Component I - Course Selection Process

A. Describe the institution's process for ensuring that each course aligns with the Foundational Component Area description and includes the required Core Objectives.

The responsibility of ensuring course alignment with the Foundational Component Areas and inclusion of Core Objectives resides with the General Education Core Committee (GECC) made up of faculty representing a wide range of disciplines and other professionals such as library and Student Success Center staff.  GECC recommendations regarding general education courses are forwarded to the Curriculum Committee (CC) that has the authority to approve and implement instructional policy.  The CC Chair is the Vice President of Academic Affairs who has the authority to enforce instructional policy.  Subsequently, General Education Core Policy becomes part of the college catalog that is approved annually by the college's Board of Trustees.

Specifically, the core course review process is as follows: For a course to be considered for the core, a written application is made to the GECC. To qualify for consideration in the core, the course must:

1. Appear in the current Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM)
2. Be in a discipline area that aligns with a Foundation Component Area
3. Be general in nature and not narrowly focused on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession
4. Indicate via its master syllabus the Core Objectives that will be covered (introduced, reinforced, and/or applied); the assessment plan to be followed for each Core Objective; and the Core Assignment(s) and related weight(s) for course evaluation purposes

Course applications originate from academic departments or faculty members.  If the application meets the initial scrutiny of the GECC chair, it is placed on the committee's agenda as an action item and a representative of the applicable discipline appears before the GECC and presents the case for the course's inclusion General Education Core.  If approved by the GECC, the application is placed on the Curriculum Committee agenda as an action item.  If approved, the course is added to the list of core courses and, as required, submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). The Vice President of Academic Affairs is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all the above steps are followed and for following up assure that full implementation of all aspects of the course's compliance with General Education Core requirements. The process as described above was followed in designing the core curriculum presently under consideration for approval by THECB staff and will be used in future for additions, deletions, and other course changes to the core curriculum.

Component II - Core Objective Assessment Plan

A. Describe the institution's process to determine the appropriate level of attainment of each core objective.

SWTJC's process to determine the appropriate level of attainment of each Core Objective is based on five assessment method types.

1.  The primary direct assessment method relies on student work samples, hereafter referred to as "artifacts."   Assessment artifacts are the products of classroom Core Assignments that represent authentic student effort.  Artifacts may take the form of embedded activities or observable performances.  Artifacts are assessed in a juried process using institutionally common, unmodified LEAP Value rubrics[1].  Results of the assessment are then analyzed by the General Education Core Assessment Committee (GECAC) to set levels of attainment.  Specifically, the process follows these steps for each Core Objective:

    1)  Faculty in associated core courses make a Core Assignment and collect the resulting artifact.  Collection of core assignments vary depending of their type; specifically,
        i.   Written core assignments embedded in final exams are completed using the Prosper Scantron System.
        ii.  All remaining written core assignments are completed using CampusCruiser.
        iii. Oral communication core assignments where applicable are performed in the presence of Oral Communication Assessment Team members who perform assessment in situ.
    2)  Faculty evaluate the artifact and assign a grade to boost assessment validity.
    3)  Embedded artifacts are scanned and stored digitally for later retrieval. Performance-based artifacts are recorded electronically as required and stored digitally.
    4)  In early summer of each year, multidisciplinary faculty teams utilize LEAP Value Rubrics in calibrated, juried assessment of the artifacts randomly sampled from the current year's core completers.  Both dimension (line-item) and aggregate ratings are reported.  A minimum of 100 artifacts are sampled.
    5)  With assistance from the Office of Assessment, the GECAC conducts a detailed review and analysis of artifact ratings giving consideration to (1) results of past SWTJC LEAP-based assessments, (2) comparable external benchmarks from peer colleges[2], and (3) comparable external benchmarks from national results.[3]
    6)  Based on this review, the GECAC
        i.   Reports the "current level of attainment" as the percent of students in the sample that have scored N or higher where N is the target score for the

---

[1] American Association of Colleges and Universities; see http://www.aacu.org/leap/.

[2] SWTJC is a charter member of the LEAP Texas Initiative from which collaboration is hoped that comparative data can be shared between peer institutions.

