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KU Core Review Process

I: Login
To access the KU Assessment System Online (ASO), please COPY and PASTE the login URL http://ku.compliance-assist.com into your web browser, and use your KU Online ID and Password to login.

II: Dashboard
This online system provides a dashboard to help organize all assessment modules you are assigned to. To access the dashboard, follow the following steps:

1. Click “Planning” on the left side of the landing page.

2. Click “My Dashboard” on the menu bar at the top of the web page.

3. Then you will be directed to the dashboard where you see modules including “My Roles”, “Degree-Level Assessment” and “KU Core Review.”
III: Submitting KU Core Review Forms Online

1. First, click the “KU Core Review” tab to access the “KU Core Review” module.

2. Once you are at the “KU Core Review” Module, an organization chart will appear on the left side of the page. Click and highlight the name of your department/program (note: do not click on the degrees) to start the application process.
3. Click “New Item” to collapse a drop-down menu. Select a review form (currently, forms are available for Goal 1 and 2) for a KU Core goal your course is contributing to. A new window will pop up for you to enter information regarding your KU Core course.
4. Follow the prompts and fill out the form with your course information. 
   Note: This online form is organized a little bit differently from the paper version, but it contains the same questions. You may prepare your responses in a Word document and copy and paste your responses to the online form.

Part I: Recertification: Check “Yes” to confirm each of the recertification statements.

Part II: Assessment: Provide information to the open-ended assessment questions. Make sure to click the “instruction button” for additional guidelines and clarifications.
1) Click “Edit” button underneath the question itself to bring up a pop-up window for you to enter your responses to the question.

2) Once you are done with editing, click “update” to bring you back to the form. Please note that “Update” doesn’t save your responses. In order to save your responses, you need to click the green “Save” button at the bottom of the form.

3) Once you “Save” your responses, you will have the option to upload files to support your responses to that question.
4) You don’t have to complete your review form at once. Actually, the system allows you to log back in later to continue with your work. Click “Save and Close” button at the bottom of the form to save the work you have done before you exit.

5) When you log back into the system at another time, follow the previous steps to get to the “KU Core Review” module. Then click on the course link to bring you back to the form you have worked on earlier.

6) To edit the form, click “Edit” at the upper right corner of the form to switch to the “Edit” mode.
7) When the review form is ready to be submitted for review, change the “Progress” to “Completed”, and click “Save and Close” button to exit.

8) Repeat the same process for another course’s review application.
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Overview
The University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC) is responsible for recertifying all KU Core courses. In order to achieve this goal, the UCCC asks all departments and programs that offer KU Core courses to submit a report for each course and goal/learning outcome. In the case of a course approved for more than one goal/learning outcome, departments and programs will make separate submissions for each KU Core goal/learning outcome. The UCCC will review courses on a 6-year cycle, grouped by KU Core Goal/learning outcome, as follows:

- Year 1: Goal 1.1 + Goal 1.2 (First review due in Sept. 2015)
- Year 2: Goal 2.1 + Goal 2.2 + Goal 3 (Arts & Humanities)
- Year 3: Goal 4.1 + Goal 3 (Natural Sciences & Mathematics)
- Year 4: Goal 4.2
- Year 5: Goal 5 + Goal 3 (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
- Year 6: Goal 6

Data Collection
Departments should collect data on achievement of the learning outcome each semester/year that the course is offered. The most efficient way to complete this task is to agree as a department to include an assignment in each course that covers the dimensions of the learning outcome that the department wishes to collectively assess, and to grade at least those dimensions by a common rubric. (See the First Year Seminar assessment of Goal 1.1 for an example of how this can be done while allowing for variability in content and teaching style across a common course.)

KU Core Review Outline
The KU Core Course Review consists of two parts:

- **Part 1: Recertification** is a self-report by the department or program offering the course certifying that the course complies with the required criteria of the KU Core Goal and Learning Outcome for which it has been approved.
- **Part 2: Assessment** is a self-report by the department or program offering the course of measured student achievement of the learning outcome. The report describes how course assessment items align to dimensions of the learning outcome, a report of the measurements taken on those items across a representative sample of students, a descriptive analysis of the data, and finally, a description of changes those data suggest in order to improve student achievement of the learning outcome.

