclear on how to apply the rubric definitions to their specific assignments and thus did not submit a GELO, and/or 3) the curriculum at the college in general education does not really deliver students the learning outcome of ethical decision-making and thus more intentional curricular design is needed or the GELO should be eliminated as an outcome of the College.

Actions: Faculty concluded through the Assessment Committee that the General Education Requirements should be revised in 2016/2017 to require an Introductory Course in Ethical Decision Making (three course options were identified for students) and at least one additional course which Reinforces the Learning Outcome. Faculty Members teaching the required courses in 2018/2019 will be required to submit a GELO rubric for an assignment aligned to this Learning Outcome in order to adjust the master syllabi for those courses to ensure that students are gaining exposure to the learning outcome. In this respect the data will reflect *specific courses* designed to be intentionally aligned to ethical decision-making. Moreover, the Master Syllabi of PSY 101, CRT 303/CJS 353, CJS 490, and SIT 402 will be redesigned to include a section on ethics in human subjects research to ensure that students are exposed to this learning outcome and demonstrate understanding of core values in ethics through IRB certification. PHL 103, PHL 107, and IDS 150 were added as required elective courses to this learning outcome to ensure students experience this more intentionally BEFORE their Senior year.

Appendix: Courses Submitting GELOs by division: N=3

Language/Humanities	Fine Arts/Communication	Social Sciences	Math and Science	Business Programs
				BUS 410 (16)
0 courses, 0 students	0 courses, 0 students	0 courses, 0 students	0 courses, 0 students	1 courses, 16 students

Lincoln College Assessment Report
Student GELO IV: Students are able to articulate core values in making ethical choices.
 Comparison Report (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean (SD) and % at each level for GELO IV (Ethical Decision Making) – 2015/2016

Course Levels	Pop (N)		Ethical Issue Recognition: Student can recognize complex ethical issues.	Core Value Development: Student takes a specific position which is imaginative and recognizes complexities	Value Articulation: Student articulates own value-system and biases related to that system.	Student can articulate core values in making ethical choices: Student demonstrates evidence of ethical issue recognition, core value development, and value articulation.
100 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.				
		% at 0				
		% at 1				
		% at 2				
		% at 3				
		% at 4				
200 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.				
		% at 0				
		% at 1				
		% at 2				
		% at 3				
		% at 4				
300 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.				
		% at 0				
		% at 1				
		% at 2				
		% at 3				
		% at 4				
400 Level Courses • BUS 410	16	Mean, S.D.	m = 2.44, SD – N/A	m = 2.25, SD – N/A	m = 1.94, SD – N/A	m = 2.21, SD – N/A
		% at 0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		% at 1	12.5%	18.8%	25.0%	31.3%
		% at 2	37.5%	43.8%	56.3%	50.0%
		% at 3	43.8%	31.3%	18.8%	18.8%
		% at 4	6.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Aggregate Scores	16	Mean, S.D.	m = 2.44, SD – N/A	m = 2.25, SD – N/A	m = 1.94, SD – N/A	m = 2.21, SD – N/A
		% at 0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		% at 1	12.5%	18.8%	25.0%	31.3%
		% at 2	37.5%	43.8%	56.3%	50.0%
		% at 3	43.8%	31.3%	18.8%	18.8%
		% at 4	6.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%

Lincoln College Assessment Report
 Student GELO V: Students are able to recognize accountability to a larger community.
 Aggregate Results (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean, Median, Mode) for GELO IV (Ethical Decision-Making)

