



Program Assessment Report

Program: Global Socio-Cultural Responsibility

Option: Appreciation of the Arts

Report Year: 2018-19

Drafted by Basil Moutsatsos on Feb 21, 2020

Overall Introduction

In support of the mission of St. Petersburg College, faculty committees established several General Education Goals. These goals are to provide an open admission general education curriculum that results in students' achievement of several educational outcomes. This Assessment Report addresses Appreciation of the Arts, one of the options identified within the following educational outcome: "Students should be able to participate actively as informed and ethically responsible citizens in social, cultural, global, and environmental matters.."

It is the intent of St. Petersburg College to incorporate continuous improvement practices in all areas. Assessment reports provide comparisons of present and past results which are used to identify topics where improvement is possible. The following section illustrates how SPC has traditionally used past results as a vital tool in achieving its commitment to continuous improvement.

Program Learning Outcomes

#1: Participate actively as informed and ethically responsible citizens in social, cultural, global, and environmental matters.

I. Use of Past Results

Appreciation of the Arts:

Method 1: Assessment Administered by Instructors

2005-06 Assessment Report Results

On-Campus Classes: Overall, there was a marked improvement from the spring 2004-05 results to the spring 2005-06 results. In face-to-face classes, the Domains for Ancient Greece (Questions 1 & 2), Early Renaissance (Questions 9, 10 & 11) and Rome (Questions 3 & 4) showed improvements: the mean for Ancient Greece increased from 64.16% in 2004-05 to 67.04% in 2005-06; the mean for Early Renaissance increased from 62.90% in 04-05 to 66.9% in 05-06; and the mean for Rome increased from 54.06% in 04-05 to 58.49% in 05-06.

The Domains for Middle Ages (Questions 5, 6, 7 & 8) and High Renaissance (Questions 12, 13, 14 & 15) showed minimal improvement from spring 2004-05 to spring 2005-06: the mean for Middle Ages was 68.32% in 2004-05 and 69.98% in 2005-06; the mean for High Renaissance was 69.06% in 2004-05 and 70.36% in 2005-06.

On-line Classes: Although a smaller sample was assessed for spring 2005-06 online classes, the mean for all the Domains except Middle Ages showed improvement in comparison to the combined mean scores for 2004-05. The Domain mean scores for online classes follow: the mean for Ancient Greece was 71%; the mean for Rome was 63%; the mean for Early Renaissance was 74%; and the mean for High Renaissance was 79%. The mean score for the Domain Middle Ages remained the same with 68.32% in 2004-05 and 68% in 2005-06.

2008-09 Assessment Report Results

On-Campus Classes: Overall, there was little change between the spring 2007-08 results and the spring 2008-09 results. In face-to-face classes, the domain for Ancient Greece (Questions 1 & 2) showed an improvement of 0.04. The declines ranged from 0.4 in Rome (Questions 3 & 4) to -4.3 in Middle Ages (Questions 5, 6, 7 & 8). Early Renaissance (Questions 9, 10 & 11) and High Renaissance (Questions 12, 13, 14 & 15) also had declines of 1.9 and 0.9, respectively. Only two items in the spring 2008-09 on-campus administration met the 70% criteria for success: Early Renaissance (71.5%) and High Renaissance (73.3%).

On-line Classes: While a smaller sample was assessed in the online classes, there was also little change between the spring 2006-07 results and the spring 2007-08 results. In online classes, the domain for Early Renaissance (Questions 9, 10 & 11) and Ancient Greece (Questions 1 & 2) displayed improvements of 5.9 and 0.1, respectively. While the remaining domains declined ranging from 5.0 in High Renaissance (Questions 12, 13, 14 & 15), to 1.5 in Middle Ages (Questions 5, 6, 7 & 8), The last domain, Rome (Questions 3 & 4), declined by 1.6. No items in the spring 2008-09 on-line administration met the 70% criteria for success. High Renaissance was the closest with a mean of 69.0%.

For the participation survey item, 66.9% of the respondents from the spring 2008-09 on-campus classes attended two or more cultural activities outside of class, while 63.6% of the respondents from the spring 2008-09 on-line classes attended two or more cultural activities.

Method 2: Comparison of Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

The six items related to the Humanities and Fine Arts were compared between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys in 2005-06. Five of the six items resulted in a statistical significant difference between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys. The last item, 'Performing in or creating a work of drama, music, or dance', resulted in a mean increase of 0.12 points which was not statistically significant.

