Yearly Program Assessment Executive Summary: General Education Nathan Anderson, Director of Institutional Assessment Minot State University Spring 2024

This executive summary provides an overview of key findings and next steps reported in the General Education (GE) Yearly Program Assessment (YPA) 2022-2023 report and 2023-2024 plan. Figure 1 summarizes all the data that were collected using the Gen Ed assessment Google Forms during the 2022-2023 academic year.

Figure 1. 2022-2023 Gen Ed Assessment Data

Sep 1, 2	2022 - May 31, 2023 🔹	Year in School Global	 Advanced (4) 	Sufficient (3) Basic (2)	Insufficient (1
	uestion: What are the highest (i.e. longes he selected date range and year(s) in sch		t (i.e., longest yellow and red se	ections) performing developm	ental content
CCS1	Problem statement	20	21	2	9
	Determination of alternative sol	20	21	2	9
	Evaluation of evidence for prob	20	18	31	
	Selection of problem solution	20	17	32	
	Determine the nature and extent	64		129	71
CCS2	Access information	78		120	68
	Evaluate information and its sou	59		132	74
	Use information effectively to	61		134	68
	Use information ethically and leg		88	78	40
	Contextualization		103	51	27
CS3	Interpretation		108	42	31
	Academic discourse		108	44	29
CCS4	Interpretation				
	Application/Analysis				
	Targeting		119	80	24
CCS5	Content development and org		112	76	34
	Sources and evidence		107	77	39
	Syntax, grammar, and delivery		94	88	38
CCS6	Consensus building		158		97 28
	Compromise		144	86	50
	Individual member assessment		147	82	5
	Final product		166	52	63
PSR1	Relationships				
	Value systems				
SR2	Responding to community needs			151 43	28
SR3	Individual well-being		143	93	45
IP1	Cultural self-awareness		73	64	30
	Knowledge of cultural worldviews		69	71	28
	Curiosity		80	57	25
IP2	Knowledge of cultural worldview			46 13	
	Empathy			50	15
	Openness			49	16

The highest levels of performance were identified based on the highest percentages of students scoring sufficient (3) or advanced (4) on a four-point rubric. The highest levels of performance overall included:

- CCS5 Targeting (85%)
- CCS6 Consensus building (88%)
- IP2 Empathy (94%)
- IP2 Openness (96%)

The lowest levels of performance were identified based on the lowest percentages of students scoring sufficient (3) or advanced (4) on a four-point rubric. The lowest levels of performance overall included:

- CCS1 Problem statement (51%)
- CCS1 Determination of alternative problem solutions (51%)
- CCS1 Evaluation of evidence for problem solution alternatives (47%)
- CCS1 Selection of problem solution (46%)
- CCS2 Evaluate information and its sources critically (67%)
- CCS2 Use information effectively to accomplish a planned objective (68%)

Limitations of these results include:

- Each student is assessed at a single point in time.
- Different faculty utilize different assignments.
- The same students were not assessed on all outcomes.
- Some students may be duplicated in the results.
- Different courses assess the same outcome.
- Faculty may feel assessment fatigue.
- Potential exists for data entry error.

Given these and other limitations, faculty expressed concerns with the validity and reliability of the data and hesitations with making decisions based on the results. There seems to be a widespread belief that the Gen Ed model and assessment strategy could be improved. The campus will explore possibilities for improving the assessment model and assessment strategy.