Reporting Process
Departments will submit reports in September for each of their courses that fulfills a learning outcome that is due for review that academic year. Reports will be submitted through Assessment System Online. The system provides prompts the user with the appropriate question for each goal/learning outcome, and the user can easily cut and paste from a Word document answers to questions requiring narrative response. As with Degree-Level Assessment, only designated department users may submit the materials.

*Note: If your department/program needs to add additional department users to the ASO system, please send your request to Ying Xiong at vxiong@ku.edu.*

UCCC Review
The UCCC will evaluate each report and provide written feedback to departments. In some cases the Committee may require additional information or data in order to recertify the course. The goal of the review is to motivate and document continuous, evidence-based improvement of student learning outcomes.
Appendix B: KU Core Review Forms (Paper Version)

Goal 1.1 Critical Thinking

PART 1 – RECERTIFICATION

Please confirm that each time your department or program offers this course it meets the requirements of Goal 1.1 and has done so since its acceptance into the KU Core or last recertification. All items must be confirmed with “Yes” in order to receive recertification.

__Yes __No Does this course focus substantially on critical thinking as stated in the learning outcome?

__Yes __No Does this course include assignments, projects, and/or tests that require students to form judgments about the assumptions or claims presented?

__Yes __No Does this course include assignments, projects, and/or tests that require students to analyze and synthesize information?

__Yes __No Does this course include assignments, projects, and/or tests that require students to make evidence-based arguments to support conclusions?

__Yes __No Does this course evaluate student performance in the tasks above, and uses this evaluation for at least 60% of the final grade?

PART 2 – ASSESSMENT

Please answer the following five questions to provide an assessment of student achievement in your course over the period of the assessment for the Goal 1.1 learning outcome:

Upon reaching this goal, students will be able to analyze and evaluate assumptions, claims, evidence, arguments, and forms of expression; select and apply appropriate interpretive tools.

1. What evidence does your department/program use to determine whether students are achieving the KU Core critical thinking goals in this course?

2. What quantitative format does your department/program use to summarize the degree to which students in this course achieve the KU Core critical thinking goal?

Instruction: For example, your instructors could use the UCCC’s suggested rubric for critical thinking (https://kucore.ku.edu/sites/kucore.drupal.ku.edu/files/docs/G1LO1_Rubric.pdf). They could also create rubrics of their own, or develop other evaluation metrics that permit insight into the degree to which this course is achieving the Goal 1.1 learning outcome.
3. Please describe your evaluation process, including rubric(s), metric(s) and assessment instrument(s) (e.g., description of assignments, test questions, final exam, final project, etc.) and how your evaluation aligns to the learning outcome.

4. Please provide a quantitative summary of student achievement in this course in the assessment period. This may take the form of a distribution of scores over several dimensions of the learning outcome or a single comprehensive assessment of the learning outcome.

   **Instruction:** For example, if you use the suggested rubric, you might use some or all of the following dimensions: Explanation of issues, Evidence selection, Influence of contexts and assumptions, Implications and consequences.

Please normalize your scoring to a scale from zero to four, where 0 = "Outcome Not Achieved" and 4 = "Exemplary Achievement" and arrange your data in the following sort of table. Feel free to add more rows or use fewer rows. Please include in your assessment only those students who completed the course. If there are deficiencies in your data collection, please explain how you plan to remedy them going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 1: (Please describe)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Exemplary Achievement&quot; (4)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Good Achievement&quot; (3)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Satisfactory Achievement&quot; (2)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Basic Achievement&quot; (2)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Outcome Not Achieved&quot; (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Taking into account your weighting of the various dimensions above, what percentage of the students achieved at least basic overall competency in this learning outcome. Please also briefly state how you have defined basic competency for this purpose.

6. Please provide a descriptive summary of student achievement in meeting the Goal 1.1 learning outcome.

7. The intent of this assessment is to promote improvement in meeting KU Core goals for greater numbers of students. What changes are suggested by the data and results you report above that would improve the achievement of this learning outcome? (Please limit your response to 500 words.)
Goal 1.2 Quantitative Literacy

PART 1 – RECERTIFICATION

Please confirm that each time your department or program offers this course it meets the requirements of Goal 1.2 and has done so since its acceptance into the KU Core or last recertification. All items must be confirmed with “Yes” in order to receive recertification.

__Yes__ __No__  Does this course focus substantially on solving problems using functions and numerical techniques?

__Yes__ __No__  Does this course require students to apply mathematical or statistical principles to organize or process numerical information?

__Yes__ __No__  Does this course require students to use specific quantitative methods to solve problems, and choose appropriate methods for given problems?