Performance Indicators	Educational Strategies (Courses or other activities)	Assess. Method	Assess. Source	Year of Data Collection	Pop (N)	Results (Mean Score)	Results (Std. Dev.)	Results (Median Score)	Results (Mode on GELO)	Evaluation of results
Civic Action and Reflection: <i>shows initiative in complex or multiple civic engagement activities with reflective insights or analysis about one's actions.</i>		GELO Rubric V	2 courses *	2016/2017, Spring (NOTE: No data submitted for 2015/2016)	32	1.03	N/A (n too small)	1.00	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Personal and Social Responsibility: Evaluates broader ethical, social, and environmental issues and the consequences of individual and collective interventions.		GELO Rubric V	2 courses *	2016/2017, Spring (NOTE: No data submitted for 2015/2016)	32	0.84	N/A (n too small)	1.00	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Application of Civic Knowledge: Applies knowledge and skills to suggest/implement appropriate and workable solutions to address complex social, political, and cultural problems.		GELO Rubric V	2 courses *	2016/2017, Spring (NOTE: No data submitted for 2015/2016)	32	1.16	N/A (n too small)	1.00	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee
Student recognizes accountability to a larger community: Student demonstrates evidence of civic action and reflection, personal and social responsibility, and application of civic knowledge.		GELO Rubric V	2 courses *	2016/2017, Spring (NOTE: No data submitted for 2015/2016)	32	1.01	N/A (n too small)	1.00	1.00	Departments; Assessment Committee; Academic Committee

Table 1.2: Percentage of Students Meeting Capstone, Milestones, and Benchmarks on GELO III (Appreciate Diversity)

Definition	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Does Not Meet Benchmark (0)
1 - Civic Action and Reflection	Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions	Demonstrates independent experience and team leadership of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.	Has clearly participated in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individuals or communities.	Has experimented with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	59.4%	18.8%
2 - Personal and Social responsibility	Evaluates the local and broader (including global) ethical, social, and environmental issues and the consequences (including global) of individual and collective interventions on those issues.	Analyzes the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of community systems (including global) and identifies a range of actions informed by one's sense of personal and civic responsibility	Explains the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of local and national decisions on community systems (including global)	Identifies basic ethical dimensions of some local or national decisions that have community (including global) impact.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	78.1%	18.8%
3 - Application of Civic Knowledge	Applies knowledge and skills to suggest/implement sophisticated, appropriate, and workable solutions to address complex social, political, and cultural problems using interdisciplinary perspectives	Plans and evaluates more complex solutions to social, political, and cultural challenges that are appropriate to their contexts using multiple disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, or scientific).	Formulates practical yet elementary solutions to social, political, and cultural challenges that use at least two disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).	Defines social, political, and cultural challenges in basic ways, including a limited number of perspectives and solutions.	Student work did not meet benchmark.
	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	46.9%	18.8%
Aggregate (Percent of students Total Score on Rubric)	Total Score on Rubric = 13-16	Total Score on Rubric = 9-12	Total Score on Rubric = 5-8	Total Score on Rubric = 1-4	Total Score on Rubric = <1
	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	65.6%	18.8%
Aggregate (Percent of students Mean Score on Rubric)	Mean Score on Rubric = 4	Mean Score on Rubric = 3-3.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 2-2.99	Mean Score on Rubric = 1-1.99	Mean Score on Rubric = <1
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	81.3%	18.8%

First Cycle Results (direct measures) 2015/2016: No GELO Rubric submissions occurred for this Learning outcome in 2015/2016. A convenience sample of only 2 sections of a POS 101 course representing 32 assessments of student assignments examining responsible citizenship was assessed using the faculty-developed GELO Rubric for the student outcome. Only one faculty member voluntarily submitted completed assessment rubrics based on an embedded course assignment which could be used to measure the outcomes (and this was done a year after the cycle indicated that assessment of GELO V should be completed). Courses *were not specifically identified* for data collection since *there was not an established curriculum map at the time* (indicating the reason Educational Strategy in Table 1.1 has been left blank on this initial report). The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated a minimum level of milestone for each performance indicator was as follows (mean scores): Indicator 1 – 21.9%, Indicator 2 – 3.1%, Indicator 3 – 34.4% (suggesting that students are stronger in applying civic knowledge than in

engaging in civic action at this level. The percent of the sample of student work that demonstrated each level of recognizing accountability to a larger community (aggregate mean score on responsible citizenship) were as follows: Capstone (4) – 0.0%, Milestone (2-3) – 0.0%, Benchmark – 81.3%, Did Not Meet – 18.8% (at least “milestone” or above = 0.0%).