[3] E.g., Voluntary System of Accountability public institutions use Value Rubrics. (Rhodes & Finley, 2013, p. 6)

designated Value Rubric. The initial target score N is 2 for all Value Rubrics and is subject to change as improvements warrant.[4]

   ii. Determines and reports the recommended "target level of attainment" as the percent xx of students scoring a N or higher on (designated) LEAP Value rubric. The initial target level of attainment is 70%.

7) Results are reported to the Curriculum Committee and to faculty. Faculty identify areas of success and areas needing improvement. Interventions in Unit Action Plans are introduced or adjusted accordingly.

2. The secondary direct assessment method uses embedded examination questions for some Core Objectives. In many disciplines, the questions are embedded in the common final examination in the course. Questions while often objective (multiple-choice format) are designed to address higher order such as analysis and synthesis of information, not just the regurgitation of factual content. The level of attainment is determined as the "percent of students who respond correctly to 75% of the questions, assuming a minimum of four questions." The test instrument's answer sheet is capable of collecting electronically both objective and subjective (written) formats offering the possibility of mixed closed- and open-ended responses. The inclusion of "gripe sheets" is encouraged because it allows students to take issue with particular questions, thereby demonstrating deeper thinking. (Leskes & Wright, 2005, p. 40) The results of all embedded examination questions are collected electronically and stored for easy access and analysis by faculty who identify areas of success and areas needing improvement. Interventions in Unit Action Plans are introduced or adjusted accordingly.

3. The tertiary direct assessment method utilizes the Educational Testing Services Proficiency Profile (ETSPP) to provide assessment data for some Core Objectives. Specifically, ETSPP provides both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores, the latter designating proficient, marginal and not proficient for three skill areas: critical thinking, written communication and math (empirical/quantitative). Specifically, the process follows these steps:

1) The ETSPP is given to associate level graduates in the spring of each even-numbered year.

2) With assistance from the Office of Assessment, the GECAC conducts a detailed review and analysis of ETSPP results giving consideration to (1) results of past ETSPP assessments, (2) comparable results from peer colleges, and (3) comparable results from method 1 above.

3) Based on this review, the GECAC

   i. Reports the "current level of attainment" as the percent of students in the sample rated "proficient."

---

[4] Recommended range for community college associate degree completers is 2 to 3. (Rhodes & Finley, 2013, p. 6)

        ii. Determines and reports the recommended "target level of attainment" as the percent xx of students rated "proficient."  The initial target level of attainment is 50%.

    4) Results are reported to the Curriculum Committee and to faculty. Faculty identify areas of success and areas needing improvement.  Interventions in Unit Action Plans are introduced or adjusted accordingly.

4. The Graduating Student Survey (GSS) provides an indirect assessment method that complements and informs the direct assessment methods above.  Survey questions are tailored to help identify problem areas, provide useful information on what students think they have learned, and assess certain implicit qualities of student learning, such as values, feelings, perceptions, and attitudes, from a variety of perspectives. (Leskes & Wright, 2005, p. 15)

    1) The GSS is given to all graduates when they apply for graduation..

    2) With assistance from the Office of Assessment, the GECAC conducts a detailed review and analysis of GSS results based on (1) trends from past GSS assessments, (2) correlation of survey responses to directly measured Core Objective assessment results, and (3) observable patterns of responses, particularly those of a negative character.

    3) Based on this review, the GECAC forwards written recommendations to the Curriculum Committee and to faculty who use the information to design more effective Unit Action Plans.

5. The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) is a commercial product that provides an indirect assessment method complementing and supplementing the direct assessment methods above.  CCSSE is a survey administered to students that assesses institutional practices and student behaviors that are correlated highly with student learning and student retention.  The GECAC can add questions to the CCSSE to strengthen its usefulness in indirectly assessing Core Objectives.  As with the GSS above,   CCSSE survey questions help identify problem areas, provide useful information on what students think they have learned, and assess certain implicit qualities of student learning, such as values, feelings, perceptions, and attitudes, from a variety of perspectives.

    1) The CCSSE is given to randomly selected sample of students during the spring term of even-numbered years.

    2) With assistance from the Office of Assessment, the GECAC conducts a detailed review and analysis of CCSSE results based on (1) trends from past CCSSE assessments, (2) correlation of survey responses to directly measured Core Objective assessment results, and (3) observable patterns of responses, particular those of a negative character.

    3) Based on this review, the GECAC forwards written recommendations to the Curriculum Committee and to faculty who use the information to design more effective Unit Action Plans.