__Yes__ __No__  Does this course evaluate student performance in the tasks above, and uses this evaluation for at least 60% of the final grade?

PART 2 – ASSESSMENT

Please answer the following five questions to provide an assessment of student achievement in your course over the period of the assessment for the Goal 1.2 learning outcome:

Upon reaching this goal, students will be able to define a problem, analyze numerical information, apply mathematical principles, and integrate quantitative methods into problem solving.

1. What evidence does your department/program use to determine whether students are achieving the KU Core quantitative literacy goals in this course?

2. What quantitative format does your department/program use to summarize the degree to which students in this course achieve the KU Core quantitative literacy goal?

Instruction: For example, your instructors could use the UCCC’s suggested rubric for quantitative literacy (https://kucore.ku.edu/sites/kucore.drupal.ku.edu/files/docs/G1LO2_Rubric.pdf). They could also create rubrics of their own, or develop other evaluation metrics that permit insight into the degree to which this course is achieving the Goal 1.2 learning outcome.

3. Please describe your evaluation process, including rubric(s), metric(s) and assessment instrument(s) (e.g., description of assignments, test questions, final exam, final project, etc.) and how your evaluation aligns to the learning outcome.
4. Please provide a quantitative summary of student achievement in this course in the assessment period. This may take the form of a distribution of scores over several dimensions of the learning outcome or a single comprehensive assessment of the learning outcome.

**Instruction:** For example, if you use the suggested rubric, you might use some or all of the following dimensions: Representation, Methodology, Computation, and Interpretation. Please normalize your scoring to a scale from zero to four, where 0 = "Outcome Not Achieved" and 4 = "Exemplary Achievement" and arrange your data in the following sort of table. Feel free to add more rows or use fewer rows. Please include in your assessment only those students who completed the course. If there are deficiencies in your data collection, please explain how you plan to remedy them going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>% of &quot;Exemplary Achievement&quot; (4)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Good Achievement&quot; (3)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Satisfactory Achievement&quot; (2)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Basic Achievement&quot; (2)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Outcome Not Achieved&quot; (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Taking into account your weighting of the various dimensions above, what percentage of the students achieved at least basic overall competency in this learning outcome. Please also briefly state how you have defined basic competency for this purpose.

6. Please provide a descriptive summary of student achievement in meeting the Goal 1.2 learning outcome.

7. The intent of this assessment is to promote improvement in meeting KU Core goals for greater numbers of students. What changes are suggested by the data and results you report above that would improve the achievement of this learning outcome? (Please limit your response to 500 words.)
Goal 2.1 Written Communication

PART 1 – RECERTIFICATION

Please confirm that each time your department or program offers this course it meets the requirements of Goal 2.1 and has done so since its acceptance into the KU Core or last recertification. All items must be confirmed with “Yes” in order to receive recertification.

__Yes __No Does this course include instruction that will require students to analyze how language and rhetorical choices vary across texts and different institutional, historical, and/or public contexts?

__Yes __No Does this course include instruction that will require students to demonstrate rhetorical flexibility within and beyond academic writing?

__Yes __No Does this course include instruction that will require students to revise and improve their own writing?

__Yes __No Does this course require writing assignments (a minimum of 2000 words/course) in English and include at least three different types of writing for different purposes, audiences, or media?

__Yes __No Does this course deliver structured feedback to students that leads to revision and sequential improvement of their texts (for example, through the revision of successive drafts)?

__Yes __No Does this course evaluate the quality of students’ written communication, and uses this evaluation for at least 60% of the final grade?

PART 2 – ASSESSMENT

Please answer the following five questions to provide an assessment of student achievement in your course over the period of the assessment for the Goal 2.1 learning outcome:

Upon reaching this goal, students will be able to generate, explore, organize, and convey ideas in writing, using language and other media (for example, digital texts, images, and graphs) to present those ideas clearly, confidently, and in a manner appropriate to specific communication situations.

1. What evidence does your department/program use to determine whether students are achieving the KU Core written communication goals in this course?
2. What quantitative format does your department/program use to summarize the degree to which students in this course achieve the KU Core written communication goal?

**Instruction:** For example, your instructors could use the UCCC’s suggested rubric for written communication (https://kucore.ku.edu/sites/kucore.drupal.ku.edu/files/docs/G2LO1_Rubric.pdf). They could also create rubrics of their own, or develop other evaluation metrics that permit insight into the degree to which this course is achieving the Goal 2.1 learning outcome.