The six items related to the Humanities and Fine Arts were compared between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys in 2006-07 and 2007-08. Four of the six items resulted in a statistical significant difference between the Entering Student and the Graduating Student Surveys in both administrations. The second to last item, 'Creating a painting, sculpture or other work of visual art' was statistically significant in 2006-07. However, it only had an increase of 0.03 in 2007-08, which was not statistically significant. The last item, 'Performing in or creating a work of drama, music, or dance', resulted in a mean increase of 0.09 points in 2006-07, and a mean decrease of 0.01 in 2007-08, neither of which was statistically significant.

This analysis while cross-sectional in nature, suggested an increase in the self-reported perceptions of students regarding their experience with Humanities and Fine Arts during their College stay.

2010-11 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

In the area of Fine Arts and Humanities, the entering student survey and graduating student surveys were compared for the years 2008-2009, and 2009-2010. Although they were not the same cohort of students, the data suggested an upward trend in two of the three categories.

This trend suggested that SPC has provided some influence toward appreciation and participation in the arts, primarily in attending concerts, dramas, performances, and art museums. It also suggested that there was a general upward trend of awareness and appreciation for performing and visual art participation and appreciation, related to a student's experience at SPC. However, the effect on visual arts creativity was not seen in this measure. Perhaps this question is too specific to conservatory arts skills and other measures would be more indicative of the positive affects of Humanities and Fine Arts on SPC students.

Method 2: Satisfaction data from Graduating Student Survey

Although the satisfaction survey indicated only a slight increase in the preparedness in the humanities (from 6.02 to 6.05) this was still relatively high on a 7 point scale. It remains our goal to see growth in this category by providing vital arts experiences and relevant teaching and learning in the classroom.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

The online general education assessment indicated slight increases in the successful responses from Spring to Summer 2010 (73.95 to 74.38). Also, comparing Fall 2010 to Spring 2011 for forms 1, 2, and 3, there was an increase in form 1 (73.78 to 75.99), a decrease in form 2 (62.35 to 59.97) and an increase in form three (61.82 to 66.69), reflecting an overall upward trend in these responses. This reflected a composite of 4 subgroups in this category: Social, Ethics, Cultural, and Global. Our faculty core group reviewed the Cultural portion of the assessment items to evaluate if they were equal in validity across the three forms. The department continues to inform and motivate faculty across the disciplines to infuse learning activities in courses that include practical applications from the arts.

2013-14 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Comparison of Entering and Graduating student surveys

The most significant change was in the category of "Attending an art museum;" which increased in all three years (.36, .29, and .29) for that item. This reflected the significant work of faculty in the humanities and other liberal arts in conjunction with the educational staff of Leepa-Rattner Museum of Art to infuse meaningful learning experiences for students of all disciplines using the resources of the museum. The item "Attending a concert, dance performance, or live drama" increased during the first year (.07) but decreased in the second (.07) and third year (.04). The overall numbers (3.05, 2.95, and 2.93) were still above average on a 5-point scale. This indicated a need for more internal communication within departments regarding arts events and activities of common interest to students. The third item focused on "Creating a painting, sculpture, or other work visual art." This showed a slight increase in the first year (.03) and slight decline in years two and three (.03 and .02), which are not significant. This item may need some re-wording to get at the general impact of the humanities program across disciplines, since the focus is general education and not limited to students entering arts majors with intention of improving their creative skills.

Method 2: Satisfaction Data from Graduating Student Survey

For all three years, the record was 4.2 out of 5, reflecting a positive response to student satisfaction with the preparation they received in the Humanities program.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

For all of the competencies, as recorded using different forms, the wide variance in the results suggested a review of assessment items, by our department, was needed to check for parity. With only 3 of the items receiving an acceptable rating of 70% or above, a review of the items was needed to ensure they were measuring the competencies appropriately, and that the most appropriate competencies for assessment had been identified.

Competency 1 - The student will be able to distinguish the broad differences within artistic style periods. This one was successful (75%) with the group who used Form 2 but not successful with groups who used forms 3 (34%), 4 (40%), or 5 (55%).

Competency 2 - The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of arts to the liberal arts and sciences. For this one, none of the forms reflected a successful result. There was more consistency among forms: 44%, 35%, 46%, 53%. This bears examination as to the methods of introducing cross-discipline applications of learning outcomes to students.