In summary, the level of attainment for each Core Objective is determined by a broad-based committee, the GECAC, relying mainly on direct assessment of student work using LEAP Value rubrics; reinforced by embedded examination questions and the ETSPP; and informed by two indirect survey measures, the GSS and CCSSE.

B. Describe the institution's plan for assessment of each core objective.

I. Overview of SWTJC Institutional Assessment Plan

SWTJC considers general education an instructional program thus bringing it into the regular program assessment, review, and planning practices of the college.[5].  General education is designated the "General Studies Program" for which the "General Education Core Certificate" is the official award.  The General Studies Program curriculum has a set of student learning outcomes (SLO's) that , by design, directly parallel the required Core Objectives; namely,

1. Demonstrate critical thinking skills
2. Demonstrate written, oral, and visual communication skills
3. Demonstrate empirical and quantitative skills
4. Work effectively in a team
5. Demonstrate personal responsibility
6. Demonstrate social responsibility

The General Studies Program curriculum consists of a set of core courses from different disciplines.  Each core course aligns with a Foundation Component Area and addresses at least three SLO's (Core Objectives); namely, nos. 1 and 2 plus at least one of the remaining nos. 4 through 7.  In addition, a semester credit hour (SCH) requirement is met within each Foundation Core Area.  Refer to Table I - "General Studies Program Curriculum Matrix" that provides an efficient way of displaying this information.

All matters relating to the assessment of General Studies Program SLO's (Core Objectives) are handled by the General Education Core Assessment Committee (GECAC).   Members are appointed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and represent a wide range of disciplines including as a minimum those represented by core courses.  The specific areas of responsibility for the GECAC are listed below.  For each Core Objective, the GECAC is charged to develop, implement and manage an assessment plan that addresses the following elements:

1. Direct and indirect assessment methods
2. Levels of attainment and targets
3. Analysis and reporting of assessment results
4. Action and follow-up

II. Description of Core Assessment Plan Elements

---

[5] These practices were subject to SACS review in 2010.  No issues were identified.

Table II is an outline of SWTJC's Core Curriculum Assessment Plan for each Core Objective. Below are general considerations that apply to the plan.

1. Assessment methods - Five different assessment methods are employed in the plan, three are direct and two are indirect. For each Core Objective, a minimum of three measures are required; at least one direct measure and one indirect measure. Two direct measures are preferred. These assessment methods are described below.

    1) Core Assignments are embedded in all core courses and produce artifacts assessable using LEAP Value rubrics. Core Assignments for specific courses course are identified in the "Core Assignment" section of master syllabi. Core course master syllabi can be linked from the General Studies Program Curriculum Matrix in the "URL Link" section of this application. The annual timeline for artifact-based assessment is as follows:

        i. Fall and spring terms - Core Assignments in all core courses produce artifacts that are collected electronically.
        ii. Early June - Faculty teams assemble at the annual Assessment Summit to conduct juried assessment of artifacts collected from core completers. A minimum of 100 artifacts constitute a suitable sample size.
        iii. Mid-August - GECAC reviews and analyzes juried assessment results, consolidates it with other assessment results, and includes it in the annual Core Objective Assessment Report. The report along with GECAC recommendations related to Core Objective attainment is distributed to the Curriculum Committee and faculty for inclusion in Unit Action Planning.

    At SWTJC, as with most community colleges, a student's course taking sequence cannot be tightly controlled. The expectation that core courses will be taken in an order that provides a sequence of coherent learning experiences is not realistic. Nor is it realistic to expect all core courses to provide a comprehensive learning experience for the Core Objectives in their respective Foundation Component Areas. To address this issue requires a carefully orchestrated approach. The following general steps are followed:

        i. Artifacts are sufficiently standard to be ratable using the appropriate LEAP Value Rubric, yet general enough to accommodate the differing disciplines across Foundation Component Areas.
        ii. An assignment that produces an artifact must fit unobtrusively in the core course and, at the same time, be doable with the knowledge and skill level of students in the course. To accomplish this, both instructors and students need specific guidance. For each Core Objective, two