Evaluation and Actions (direct measures) 2016/2017: Initial evaluation of the data clearly demonstrates that faculty members have not identified assignments which meet the learning outcomes of recognizing accountability to a larger community as only one course (American Government) submitted a GELO rubric on an assignment (in a year AFTER the scheduled date for assessment). This extremely small sample size (drawn from only one course – two sections) could suggest that: 1) the new completed curriculum map established by the Assessment and Academic Committees which aligns specific courses with the outcome (including the new IDS 105) may be beneficial in assisting faculty members to adjust master course syllabi with specific assignments meeting this outcome, and/or 2) faculty members were unclear on how to apply the rubric definitions to their specific assignments and thus did not submit a GELO, and/or 3) the curriculum at the college in general education does not really deliver students the learning outcome of responsible citizenship and thus more intentional curricular design is needed (especially in the social sciences division) to deliver the outcome, or 4) the GELO should be eliminated as an outcome of the College since we are not meeting it.

Actions: The Faculty, through the Assessment Committee, already revised the General Education Requirements in 2016/2017 based on the lack of GELO rubric submissions for this GELO in 2015/2016. The revisions require an Introductory Course in Responsible Citizenship (which has specifically been identified as Freshman Seminar (IDS 105) and at least one additional course which Reinforces the Learning Outcome. Faculty Members teaching the required courses in 2018/2019 will be required to submit a GELO rubric for an assignment aligned to this Learning Outcome in order to adjust the master syllabi for those courses to ensure that students are gaining exposure to the learning outcome. In this respect the data will reflect *specific courses* designed to be intentionally aligned to responsible citizenship. Moreover, the social sciences department should review current master syllabi to develop required assessments for courses in order to clearly link the course to the learning outcome. Master syllabus adjustments and identification of courses at the 300- and 400- levels which meet this learning outcome should be included in the next round of data gathering.

Appendix: Courses Submitting GELOs by division: N=2

Language/Humanities	Fine Arts/Communication	Social Sciences	Math and Science	Business Programs
		POS 101 (32)		
0 courses, 0 students	0 courses, 0 students	2 courses, 32 students	0 courses, 0 students	0 courses, 0 students

Lincoln College Assessment Report
 Student GELO IV: Students are able to recognize accountability to a larger community.
 Comparison Report (All Levels of Courses)

Table 1.1: Measures of Central Tendency (Mean (SD) and % at each level for GELO V (Responsible Citizenship) – 2016/2017 (NOTE: NO rubrics were submitted in 2015/2016 for this GELO)

Course Levels	Pop (N)		Civic Action and Reflection: <i>shows initiative in</i> complex or multiple civic engagement activities with reflective insights or analysis about one's actions	Personal and Social Responsibility: Evaluates broader ethical, social, and environmental issues and the consequences of individual and collective interventions.	Application of Civic Knowledge: Applies knowledge and skills to suggest/implement appropriate and workable solutions to address complex social, political, and cultural problems.	Student recognizes accountability to a larger community: Student demonstrates evidence of civic action and reflection, personal and social responsibility, and application of civic knowledge.
100 Level Courses • POS 101	32	Mean, S.D.	m = 1.03, SD – N/A	m = 0.84, SD – N/A	m = 1.16, SD – N/A	m = 1.01, SD – N/A
		% at 0	18.8%	18.8%	18.8%	18.8%
		% at 1	59.4%	78.1%	46.9%	78.1%
		% at 2	21.9%	3.1%	34.4%	3.1%
		% at 3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		% at 4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
200 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.				
		% at 0				
		% at 1				
		% at 2				
		% at 3				
		% at 4				
300 Level Courses	0	Mean, S.D.				
		% at 0				
		% at 1				
		% at 2				
		% at 3				
		% at 4				
400 Level Courses • BUS 410	0	Mean, S.D.				
		% at 0				
		% at 1				
		% at 2				
		% at 3				
		% at 4				
Aggregate Scores	32	Mean, S.D.	m = 1.03, SD – N/A	m = 0.84, SD – N/A	m = 1.16, SD – N/A	m = 1.01, SD – N/A
		% at 0	18.8%	18.8%	18.8%	18.8%
		% at 1	59.4%	78.1%	46.9%	78.1%
		% at 2	21.9%	3.1%	34.4%	3.1%
		% at 3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		% at 4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%