Competency 3 - The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of the arts to the liberal arts and sciences. Although forms 2 and 3 did not illustrate success for this competency, forms 4 and 5 did, with 75% and 74%, respectively. This indicated a review of the appreciation of the arts assessment items was needed to check for parity and revision, if necessary.

2015-16 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

A slight increase is seen in 2014-2015 compared to 2013-2014 in all three areas, though not statistically significant (less than 0.05 change from year to year). The most significant change from entering to graduation is "visiting an art museum;" a change of +0.30. This is attributable to SPC's Leepa-Rattner Museum of Art, and other local art museums that are used for a cultural experience assignment for students.

Method 2: Satisfaction Data from Graduating Student Survey.

Moving from 4.17 to 4.21 (7-point scale) from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 is a positive direction; though slight. Both years show overall satisfaction with Humanities preparedness at SPC.

Method 3: Online Gen Ed Assessment.

Results here are less positive; in that only one category is seen as acceptable: "The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of arts to the liberal arts and sciences" which was rated at 87%. Questions for these domains are being revised and will be implemented in an upcoming administration of this method.

Method 4: Course Assessment

This was a pilot of a new assessment methodology that will expand to larger group this year. These results were skewed by a rubric that had included global focus in the scoring, though many of the particular cultural experience assignment essays that contributed to the pool of data did not have a global focus as assigned by faculty. This resulted in lower scores for those assignments on two rubric items. We are adjusting for next iteration by 1) clarifying the nature of the assignments used in Humanities sections that will be used for this purpose; 2) including World Religion REL 2300 to incorporate the global focus; and 3) adjusting the rubrics used to appropriately represent the assignments to which they apply.

Also, we will more accurately aggregate the resulting data. An aggregate of the six groups assessed in this report is as follows:

n=128

Capstone - 2.6% achievement (4 point)
Milestones - 18.1% (3-point); 33.1% (2 point); combined 41.2% achievement
Benchmark - 26.1% achievement (1 point)
Not Met - 20.2% (0 point)

It is hoped that these numbers will increase with ongoing improvements in HUM 1020 standard course; addition of REL 2300 standard course to data collection; revision of rubrics; and more understanding and participation by faculty in the next administration of this assessment.

II. Methodology

Means of Assessment: The Appreciation of the Arts option within the Global Socio Cultural Responsibility goal was assessed using four methods. The first method includes a comparison of the Entering and Graduating student survey data collected during two years; the second method includes a comparison of graduating student survey satisfaction data collected during two years; the third method includes assessment data collected from several administrations of an online general education assessment which was implemented in 2010.; and the fourth method provides assessment data collected through a course assessment.

Date(s) of Administration: 2015-16, 2016-17, 2018-19

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys Beginning in 2008-09, the Entering Student Survey was revised to eliminate redundancy, and reduced in size in order to minimize the impact on students. As a result, three of the prior six items related to Humanities were removed from the survey. During 2015-16, and 2016-17 three items related to the participation in and appreciation of humanities and fine arts were compared between the Entering and Graduating Student Surveys.

Method 2: Satisfaction data from Graduating Student Survey Satisfaction data collected during 2015-16, and 2016-17 was used to assess students' satisfaction with the preparedness they received at SPC in the area of humanities.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment The purpose of the new online general education assessment, which was developed in 2010, is to improve the general education assessment process by establishing a model that evaluates students' general education competencies near the end of the completion of their degree. The assessment was developed as a collaborative effort between the general education deans and their faculty in each discipline, and the department of Academic Effectiveness and Assessment. The assessment is available to students in the MyCourses (D2L) environment, and was first administered in Spring 2010.

Assessment Instrument: The online general education assessment consists of 50 multiple-choice items, and contains 10 items from each of SPC's five general education goals. One of the five goals is Global Socio - Cultural Responsibility which includes Humanities/Fine Arts.

Population: Students who had completed 45-55 credits in Fall 2018, were invited to complete the online assessment.

Method 4: Course Assessment

Students in HUM1020 Introduction to Humanities courses were assigned an Aesthetic Experience Assignment that required students to attend a performance (e.g. dance concert, play, musical theater production, poetry reading, opera, musical performance, etc.) or an arts museum or gallery. Students are required to reflect and describe their experiences using the appropriate vocabulary for the area of the humanities appropriate to their experience and correctly identify the broad cultural context (eastern or western) to which the experience conformed. Instructors are given latitude on the length and format of the assignment as long as the core components are included.