LibGuides[6] are available through the college library's online information services.  The Instructor LibGuide provides information for designing a Core Assignment that will produce an artifact that meets the requirements of the given LEAP Value Rubric.  It also provides insight into introducing and reinforcing student learning for the Core Objective <u>within</u> the context of the course and <u>without</u> encroaching on the course's content. Example Core Assignments from various disciplines are provided. The Student LibGuide provides lessons and examples covering the basic knowledge and skills the student must have to produce the given Core Objective artifact.  In effect, it serves as an online resource that the instructor can assign in conjunction with classroom preparation before making the assignment.

iii. According to Rhodes and Finley, artifacts (e-portfolio evidence) "should be purposeful collections of student work, scaffolded and organized around learning outcomes at progressively more levels of accomplishment." (Rhodes and Finley, p. 34)  To that end, Core Assignments are given and artifacts collected from <u>all</u> students in <u>all</u> core courses <u>whenever</u> and <u>wherever</u> offered.  While this may seem at first a burdensome request of faculty, it should be remembered that Core Assignments by design should be unobtrusively embedded in the course. If this is not the possible, then it raises the question, "Is the core course really appropriate to address the Core Objective?"  At the institution level, carefully planned use of technology eases the burden considerably.

2) Questions are embedded in examinations is some core courses.  Common final examinations are frequently used.  Processing of the examinations is automated including scanning, storing electronically, and applying the assessment rubric. The assessment rubric defines the success criteria for each Core Objective as 75% of the questions pertaining to that objective answered correctly.  A minimum of four questions is required for each Core Objective.  The percent value in the success criteria is subject to change as improvements warrant.  The annual timeline for embedded question assessment is as follows:
   i. Fall and spring terms - Examinations given and scanned as scheduled.
   ii. Mid-August - GECAC reviews and analyzes stored assessment results, consolidates it with other assessment results, and includes it in the annual Core Objective Assessment Report.  The report along with GECAC recommendations related to Core Objective attainment is distributed to the Curriculum Committee and faculty for inclusion in Unit Action Planning.

---

[6] For more information on LibGuides, see http://springshare.com/libguides/.

3) Commercial testing utilizing the ETS Proficiency Profile provides a secondary direct measure. Both normed and criteria referenced data is provided for analysis. The timeline for commercial testing is as follows:

    i. Spring term even numbered years - The ETS Proficiency Profile is given to applicants for graduation in the spring of even numbered years.

    ii. Early June - ETS Proficiency Profile results are collected and a report is prepared by the Office of Assessment.

    iii. Mid-August - GECAC reviews and analyzes ETS Proficiency Profile results, consolidates it with other assessment results, and includes it in the annual Core Objective Assessment Report. The report along with GECAC recommendations related to Core Objective attainment is distributed to the Curriculum Committee and faculty for inclusion in Unit Action Planning.

4) The Graduating Student Survey provides indirect assessment that complements and informs the direct assessment methods above. The timeline for the Graduating Student Survey (GSS) is as follows:

    i. Year round - Students applying for graduation at any time must complete the GSS.

    ii. Mid July - The Office of Planning and Research collects results from the previous year's GSS then compiles it into the Graduating Student Survey Report.

    iii. Mid-August - GECAC uses the reported survey data to complement and inform direct assessment results that in turn are used to produce the annual Core Objective Assessment Report. The report along with GECAC recommendations related to Core Objective attainment is distributed to the Curriculum Committee and faculty for inclusion in Unit Action Planning.

5) The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) provides indirect assessment that complements and informs the direct assessment methods above. The timeline for the Graduating Student Survey is as follows:

    i. Spring term even numbered years - The CCSSE is given to randomly selected students during the spring term of even numbered years.

    ii. Mid July - The Office of Planning and Research collects current CCSSE data and produces Graduating Student Survey Report that includes both current survey results and trends based on with past CCSSE results.

    iii. Mid-August - GECAC uses the reported survey data to complement and inform direct assessment results that in turn are used to produce the annual Core Objective Assessment Report. The report along with GECAC recommendations related to Core Objective attainment is distributed to the Curriculum Committee and faculty for inclusion in Unit Action Planning.

