General Education Action Update

For

Humanities Learning Outcomes

May 2011

Humanities – GE: 2010 program review	
1. Hold a meeting with the Humanities faculty to discuss the results of this assessment, giving particular focus to the results for Outcome #2 (outcomes #3 and #4 in the assessment). Why are students scoring poorly on this learning outcome? Why was this outcome less likely to be represented in the assignments being assessed? Is this still an appropriate outcome? If yes, how can the learning outcome be addressed more explicitly in courses? Is the language of the outcome inaccessible to students, and thus difficult to assess? Students were less able to see enduring human concerns than changes in the human condition. How can we help students see the universality of the human condition in the works studied?	All of the Humanities' department chairs were given a summary of the results
2. For future Humanities assessments, the student survey should not include Question #1, and questions #9 and #10 need to be reworded to better communicate the learning outcome reflected in the questions.	This is relevant for future assessments
3. For future Humanities assessments, ask faculty to submit student work for an assessment conducted by a group of Humanities faculty. This will allow for better consistency among evaluators and also diminishes the effect of ego or bias.	This is relevant for future assessments
4. For future Humanities assessments, revise the assessment rubric so that the first outcome says "Student is able to analyze, interpret, and evaluate human intellectual and/or imaginative creations including the context of their production" and the second outcome reads "Student is able to appreciate human intellectual and/or imaginative creations, including the context of their production." This wording will cause less confusion for faculty assessing student work.	This is relevant for future assessments