

Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER)  
**GENERAL EDUCATION**

<b>Fiscal Year:</b>	FY2017
<b>Prepared By:</b>	René Bruckner, Full Time Faculty / General Education Curriculum Coordinator

**Overview**

The General Education program is assessed according to the following General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) and department outcomes.

- GELO 1: Command of written language, expressive form, structure, and rhetorical strategies for precise and persuasive written communications.
- GELO 2: Facility with oral communication to convey meaning and information, to engage in productive dialogue/debate, and to present ideas persuasively.
- GELO 3: Capacity to recognize the need for research, to locate information, to evaluate it, and to employ it effectively and ethically.
- GELO 4: Proficiency in mathematics and statistical analysis to interpret quantitative information; understanding of the power and limitations of quantitative data in real-world settings.
- GELO 5: Command of critical thinking, based in the habit of exploring ideas, issues, and evidence in formulating conclusions, responses, or plans for action.

**Assessment Methods**

- GELOs: Review student work. Assign a score based on the GELO rubric.  
 Goal: > 2.5 or above      0 = Not Present  
    1 = Initial  
    2 = Emerging  
    3 = Developed  
    4 = Highly Developed

**GELO 1: Command of written language, expressive form, structure, and rhetorical strategies for precise and persuasive written communications.**

<b>SP17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
<b>Course</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b># of Students Measured</b>	<b>Average score</b>
GH101 Writers Workshop	1 <sup>st</sup> year	14	2.3
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	40	2.9
GH376 MP History: Fr New Wave	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	23	2.95
GS362 Social Problems	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	8	2.25
<b>SU17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
<b>Course</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b># of Students Measured</b>	<b>Average score</b>
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	21	2.86
GH189 The Hero's Journey	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	3	2
GH304 Mythology & Symbolism	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	8	3.38

**GELO 2: Facility with oral communication to convey meaning and information, to engage in productive dialogue/debate, and to present ideas persuasively.**

<b>SP17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
<b>Course</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b># of Students Measured</b>	<b>Average score</b>
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	40	3.2
GH376 MP History: Fr New Wave	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	23	3
F335 Production Workshop 3	4 <sup>th</sup> year	28	2.6
<b>SU17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			

Course	Cohort	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	21	2.81
GH189 The Hero's Journey	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	3	3
GH304 Mythology & Symbolism	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	8	3.06
F335 Production Workshop 3	4 <sup>th</sup> year	17	2.74

**GELO 3: Capacity to recognize the need for research, to locate information, to evaluate it, and to employ it effectively and ethically.**

SP17			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
Course	Cohort	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH101 Writers Workshop	1 <sup>st</sup> year	13	2.5
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	40	2.9
GH376 MP History: Fr New Wave	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	23	2.7
GS362 Social Problems	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	8	3
SU17			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
Course	Cohort	# of Students Measured	Average score
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	21	2.90
GH189 The Hero's Journey	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	3	3.33
GH304 Mythology & Symbolism	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	8	3.25

**GELO 4: Proficiency in mathematics and statistical analysis to interpret quantitative information; understanding of the power and limitations of quantitative data in real-world settings.**

<b>SP17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
<b>Course</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b># of Students Measured</b>	<b>Average score</b>
GN105A Math Essentials	1 <sup>st</sup> year	17	2.65
GN329: Minerals, Crystals, and Gems	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	15	3.1

  

<b>SU17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
<b>Course</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b># of Students Measured</b>	<b>Average score</b>
GN105A Math Essentials	1 <sup>st</sup> year	6	3.58
GN280 The History of Life	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	6	3.67

**GELO 5: Command of critical thinking, based in the habit of exploring ideas, issues, and evidence in formulating conclusions, responses, or plans for action.**

<b>SP17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
<b>Course</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b># of Students Measured</b>	<b>Average score</b>
GH101 Writers Workshop	1 <sup>st</sup> year	14	2.6
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	40	2.9
GS362 Social Problems	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	8	2.9
F335 Production Workshop 3	4 <sup>th</sup> year	28	2.6

  