2. Levels of Attainment/Targets - As previously discussed, levels of attainment pertain to direct methods of assessment and are complemented and informed by indirect methods of assessment. All Core Outcomes are subject to three or more assessment methods, at least one direct and one indirect method. The methods include the following:
   1) Direct
      i. Juried assessment of Core Assignment artifacts using LEAP Value Rubrics
      ii. Embedded examination questions frequently part of common core course final examinations
      iii. ETS Proficiency Profile
   2) Indirect
      i. Graduating Student Survey
      ii. Community College Survey of Student Engagement

   Refer to Table II for specific details about the methods employed for each Core Outcome. Except for the use of LEAP rubrics, several years of results exist. Use of LEAP rubrics began in 2012-13 college year and will be expanded to scale during the 2013-14 college year. Target levels of attainment are at present tentative and under study by the General Education Core Curriculum Assessment Committee. Final targets will be arrived at and posted by June 30, 2014 so that they will in place for the implementation of the new core during the Fall 2014 term.

3. Analysis - The General Education Core Curriculum Assessment Committee is charged with reviewing and analyzing Core Assessment results. The committee is assisted by the Office of Assessment and the Office of Planning and Research. The committee meets regularly during the college year. By the mid-August, review and analysis are complete and the Core Assessment Report is distributed to the Curriculum Committee and faculty for inclusion in Unit Action Planning.

   Since direct assessment results are quantifiable, the first stage of analysis can be highly objective. For each Core Objective, direct assessment results are weight-averaged to produce an Aggregate Level of Attainment value. The weights are representative of the validity and reliability of the individual assessment methods. The greatest weight is given to juried assessment with LEAP Value Rubrics, a lessor weight to embedded examination questions, and least weight to the ETS Proficiency Profile. Juried assessments of student work are by far the most valid and reliable. Embedded examination questions are less reliable because they are generally based on responses to objective questions such as multiple-choice. In general, they do not give students the opportunity to construct their own answers or demonstrate important affective traits such as persistence and creativity. (Leskes & Wright, 2005, p. 41) The ETS Proficiency Profile is voluntary and not part of a required capstone experience. Because it is not connected with coursework and grades, students often are not motivated to do their best work or take the test seriously. (Finley, 2012, p.21) This seriously impairs its validity and lowers its weighting to least of all. Besides generating Aggregate Levels of

Assessment, the committee also reports further breakdowns of Core Objective results such as the dimensions (line item) scores from the LEAP Value Rubrics. Embedded examination results are broken down by course outcomes that map to Core Objectives. These added details help faculty identify specific areas of learning that need improvement.

The second stage of analysis involves taking a look at trends in levels of attainment over time. This information is important in strategic planning and in determining budget and other priorities. The Core Assessment Report contains graphical presentations of trends including predictive short and long term results.

The third stage of analysis involves using indirect assessment results to complement and inform the direct results above. As previously stated, studying indirect responses helps identify problem areas, provides useful information on what students think they have learned, and assess certain implicit qualities of student learning, such as values, feelings, perceptions, and attitudes, from a variety of perspectives. From such study, the committee formulates comments and recommendations that are included in the Core Assessment Report. From these, faculty gain additional insight into developing strategies for Core Objective improvement.

The fourth stage of analysis uses the available data to make longitudinal studies of Core Objective attainment. Leskes and Wright note that "No student is the product of a single faculty member, a single course, or a single program." (Lekses & Wright, 2005, p. 23) The attainment of Core Objectives accumulates over time. Longitudinal analysis helps pinpoint strengths and weaknesses at various stages in student learning that affect Core Objective attainment. Such analysis is useful identifying good practices and troubleshooting problem areas.

4. Action and Follow-Up - As indicated previously, the college treats General Education as an instructional program making it subject to Unit Action Planning. This means that assessment results and associated recommendations directly feed the college's planning process. Annual Unit Action Plans document activities and interventions that address improvement needs identified by various processes including core assessment. Typically, strategies for core related improvements are developed into plans during late spring and summer and are based on assessment results and recommendations from Core Curriculum Assessment Reports. In cases where college policy is involved, direction may come from the Curriculum Committee or administration. The resulting Unit Action Plan is implemented in September and continues through the college year. In May of the following year, units document results based on assessment that gauges the effectiveness of the activity/intervention. In addition, units must also indicate follow-up actions for the coming year such as continuance with modification or, in the best case, bringing a successful activity/intervention to scale. The Office of Planning

and Research is charged with oversight of the planning process that includes tracking core assessment improvement plans through to completion.  Since plans can originate for reasons other than core assessment, core related plans are specially flagged so they can be tracked independently.  During the mid-August meeting of the General Education Core Curriculum Assessment Committee, the Office of Planning and Research presents a report of core related Unit Action Planning for the previous year.  This information along with recently updated core assessment results is used to prepare the next Core Curriculum Assessment Report, thus closing the loop and assuring that the Core Objectives undergo continuous improvement.