3. Please describe your evaluation process, including rubric(s), metric(s) and assessment instrument(s) (e.g., description of assignments, test questions, final exam, final project, etc.) and how your evaluation aligns to the learning outcome.

4. Please provide a quantitative summary of student achievement in this course in the assessment period. This may take the form of a distribution of scores over several dimensions of the learning outcome or a single comprehensive assessment of the learning outcome.

**Instruction:** For example, if you use the suggested rubric, you might use some or all of the following dimensions: Content development, Organization and format, Sources and evidence, and Control of style, syntax and mechanics. Please normalize your scoring to a scale from zero to four, where 0=“Outcome Not Achieved” and 4=“Exemplary Achievement” and arrange your data in the following sort of table. Feel free to add more rows or use fewer rows. Please include in your assessment only those students who completed the course. If there are deficiencies in your data collection, please explain how you plan to remedy them going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>% of “Exemplary Achievement” (4)</th>
<th>% of “Good Achievement” (3)</th>
<th>% of “Satisfactory Achievement” (2)</th>
<th>% of “Basic Achievement” (2)</th>
<th>% of “Outcome Not Achieved” (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Taking into account your weighting of the various dimensions above, what percentage of the students achieved at least basic overall competency in this learning outcome. Please also briefly state how you have defined basic competency for this purpose.
6. Please provide a descriptive summary of student achievement in meeting the Goal 2.1 learning outcome.

7. The intent of this assessment is to promote improvement in meeting KU Core goals for greater numbers of students. What changes are suggested by the data and results you report above that would improve the achievement of this learning outcome? (Please limit your response to 500 words.)
Goal 2.2 Oral Communication

PART 1 – RECERTIFICATION

Please confirm that each time your department or program offers this course it meets the requirements of Goal 2.1 and has done so since its acceptance into the KU Core or last recertification. All items must be confirmed with “Yes” in order to receive recertification.

__Yes __No  Does this course include instruction to require students to apply theory to prepare and present content in an organized manner and with a delivery appropriate to the audience?

__Yes __No  Does this course include instruction to require students to engage in active listening and participate in discussions in a respectful manner?

__Yes __No  Does this course include instruction to require students to analyze their own communicative behaviors in both interpersonal and public speaking?

__Yes __No  Does this course include assignments structured so that students compete at least three different types of speeches or presentations in English with different purposes or audiences?

__Yes __No  Does this course deliver structured feedback to students that leads to revision and substantial improvement?

__Yes __No  Does this course evaluate the quality of students’ oral communication, and use this evaluation for at least 60% of the final grade?

PART 2 – ASSESSMENT

Please answer the following five questions to provide an assessment of student achievement in your course over the period of the assessment for the Goal 2.2 learning outcome:

Upon reaching this goal, students will be able to generate, develop, organize and convey ideas orally, using language, presentation skills, and other media (for example, digital texts, images and graphs) to present those ideas clearly, confidently, and in a manner appropriate to specific communication situations.

1. What evidence does your department/program use to determine whether students are achieving the KU Core oral communication goals in this course?
2. What quantitative format does your department/program use to summarize the degree to which students in this course achieve the KU Core oral communication goal?

**Instruction:** For example, your instructors could use the UCCC’s suggested rubric for oral communication (https://kucore.ku.edu/sites/kucore.drupal.ku.edu/files/docs/G2LO2_Rubric.pdf). They could also create rubrics of their own, or develop other evaluation metrics that permit insight into the degree to which this course is achieving the Goal 2.2 learning outcome.

3. Please describe your evaluation process, including rubric(s), metric(s) and assessment instrument(s) (e.g., description of assignments, test questions, final exam, final project, etc.) and how your evaluation aligns to the learning outcome.

4. Please provide a quantitative summary of student achievement in this course in the assessment period. This may take the form of a distribution of scores over several dimensions of the learning outcome or a single comprehensive assessment of the learning outcome.

**Instruction:** For example, if you use the suggested rubric, you might use some or all of the following dimensions: Organization, Language, Delivery, Supporting Materials, and Central Message.