<b>SU17</b>			
Goal: > 2.5 or above			
<b>Course</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b># of Students Measured</b>	<b>Average score</b>
GH152A History of Crit. Analysis	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	21	3.09
GH189 The Hero's Journey	1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> year	3	3.33

GH304 Mythology & Symbolism	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year	8	3.69
GN280 The History of Life	2 <sup>nd</sup> year	6	3.83
F335 Production Workshop 3	4 <sup>th</sup> year	17	2.76

*(Scroll down for Summary)*



Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER)  
**GENERAL EDUCATION**

**ANNUAL SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS**

<b>Fiscal Year:</b>	FY2017	<b>Date Prepared:</b>	2/26/18
<b>Campus:</b>	Hollywood	<b>Date Submitted:</b>	2/27/18
<b>Prepared By:</b>	René Bruckner	<b>Title:</b>	Full Time Faculty/ General Education Curriculum Coordinator

<b>Summary Comments:</b>	<p>CCH’s GE program underwent sweeping changes during 2017. In the following summary, those changes are broken up into four main areas: (1) Program Assessment procedures and the GELOs; (2) Faculty Qualifications and Development; (3) Curriculum Development; and (4) Support and Resources outside of the classroom.</p> <p>(1) <b>Program Assessment.</b> In January of 2017, under the guidance of Lex Sanderson, we began drafting a new set of General Education Learning Outcomes to replace the existing set. The result was a set of five outcomes, written to align with the five Core Competencies, one competency per outcome: Written Communication, Oral Communication, Information Literacy, Quantitative Reasoning, and Critical Thinking. Along with the outcomes, I researched performance indicators for each core competency and drafted a list of indicators, plus sub-indicators, for each GELO. Starting in February, I proceeded to hold small group meetings of faculty who teach GE courses, where the GELOs and performance indicators were discussed; the goal of the meetings was to determine which 2 indicators for each GELO would be the most beneficial for CCH’s assessment process to include. After the GE faculty had all weighed in, in Feb</p>
--------------------------	--

and March I held several meetings with non-GE faculty who weighed in on the same question. The results of all this string of meetings was a simple pair of indicators for each GELO which would then be scored by instructors in select courses. I created a complete rubric for indicators A and B of each GELO explaining what a 0-4 score should mean. Those rubrics are attached to simple score sheets that come with the course roster included. The GELO data reported in the quarterly IER derives from this process.

**(2) Faculty Excellence and Development.** This category covers two aspects of faculty excellence:

(A) Faculty Excellence. Numerous new adjuncts were hired for GE courses, partly because of the growing population and increase in sections, but also because of an initiative to improve the ratio of faculty with terminal degrees (PhD, MFA, JD, EdD). At the end of 2017, here are the numbers of faculty who teach GE courses:

Total GE faculty: 30  
Total with terminal degrees: 22 (4 PhD, 17 MFA, 1 JD)

New-to-GE faculty (2017): 15  
New-to-GE w/ terminal deg's: 14

In addition to improving the above ratio, observations of GE classes were done on a regular basis, to assess the course design and the quality of instruction. Feedback is given to instructors about both of those aspects, with the goal of leading to overall improved teaching.

Another broad issue that arose in 2017 was that of classroom time devoted to screening of films and other media (a large portion of the college's Humanities courses fall under the film/media history, criticism, and appreciation category and typically involve significant screening time). The concern was that instructors who give significant portions of their class meeting time to

screenings are not able to cover enough content. I called a meeting of the relevant course instructors to address the issue, and out of the meeting came a dual result: (a) the faculty reinforced the value and necessity of holding in-class screenings; and (b) the group considered and adopted a set of best-practices for maximizing instruction time before, during, and after screening media in class (notes and post-meeting surveys are available).