Another level of action and follow-up is less obvious; that is, faculty's concentrated efforts designing, implementing, and assessing general education is a highly effective form of professional development.  At SWTJC, the intense discussion of juried, rubric-based assessment has materially deepened faculty understanding of "what matters in terms of learning outcomes, pedagogy, assessment, and student learning in general." (Rhodes and Finley, p. 37)  Treating general education as a program, for instance, has focused faculty on long-term, "walk away" outcomes rather than narrower course level outcomes.  In turn, this results in consideration of instructional practices that may more effectively address these broader outcomes.  For instance, "Work effectively in a team" suggests a more student active approach to learning than traditional lecture can offer. There are many other examples.

Table II - Outline of SWTJC Core Curriculum Assessment Plan

| Core Objectives | Assessment Method | Type | Level of Attainment | Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Critical Thinking**<br><br>To include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information | Assessment of Student Work from Across the Core. LEAP Value Rubrics:  Critical Thinking, Inquiry & Analysis, and Information Literacy | Direct | xx% of students scoring 2 or higher | 70% |
| | Embedded examination questions | Direct | xx% of students answering 75% of the questions correctly.  Minimum of 4 questions required. | 70% |
| | ETS® Proficiency Profile | Direct | xx% of students scoring proficient | 50% |
| | SWTJC Graduating Student Survey | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| | Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| **Communication**<br><br>To include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication. | Assessment of Student Work from Across the Core. LEAP Value Rubrics: Written Communication and Oral Communication | Direct | xx% of students scoring 2 or higher | 70% |
| | Embedded examination questions | Direct | xx% of students answering 75% of the questions correctly.  Minimum of 4 questions required. | 70% |
| | ETS® Proficiency Profile | Direct | xx% of students scoring proficient | 50% |
| | SWTJC Graduating Student Survey | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| | Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| **Empirical and Quantitative Skills**<br><br>To include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions. | Assessment of Student Work from Across the Core. LEAP Value Rubrics: Quantitative Literacy and Problem Solving | Direct | xx% of students scoring 2 or higher | 70% |
| | Embedded examination questions | Direct | xx% of students answering 75% of the questions correctly.  Minimum of 4 questions required. | 70% |
| | ETS® Proficiency Profile | Direct | xx% of students scoring proficient | 50% |
| | SWTJC Graduating Student Survey | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| | Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| **Teamwork**<br><br>To include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared | Assessment of Student Work from Across the Core. LEAP Value Rubric: Teamwork | Direct | xx% of students scoring 2 or higher | 70% |
| | Embedded examination questions | Direct | xx% of students answering 75% of the questions correctly.  Minimum of 4 questions required. | 70% |

Table II - Outline of SWTJC Core Curriculum Assessment Plan

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| purpose or goal. | SWTJC Graduating Student Survey | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| | Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| **Personal Responsibility**<br><br>To include the ability to connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making. | Assessment of Student Work from Across the Core. LEAP Value Rubrics: Intercultural Knowledge and Competence and Civic Engagement | Direct | xx% of students scoring 2 or higher | 70% |
| | Embedded examination questions | Direct | xx% of students answering 75% of the questions correctly.  Minimum of 4 questions required. | 70% |
| | SWTJC Graduating Student Survey | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| | Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| **Social Responsibility**<br><br>To include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities. | Assessment of Student Work from Across the Core. LEAP Value Rubric: Ethical Thinking | Direct | xx% of students scoring 2 or higher | 70% |
| | Embedded examination questions | Direct | xx% of students answering 75% of the questions correctly.  Minimum of 4 questions required. | 70% |
| | SWTJC Graduating Student Survey | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |
| | Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) | Indirect | N.A. | N.A. |

# References

Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2002. *Greater Expectations: A new vision as a nation goes to college.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Finley, Ashley. 2012. *Making Progress? What We Know About the Achievement of Liberal Education Outcomes.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Leskes, Andrea, Barbara D. Wright. 2005. *The Art and Science of Assessing General Education Outcomes.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Rhodes, Terrel L., Ashley Finley. 2013. *Using the Value Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.