Please normalize your scoring to a scale from zero to four, where 0=“Outcome Not Achieved” and 4=“Exemplary Achievement” and arrange your data in the following sort of table. Feel free to add more rows or use fewer rows. Please include in your assessment only those students who completed the course. If there are deficiencies in your data collection, please explain how you plan to remedy them going forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>% of “Exemplary Achievement” (4)</th>
<th>% of “Good Achievement” (3)</th>
<th>% of “Satisfactory Achievement” (2)</th>
<th>% of “Basic Achievement” (2)</th>
<th>% of “Outcome Not Achieved” (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3: (Please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Taking into account your weighting of the various dimensions above, what percentage of the students achieved at least basic overall competency in this learning outcome. Please also briefly state how you have defined basic competency for this purpose.
6. Please provide a descriptive summary of student achievement in meeting the Goal 2.2 learning outcome.

7. The intent of this assessment is to promote improvement in meeting KU Core goals for greater numbers of students. What changes are suggested by the data and results you report above that would improve the achievement of this learning outcome? (Please limit your response to 500 words.)
Appendix C: KU Core Review Examples

Example 1: First Year Seminars for Goal 1.1 Critical Thinking

Example 2: COMS 130/131 for Goal 2.2 Oral Communication
Department prefix + 177

Start: 7/1/2014
End: 6/30/2015
Providing: First Year Seminars
Department: Department prefix + 177
Course ID (ex., ENG 101): Department prefix + 177
Course Name (ex., Introduction to Psychology): First Year Seminars
Name of Contact(s): Sarah Crawford-Parker
Period of Assessment: Fall 2012, Fall 2013, Fall 2014

Recertification Item 1: Does this course focus substantially on critical thinking as stated in the learning outcome?:
Yes

Recertification Item 2: Does this course include assignments, projects, and/or tests that require students to form judgments about the assumptions or claims presented?:
Yes

Recertification Item 3: Does this course include assignments, projects, and/or tests that require students to analyze and synthesize information?:
Yes

Recertification Item 4: Does this course assignments, projects, and/or tests that require students to make evidence-based arguments to support conclusions?:
Yes

Recertification Item 5: Does this course evaluate student performance in the tasks above, and uses this evaluation for at least 60% of the final grade?:
Yes

Assessment Q1: What evidence does your department/program use to determine whether students are achieving your KU Core critical thinking goals in this course?
We assess capstone assignments using the AAC&U Value Rubric for critical thinking. In 2012, we assessed all capstone assignments for the 11 seminars offered. In 2013, we assessed approximately 40% of capstone assignments randomly selected from the 20 seminars offered. We share student learning results with program faculty and use these results for course and program improvement.

Assessment Q2: What quantitative format does your department/program use to summarize the degree to which students in this course achieve the KU Core critical thinking goals?
The AAC&U Value Rubric for critical thinking evaluates the following dimensions: 1) explanation of issues 2) evaluation of evidence 3) context and assumptions 4) student’s position 5) conclusions. Key language to describe these dimensions include: critical language, questioning viewpoints of experts, understanding relevant information, analyzing assumptions, thesis, position, and informed evaluation.

Assessment Q3: Please describe your evaluation process, including rubric(s) and metric(s) and assessment
As part of the First-Year Seminar proposal process, faculty describe an integrative assignment that they will use in the course for the assessment of critical thinking. Typically these assignments are completed in states with support and feedback provided to students at each stage, and they culminate in a final project that reflects their learning throughout the semester, with an emphasis on critical thinking skills developed in the course. Recent examples include:
GEOL 177  Students write a paper taking the position of an energy consulting firm planning out a strategy and rationale to divest from fossil fuel use.

LING 177  Students write response papers to parent questions asking whether they should raise their children as bilinguals. Responses must provide an accessible explanation of research and offer arguments supported by scientific evidence.

PSYC 177  Students write a paper in which they identify a significant traumatic public event and prepare a report or response plan for the community affected by this event. The plan must be supported by evidence in the scientific literature and address what the children affected by this event could be expected to remember about it in the short and long-term, the implications for well-being, and suggest and intervention plan.

JOUR 177  Students develop a project based on the use of visual communication by a specific candidate or campaign issue during the 2012 election. Students place the visual communication strategies in historical context and identify key differences with the opposing candidate or issue perspective and draw relevant conclusions.