Assessment Instrument: Aesthetic Experience Assignment

The assessment used is aligned to course outcomes and general education outcomes. Students must attend an event, performance, or museum outside of class and compose a written response and reflection on that experience by applying key concepts relevant to the humanistic discipline appropriate to their choice. When students attended a museum, they are required to choose a specific work of art to discuss. Students must demonstrate their ability to:

1. correctly apply the appropriate vocabulary and concepts;
2. correctly identify the work's basic elements of style and broad cultural context; and
3. demonstrate their critical thinking skills through written communication.

The faculty chose to use 2 different modified version of the AAC&U Global Learning Value Rubric. The modified rubrics were applied by an assessment committee after the student submissions were collected. The first rubric was a further

adaptation of the AAC&U Global Learning Rubric than what was used in the past, but the second rubric was the original rubric adapted from the AAC&U Global Learning Rubric and it was accidentally used by the new lead committee member. The collected pieces were divided among the committee (6 members in Fall2016-Spring2017 and 11 members for Spring 2019) and then evaluated based on the corresponding rubric for each of the semesters listed.

Population: The sample population for this assessment was 20% of the total sections of HUM1020 that ran in Fall 2016, Spring 2017, and Spring 2019 across all modalities (face-to-face, blended, and online).

Rubric: (Two Different Rubrics were used in these 3 semesters:

Rubric 1- was an adaptation of the first rubric used in Spring 2016 and changes were made based on the evaluation committee and committee leader. This rubric was used for evaluations of Fall 2016 and Spring 2017:

Level	Capstone	Milestone			Benchmark	Not Met
	4	3	2	1	0	
Learning outcome 1: The student will be able to distinguish the broad differences within artistic style periods.	For the artistic work under consideration, all of the following are identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, at least 3 of the following are identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, at least 2 of the following are identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, only 1 of the following is identified with evidence provided for choices: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	For the artistic work under consideration, none of the following are identified correctly: humanities discipline (visual, literary, performing, architecture, etc.), genre, medium, style	
Learning outcome 2: The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of the arts across disciplines.	The artistic work under consideration is strategically linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines in organized and clear way.	The artistic work under consideration is strategically linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines but the analysis lack organization or clarity.	The artistic work under consideration is partially linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines and the analysis may lack organization or clarity.	The artistic work under consideration is minimally linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts using at least two disciplines and the analysis may lack organized or clarity.	The artistic work under consideration is not linked to its social, historical, and cultural contexts.	
Learning outcome 3: The student will be able to identify characteristics of cultures in other nations.	Student demonstrates extensive cross-cultural knowledge by comparing the artistic work under consideration by identifying at least 3 characteristics in one other work from a different culture using extensive evidence.	Student demonstrates some cross-cultural knowledge by comparing the artistic work under consideration by identifying at least 3 characteristics in one other work from a different culture using evidence, but the discussion may lack organization or clarity.	Student demonstrates some cross-cultural knowledge by comparing the artistic work under consideration by identifying at least 2 characteristics in one other work from a different culture using evidence, or the discussion may lack organization or clarity.	Student demonstrates marginal cross-cultural knowledge by comparing the artistic work under consideration to one other work from a different culture but does not use evidence.	Student does not demonstrate cross-cultural knowledge because no comparison to one work from another culture is made.	

<p>Learning outcome 4:</p> <p>The student will be able to develop critical analysis skills in reference to works of human creative expression by applying basic vocabulary essential for communicating concepts in the humanities disciplines.</p>	<p>Student demonstrates their critical analysis skills by employing specialized vocabulary correctly through multiple and diverse examples.</p>	<p>Student demonstrates their critical analysis skills by employing specialized vocabulary correctly within their analysis but the examples maybe limited in scope and/or application.</p>	<p>Student makes use of some specialized vocabulary, but the critical analysis is not fully developed or the application of the terms needs some improvement.</p>	<p>Some specialized vocabulary is used but the application of the terms lacks accuracy and the student's analysis is underdeveloped</p>	<p>A critical analysis is not developed and/or no specialized vocabulary relating to the subject area is present in the analysis.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---

Rubric #2 – was used for evaluation of Spring 2019 semester evaluations and it was the first rubric used in Spring 2016 semester. This was an error on the new faculty lead for this project, but the department will be changing this rubric for future semesters:

Humanities Departmental Assessment Rubric					
	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met
	4	3	2	1	0
<p><u>Knowledge:</u> <u>Cultural worldview frameworks</u> LO 1: The student will be able to identify elements of style in various forms of western and non-western human creative expression.</p>	<p>The humanities discipline, genre, medium, style are correctly identified AND the Western vs. Non-Western classification is clearly identified with evidence provided.</p>	<p>At least three of the humanities discipline, genre, medium, style are correctly identified AND the Western vs. Non-Western classification is clearly identified with evidence provided.</p>	<p>At least two of the humanities discipline, genre, medium, style are correctly identified AND the Western vs. Non-Western classification is identified correctly with some evidence provided.</p>	<p>At least one of the humanities discipline, genre, medium, style are correctly identified AND/OR the Western vs. Non-Western classification is NOT identified correctly.</p>	<p>No correct identification of humanities discipline, genre, medium, style AND the Western vs. Non-Western classification is NOT identified correctly.</p>
<p><u>Skills:</u> <u>Application</u> LO 2: The student will be able to apply a basic vocabulary essential for communicating concepts in the humanities disciplines.</p>	<p>Specific and clear understanding of the subject's specialized vocabulary is synthesized throughout the analysis by at least three examples.</p>	<p>Specialized vocabulary is synthesized within the analysis by at least three examples but understanding of at least one of the terms needs some improvement.</p>	<p>Specialized vocabulary is used, but clear understanding is not fully demonstrated by at least three examples and/or the terms used need significant improvement.</p>	<p>Specialized vocabulary is used but it lacks at least three examples and does not demonstrate full understanding of the terms or their application.</p>	<p>No specialized vocabulary relating to the subject area is present in the analysis.</p>
<p><u>Knowledge:</u> <u>Cultural self-awareness</u> LO 3: The student will be able to identify how forms of Western and Non-Western human creative expressions</p>	<p>The chosen subject is strategically linked to social, historical, and cultural contexts while also identifying its relevance to the human condition in an organized and</p>	<p>The chosen subject is strategically linked to social, historical, and cultural contexts while also identifying its relevance to the human condition but needs some</p>	<p>The chosen subject is partially linked to social, historical, and cultural contexts while partially identifying its relevance to the human condition but needs significant</p>	<p>The chosen subject is only minimally linked to social, historical, and cultural contexts while minimally identifying its relevance to the human condition and needs</p>	<p>The chosen subject is not linked to social, historical, and cultural contexts with no indication of the relevance to the human condition.</p>

reflect the human condition.	clear way.	improvement on at least one of the requirements of organization or clarity.	improvement on at least one of the requirements of organization or clarity.	significant improvement on BOTH of the requirements of organization and clarity.	
<i>Skills: Perspective taking</i> LO 4: The student will be able to compare and contrast enduring contributions of individual artists, thinkers, and writers.	The analysis demonstrates excellence in scholarship and organization while providing a clear comparison to another enduring contribution or masterpiece using three specific examples to support the claims.	The analysis demonstrates good scholarship and organization while providing a plausible comparison to another enduring contribution or masterpiece using three specific examples to support the claims but at least one example needs some improvement.	The analysis demonstrates some scholarship and sufficient organization while providing some comparison to another enduring contribution or masterpiece using at least two specific examples to support the claims but needs significant improvement.	The analysis demonstrates little or no scholarship and lacks sufficient organization while providing some comparison to another enduring contribution or masterpiece using at least one specific example to support the claims and needs significant improvement.	The analysis demonstrates no scholarship and shows little or no organization while providing no comparison to another enduring contribution or masterpiece with no specific examples.
<i>Skills: Nonverbal communication</i> LO 5: The student will be able to develop critical analysis skills in reference to works of human creative expression.	The analysis demonstrates excellence in scholarship and organization while demonstrating critical thinking by expanding upon all minimum requirements.	The analysis demonstrates good scholarship and organization while demonstrating critical thinking by expanding upon most minimum requirements but needs some improvement on at least one of the requirements.	The analysis demonstrates some scholarship and sufficient organization while demonstrating some critical thinking by expanding upon most minimum requirements but needs significant improvement on at least one of the requirements.	The analysis demonstrates little or no scholarship and lacks sufficient organization while demonstrating some critical thinking by expanding upon some of the minimum requirements and needs significant improvement on at least two of the requirements.	The analysis does not meet the minimum writing requirements involving content or quantity.