(B) Faculty Development. Faculty members are required to improve their teaching through trainings and workshops that are included as part of their annual Faculty Development plans. CCH holds a Faculty Development Day during each break between quarters, giving our adjunct and full-time GE instructors a chance to learn in various areas. Over the past year, the topics relevant to GE instructors were: Canvas (online tool) trainings at beginning and intermediate levels; WASC Core Competencies Info Session and Workshop; Designing Courses on a Point System; Student Affairs Case Studies; Designing Research Assignments; Fake News & Info Literacy; Communicating with Students: Case Studies & Best Practices; Effective Classroom Critiques; Variety Insight & Library Resources; Syllabus Workshop; Maximum GE (teaching and measuring the GELOs); Program Learning Outcomes Workshop for the Cinema Major; Writing Your Teaching Philosophy; and Academic Integrity Information Session & Workshop. See the Faculty Development IER for more details.

(3) **Curriculum Development.** During 2017, as the GELO-based assessment process was being developed, the GE instructors also worked on course development in conjunction with the GE curriculum coordinator. That work proceeded in a few ways: rewriting existing CLOs, reworking existing syllabi, and developing new courses (syllabi and CLOs). The process has resulted in a vast improvement in the consistency and standardization of courses, both across multiple sections of the same



	<p>course, and across the college's curriculum as a whole.</p> <p>Relatedly, a Syllabus Workshop was included in the Fall 2017 Faculty Development Day to educate instructors on the more rigorous expectations for what is included in a syllabus. This measure functions in tandem with other Faculty Development workshops listed above, such as the Maximum GE, which focused on teaching with the core competencies/GELOs in mind.</p> <p>(4) <b>Support and Resources.</b> To bolster support/resources for students on campus, the Writing Lab was created in Spring 2017. It is meant to make assistance available for any type of writing assignment, and is staffed by one of the school's composition instructors (this is in contrast to the tutoring program, staffed by students). Hours were expanded in Summer 2017 because the demand was high, and the expanded hours were kept the same in Fall 2017.</p>
<p><b>Plans for Improvement:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Continue hiring instructors with PhDs:</b> For the GE curriculum, the ratio of instructors with a terminal degree is moving in a positive direction, but many of these are MFAs. Hiring goal is to hire more faculty with PhDs in Humanities, Science, and Social/Behavioral Science fields.</li> <li>• <b>GELO trend:</b> The GELO assessment process was completely overhauled in 2017. As a new process, it showed need for improvement as it began to be implemented. For one thing, the score sheets were found to be overly complicated at first, so they've been simplified and time has been taken individually to go over the philosophy behind them.</li> </ul> <p>More significantly, the GELO scores show that the faculty doing the scoring had inconsistent levels of expectations. Some instructors have expressed confusion over the overarching goal of GELO assessment. Since some of them were accustomed to scoring CLOs for their courses every quarter, their first attempt to score GELOs was approached with the standards/expectations of their individual courses in mind, as in CLO scoring, rather than those of the 4-year program as a whole. The inconsistent understanding became clear in one FDD workshop (Maximum GE) and plans are underway to hold a follow-up (perhaps at a future FDD) to work on getting the GE</p>

instructors on the same page (i.e., to raise awareness that, for lower level courses, students may do well on the CLOs but still be lacking in some or all of the GELOs, which are geared toward the eventual goal at graduation, and that is not a sign of any shortcomings on the student's and/or instructor's part).

Lastly, the choice of which courses to measure needs more thought. A more rigorous mechanism for determining this, like an annual cycle (wheel), would provide more consistent data over time.

• **Curriculum:** In the above-mentioned GELO meetings as well as in other meetings and one-on-one conferences with faculty, two major concerns frequently arise: the student body's overall skill level in written communications and, relatedly, information literacy. This has led to a significant amount of thought and planning for the upcoming new program. We have taken some initial measures to shore up the existing program (two examples include: (i) multiple meetings with all of the composition faculty to rework the syllabi and coursework—in particular, for the core composition courses, College Writing and Writer's Workshop; and (ii) the addition of a new course, The Hero's Journey, focused on literary analysis/criticism, with a focus on composition, to offer in place of courses in general Humanities and Western Civilization). However, numerous faculty have expressed that these are only stopgap measures, and the consensus is that more fundamental structural changes, especially at the lower level, are necessary. It seems likely that the GELO data will begin to show this set of problems more clearly as we improve on the above-mentioned issue of inconsistent approach to scoring.