Assessment Q4: Please provide a quantitative summary of student achievement in this course in the assessment period. This may take the form of a distribution of scores over several dimensions of the LO or a single comprehensive assessment of the LO.:

2012 Critical thinking results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>% of &quot;Exemplary Achievement&quot; (4)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Good Achievement&quot; (3)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Satisfactory Achievement&quot; (2)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Basic Achievement&quot; (1)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Outcome Not Achieved&quot; (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1: Explanation of issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2: Evaluation of evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3: Context and assumptions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 4: Student’s position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 5: Conclusions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment of learning outcome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013 Critical thinking results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 1: Explanation of issues</th>
<th>% of &quot;Exemplary Achievement&quot; (4)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Good Achievement&quot; (3)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Satisfactory Achievement&quot; (2)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Basic Achievement &quot; (1)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Outcome Not Achieved&quot; (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2: Evaluation of evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3: Contexts and assumptions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 4: Student’s position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 5: Conclusions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment of the learning outcome</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Q5:** What percentage of the students achieved at least basic overall competency in this learning outcome? Please also briefly state how you have defined basic competency for this purpose.

2012 80% of students at or above basic competence level for critical thinking (milestone 1 or higher—satisfactory achievement or higher on above data chart)

2013 77% of students at or above basic competence level for critical thinking.

**Assessment Q6:** Provide a descriptive summary of student achievement in meeting the Goal 1.1 learning outcome.

Performance rates are reflective of fall semester achievement for first-time, full-time freshman students. Faculty in the 2012 cohort participated in a year-long process to create the FYS program and design the initial FYS courses. We are committed to maintaining a high level of student achievement for the critical thinking learning outcome and continue to require FYS faculty to participate in course design workshops and development and assessment-related activities. The close correspondence between 2012 and 2013 student learning results suggest that we maintaining a high level of quality with our program expansion, but there is still room for improvement (see #6). Performance rates are reflective of fall semester achievement for first-time, full-time freshman students. Faculty in the 2012 cohort participated in a year-long process to create the FYS program and design the initial FYS courses. We are committed to maintaining a high level of student achievement for the critical thinking learning outcome and continue to require FYS faculty to participate in course design workshops and development and assessment-related activities. The close correspondence between 2012 and 2013 student learning results suggest that we maintaining a high level of quality with our program expansion, but there is still room for improvement (see #6). Performance rates are reflective of fall semester achievement for first-time, full-time freshman students. Faculty in the 2012 cohort participated in a year-long process to create the FYS program and design the initial FYS courses. We are committed to maintaining a high level of student achievement for the critical thinking learning outcome and continue to require FYS faculty to participate in course design workshops and development and assessment-related activities. The close correspondence between 2012 and 2013 student learning results suggest that we maintaining a high level of quality with our program expansion, but there is still room for improvement (see #6).

**Assessment Q7:** The intent of this assessment is to promote improvement in meeting KU Core goals for greater numbers of students. What changes are suggested by the data and results you report above that would improve the achievement of this LO?

Student learning results are shared with First-Year Seminar faculty on an annual basis. After compiling the 2012 and 2013 results, we targeted the critical thinking dimension "influence of context and assumptions" as an area for targeted improvement. 2013 and 2014 course design workshops and information literacy workshops delivered by the KU Libraries specifically addressed ways to improve student learning in this area. Below are two examples of how faculty have designed their course learning activities to better address this skill with their students:

"Following the first library session we discussed in class not only where and how to find materials, but how to evaluate which materials were valuable for particular uses: books tend to take longer to produce and might not contain current information on women’s education conditions in contemporary Islamic social contexts, while ephemera, which are more current, need to be judged for their authenticity."

Humanities faculty member

"The library did help this (evaluating contexts and assumptions) as it helped students to understand how to place information resources in context. I also had them write on every writing assignment why they thought the information was credible. Finally, because this is a science class, we always had to discuss assumptions. So, often when we discussed problems I would ask students what assumptions went into getting this answer. This became relevant when talking about scientific paradigm shifts as people were forced to throw the old assumptions out the window."

Natural sciences faculty member

In addition to focusing our existing training sessions to target specific areas for improvement, we have also added a new workshop for First-Year Seminar faculty focused on ways to scaffold the research process to address different dimensions evaluated by the critical thinking rubric. We are launching this new workshop in spring 2015.