III. Criteria for Success

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

Goal: A significant (at the alpha 0.05 level) positive change in means. Above Average (3 out of 5) means.

Method 2: Satisfaction data from Graduating Student Survey

Goal: Above average (4 out of 7) means.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

Goal: Students must score at least 70% to be successful.

Method 4: Course Assessment

Goal: Students must score at least 70% to be successful.

IV. Summary of Assessment Findings

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

--	--

Humanities Activities In which of the following activities do you participate? (5-point scale).	2015-16		
	Entering Mean	Graduating Mean	Mean Difference
Visiting an art museum	2.41	2.76*	+0.35
Creating a painting, sculpture or other work of visual art	2.88	2.94	+0.06
Attend a concert, dance performance or live drama	2.35	2.37	+0.02

Humanities Activities In which of the following activities do you participate? (5-point scale).	2016-17		
	Entering Mean	Graduating Mean	Mean Difference
Visiting an art museum	2.42	2.80*	+0.38
Attending a concert, dance performance or live drama	2.80	3.02*	+0.22
Creating a painting, sculpture or other work of visual art	2.30	2.45*	+0.15

Method 2: Satisfaction data from Graduating Student Survey

Graduating Student Survey - students' satisfaction with the preparedness they received at St. Petersburg College in "Humanities".	
Year	Mean (5-point scale)
2015-16	4.21
2016-17	4.21

Method 3: General Education Assessment

Students will demonstrate a greater appreciation of the arts.			
Competency	Form 1 (N=23)	Form 3 (N=29)	Form 5 (N=25)
	Number of students who answered correctly		
The student will	20 (87%)	26 (90%)	15 (60%)

be able to distinguish the broad differences within artistic style periods.			
The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of arts to the liberal arts and sciences.	18 (78%)	22 (76%)	11 (44%)
The student will be able to illustrate the interconnections of arts to the liberal arts and sciences.	16 (70%)	19 (68%)	21 (84%)

Method 4: Course Assessment

The following are the total results from the administered evaluations of this assessment according to each semester (more detailed results by modality, averages, etc. are attached to the report).

Fall 2016	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	Totals
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	18	52	65	34	6	175
LO - 2	15	54	53	47	8	177
LO - 3	5	16	12	41	105	179
LO - 4	23	55	50	41	7	176
Totals	61	177	180	163	126	

Spring 2017	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	Totals
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	25	54	75	41	14	209
LO - 2	14	52	70	53	23	212
LO - 3	7	15	20	23	143	208

LO - 4	24	52	71	40	23	210
Totals	70	173	236	157	203	

Spring 2019	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark	Not Met	Totals
	4	3	2	1	0	
LO - 1	84	84	53	67	16	304
LO - 2	84	87	77	37	20	305
LO - 3	72	88	54	49	43	306
LO - 4	65	90	68	52	28	303
LO - 5	58	102	78	44	22	304
Totals	363	451	330	249	129	

V. Discussion and Analysis of Assessment Findings

Method 1: Comparison Between Entering and Graduating Student Surveys

Comparisons between the Entering and Graduating Student Surveys indicated increases in each of the three categories, both years.

Method 2: Satisfaction data from Graduating Student Survey

When asked about their satisfaction with the preparedness they received at St. Petersburg College in "Humanities", students mean score (4.21) remained the same both years.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

The fall 2018 administration of the online general education assessment utilized three forms. For students completing forms 1 and 2, (68%-90%) responded correctly to the questions. The percent of students (44%-84%) responding correctly to questions in form 5, was lower.

Method 4: Course Assessment

This evaluation was a continuation of an assessment methodology that began in 2015-2016. These results were inconsistent from the Fall 2016-Spring 2017 results versus the Spring 2019 results. This may be because of a change in the rubric used (lead committee member error in Spring 2019) or because there were more evaluators for Spring 2019 with all of the full time Humanities faculty participating. Regardless, since the entire department was involved in this process, with even some help from an adjunct faculty member, the members of the department have decided to adjust the rubric again for future evaluations.

As the department viewed the results, Fall 2016-Spring 2017 results were skewed by a rubric that had included an updated wording of "Global focus" in the scoring, though many of the particular cultural experience assignment essays

that contributed to the pool of data did not have a “Global focus” as assigned by faculty. Scores for Learning Outcome 3 were consistently below the Benchmark. While it was determined in results from the Fall 2015-Spring 2016 evaluation that the “Global focus” element of this assessment would be shifted to REL 2300 (World Religions) because of similar results from past evaluations, the implementation of using an assignment from REL 2300 had not been put into practice yet. A new rubric for a REL 2300 assignment evaluation for the “Global focus” has been created and will be used as early as Fall semester 2019 evaluation.

