



Oglala Lakota College
 Governance Committees
 General Education Committee Strategic Planning
 Report
 2014-2015

Number of meetings held	Number in attendance	Number of subcommittees
3	6-9	N/A

Goal 1: Assess one general education outcome per semester

Objective A	Assess General Education Outcome 4 (Apply quantitative analytical skills) in the Fall 2014 semester.
Measurement Tool (who, What, when, how?)	Rubrics with scores; General Education Fall 2014 Report
Measurement Goal	Artifacts are collected from multiple general education and program-level courses; At least two academic departments are involved in the scoring.
Findings results	<p>165 Artifacts were received from 6 courses from 4 departments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math 103: 98 artifacts received (Math and Science Department; general education course) • Math 154: 39 (Math and Science Department; program-level course) • Nurs 312: 11 (Nursing Department; program-level course) • SoSc 313: 7 (Humanities and Social Science Department; program-level course) • ANTH 433: 8 (Humanities and Social Science Department; program-level course) • ED 489: 2 (Humanities and Social Science Department; program-level course) <p>Scoring took place on 2/13/2015 by 9 individuals representing 4 departments (Math and Science, Nursing, Education, and Humanities and Social Science), the Assessment Office, and the Vice President for Instruction</p>
Data Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The measurement goals for this objective have been met. • How to analyze overall scores from a variety of assignments was unclear. This was improved for the Spring 2015 general education assessment. • Most artifacts did not allow assessment of Wolakolkiciyapi.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long comprehensive exams may not be the best suitable for general education assessment. Selection of key tasks from the long exams was effective.
Action/Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Assessment Academy Team (AAT) should collaborate with the Lakota Studies Department to provide guidance to all departments regarding inclusion of Wolakolkiciyapi. • Shorter assignments (e.g. homework assignments) should be considered as artifacts in place of long assignments (especially with regard to quantitative reasoning). • The description of the assignments needs to be requested with the artifacts (GEO 4 artifacts should also include an answer key or corrections). • Student names should be removed from the artifact to allow blind scoring. • The AAT needs to request that artifacts are submitted numbered no later than one week before the scoring session. Random sampling should be conducted prior to the meeting. • Quantitative Reasoning rubric: Add the scores (including 0); clarify “Interpretation”; define the different levels; consider widening the scope of the rubric so it is of more use to assignments that do not focus only on quantitative reasoning. • GEO rubrics need to be completed prior to the beginning of the semester in which a certain GEO is assessed.

Objective B	Assess General Education Outcome 3 (Demonstrate oral communication skills in both Lakota and English) in the Spring 2015 semester.
Measurement Tool (who. What, when, how?)	Rubrics with scores; General Education Spring 2015 Report
Measurement Goal	Artifacts are collected from multiple general education and program-level courses; At least two academic departments are involved in the scoring.
Findings results	<p>95 Artifacts were received from 5 courses from 3 departments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SpCm 103: 76 artifacts received (Humanities and Social Science Department; general education course) • Lak 103: 9 (Lakota Studies Department; general education course) • SpCm 233: 2 (Humanities and Social Science Department; program-level course) • SpCm 433: 3 (Humanities and Social Science Department; program-level course) • ECH 233: 5 (Education Department; program-level course) <p>Scoring took place on 5/20/2015 by 6 individuals representing 3 departments (Humanities and Social Science, Lakota Studies, and Education) and the Assessment Office.</p>
Data Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The measurement goals for this objective have been met.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEO 3 analysis is limited because no recordings were collected. Looking at the written portion only can result in lower ratings. • First-time members of the ad-hoc scoring group described having benefitted from participating in the scoring as it helped them gain better understanding of the assessment process. • Evaluation of Wolakolkiciyapi was not possible for the majority of artifacts. • GEO 3 rubric: There is too much focus on the written aspect instead of on oral communication. The current rubric therefore does not adequately measure oral communication. In addition, there is no element focusing on the content of a speech/presentation.
Action/Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to accurately assess oral communication skills, audio-visual or at least audio recordings of the speeches/presentations are necessary. This may cause some logistical difficulties such as providing technical assistance to all instructors. However, students can benefit from being able to review their own speech. • The description of the assignments needs to be requested from the departments. • The GEO 3 rubric should be revised to place more emphasis on oral instead of written communication and an element regarding quality of content needs to be added. • The departments need to be reminded at the beginning of the semester which GEO is assessed and a reminder needs to be sent in the second half of the semester. • The GEO rubric should be developed in a collaborative effort of the different departments that offer courses that are assessed. • Scoring the artifacts during the following semester instead of right at the end of the semester should be considered. Giving the scorers time between grading, departmental assessment activities and the general education scoring may result in more constructive input. • Include “new scorers” each semester so more faculty members gain insight into the general education assessment process.

Overall Recommendations to Presidents Council and OLC BOT :	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general education assessment processes have evolved drastically over the past twelve months. Nonetheless, the absence of a person who is able to devote sufficient time to leading the general education assessment process has negatively impacted the general education assessment activities in the Spring 2015 semestre. It is expected that hiring a General Education Faculty Director will solve this problem. If no suitable candidate is found for this position, it is recommended that a reduction of work-load is given to the person taking over the lead. • It is essential that general education assessment continues to be conducted collaboratively, including rubric development and scoring. • It is recommended that at the beginning of the 2015-2016 academic year, the Vice President of Instruction, the Assessment Director, the General Education Faculty Director and the Assessment Committee meet to discuss division of responsibilities.