**Progress:** Completed

**Responsible Roles:** No Roles Selected
Recertification Item 1: Does this course include instruction to require students to apply theory to prepare and present content in an organized manner and with a delivery appropriate to the audience? 
Yes

Recertification Item 2: Does this course include instruction to require students to engage in active listening and participate in discussions in a respectful manner? 
Yes

Recertification Item 3: Does this course include instruction to require students to analyze their own communicative behaviors in both interpersonal and public speaking? 
Yes

Recertification Item 4: Does this course include assignments structured so that students complete at least three different types of speeches or presentations in English with different purposes or audiences? 
Yes

Recertification Item 5: Does this course deliver structured feedback to students that leads to revision and substantial improvement? 
Yes

Recertification Item 6: Does this course evaluate the quality of students' oral communication, and use this evaluation for at least 60% of the final grade? 
Yes

Assessment Q1: What evidence does your department/program use to determine whether students are achieving the KU Core oral communication goals in this course? 
We have developed an extensive assessment program to evaluate each of the facets of Goal 2.2. These include student scores on speech grading rubrics. Future data will also include assessment of students' self-reflection papers, as well as evaluation of student performance and engagement in classroom discussion.

Assessment Q2: What quantitative format does your department/program use to summarize the degree to which students in this course achieve the KU Core oral communication?
We use our own developed rubrics to assess each of the pieces of evidence discussed above. A copy of these rubrics is attached to this form.

- COMS130 Informative Speech Rubric
- COMS130 Persuasive Speech Rubric
goals?
Assessment Q3: Please describe your evaluation process, including rubric(s), metric(s) and assessment instrument(s) (e.g., description of assignments, test questions, final exam, final project, etc.) and how your evaluation aligns to the learning outcome.

Assessment Q4: Please provide a quantitative summary of student achievement in this course in the assessment period. This may take the form of a distribution of scores over several dimensions of the LO or a single comprehensive assessment of the LO.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>% of &quot;Exemplary Achievement&quot; (4)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Good Achievement&quot; (3)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Satisfactory Achievement&quot; (2)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Basic Achievement &quot; (1)</th>
<th>% of &quot;Outcome Not Achieved&quot; (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension1: Apply theory to prepare and present content in an organized manner and with a delivery appropriate to the audience.</td>
<td>8% 14%</td>
<td>26% 42%</td>
<td>28% 27%</td>
<td>18% 12%</td>
<td>20% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension2: Engage in active listening and participate in discussions in a respectful manner.</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension3: Analyze students’ own communicative behaviors in both interpersonal and public speaking.</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
<td>--- ---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of students who meet basic overall competency in the learning outcome: 95%

95%

Assessment Q5: What percentage of the students achieved at least basic overall competency in this learning outcome. Please also briefly state how you have defined basic competency for this purpose.

Assessment Q6: Please provide a descriptive summary of student achievement in meeting the Goal 2.2 learning outcome.:

Assessment Q7: The intent of this assessment is to promote improvement in meeting KU Core goals for greater numbers of students.

What changes are suggested by the data and results you report above that would improve the achievement of this LO?:

Progress: Completed

Responsible Roles: No Roles Selected

Our ultimate goal in the course is to see improvement in students’ performance across the course, reflective of actual learning and internalization of the theory and concepts related to public speaking. Thus far, our data indicate that for the lowest performing students in our classes, we are achieving this goal. Students in the C/D range on the first speech make dramatic improvements in their performance on a later speech assignment. Also, while students overall do well with speech structure and content, they struggle more with appropriate citation of material to support their ideas. Overall, our students demonstrate an above average level of public speaking skill when they leave Coms 130.

Through our assessment process, we have learned several things. First, we are continually refining the grading rubric to be a better reflection of student’s achievement of different components of the speech. This will aid in greater accuracy in student grades but also, assessment of the course. Furthermore, we are working out logistical details involved with evaluating a course taken by thousands of students each year which will better allow us to assess other sub-components of Goal 2.2, including effectiveness of student self-reflection and participation in ethical discussions.

As is evidenced in the chart above, we have not yet collected data to assess the self-reflection and discussion components of Goal 2.2. To remedy this shortcomings, we have developed a series of assessments and modifications to the course to allow us to collect this data moving forward. In Spring of 2015 we will begin specific assessment of these dimensions of Goal 2.2, allowing us to better understand how students perform on the self-reflection papers students have been completing for several semesters. In conjunction with this, we are also restructing components of the class to better assess how discussion and conversation in the classroom reflect student learning of course concepts. In all, we feel through this assessment process we have learned how we might more closely align grading and assessment measures to reflect actual student performance. Also, we have embraced technology as a means through which to manage the significant data generated by assessment of this course.
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