The results for Spring 2019 seemed more balanced with the majority of the submissions evaluated at Capstone or Milestone level. However, this may be due to the old rubric applied or almost twice the evaluators as before. It may seem like an anomaly, but the numbers show a fair increase in submission meeting a high level of Capstone or Milestone. These results are promising and hopefully this trend continues in subsequent evaluations.

Furthermore, as a result of REL 2300 being used for evaluating the “Global focus”, the existing rubric for HUM 1020 needed to be adapted as well. Moving forward, the HUM 1020 rubric will not focus on any “Global focus” and the wording of that rubric will be edited so that it is adequately focused on the proper learning outcomes.

Also, we will more accurately aggregate the resulting data. Aggregates of each semester groups assessed in this report are as follows:

Fall 2016: n=707
Capstone – 8.6% achievement (4 point)
Milestones – 25% (3-point); 25.5% (2 point); combined 50.5% achievement
Benchmark - 23.1% achievement (1 point)
Not Met – 17.8% (0 point)

Spring 2017: n=839
Capstone – 8.3% achievement (4 point)
Milestones – 20.6% (3-point); 28.1% (2 point); combined 48.7% achievement
Benchmark – 18.7% achievement (1 point)
Not Met - 24.2% (0 point)

Spring 2019: n=1522
Capstone – 23.8% achievement (4 point)
Milestones – 29.6% (3-point); 21.7% (2 point); combined 51.3% achievement
Benchmark – 16.3% achievement (1 point)
Not Met – 8.5% (0 point)

It is hoped that these numbers will continue to increase with ongoing improvements in HUM 1020 standard course;

addition of REL 2300 standard course to data collection; revision of rubrics; and more understanding and participation by faculty in the next administration of this assessment, as shown with involvement with this particular assessment.

Action Plan

Category	Action Plan Detail / Implications	For PLO	Responsible Party / Due Date
D. Improve Assessment Methodology			
D4. Improve method of data collection & analysis			
	Moving forward, the HUM 1020 rubric will not focus on any "Global focus" and the wording of that rubric will be edited so that it is adequately focused on the proper learning outcomes.		Basil Moutsatsos Aug 2020
	Work with faculty to more accurately aggregate the resulting data.		Basil Moutsatsos Aug 2020

Evaluation of the Impact of Action Plan Items on Program Quality

This assessment is a major agenda item at each of our College-wide Humanities and Fine Arts Faculty meetings. We look at the data and the process, and are struggling together as a group to find the best way to improve how we assess what we do. Included in this discussion is a review of how we present the major learning outcomes for our students and how to make them relevant for students in a process of continuous improvement.

Approvals

Program Administrators:

Anthony LaPorte - Faculty
Basil Moutsatsos - Faculty
Erika Johnson-Lewis - Faculty

Approved by Basil Moutsatsos - Faculty on Feb 21, 2020

Educational Outcomes Coordinators:

Amy Eggers - Coord, Accredtn&BaccAssessment
Magaly Tymms - Assessment Director

Approved by Magaly Tymms - Assessment Director on Feb 21, 2020

Dean:

Barbara Hubbard - Acting Dean, Hum & Fine Arts

Approved by Barbara Hubbard - Acting Dean, Hum & Fine Arts on Feb 24, 2020

Senior Vice President:

Sabrina Crawford - AVP, Institutional Eff Acad Srv

Approved by Sabrina Crawford - AVP, Institutional Eff Acad Srv on Jul 6, 2020

St. Petersburg College
P.O. Box 13489
St. Petersburg FL 33733-3489

Having technical difficulties? [Contact us](#)

© 2023 St. Petersburg College | [Legal Notices](#)

St. Petersburg College is committed to equal access/equal opportunity in its programs, activities, and employment. For additional information visit www.spcollege.edu/eaao/. St. Petersburg College is an Equal Opportunity Employer. [Privacy Policy](#) | [Social Security Number usage](#) | [Site Disclaimer](#) | [Crime Reports](#) | [Campus Safety](#) | [Emergency Preparedness](#)

[Use this link to report accessibility issues on this page.](#)