2018 – 2019/2019 – 2020 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Human and Social Sciences   **Date: 7/2/2020**
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Ed Hoffman and Sara Brady
See General Education Assessment Plan for: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology
Analysis of artifacts: *1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*   **Data Collection**   Data ($N = 19$) was collected in a DCE course (CEL 480; $n = 11$) and a behavioral science course (SW 201; $n = 8$) during Fall 2019. Data was originally supposed to be collected in a psychology and criminal justice courses but these artifacts were not collected. In both courses, an ethical dilemma was posed to students (a different ethical dilemma case study was presented to each course). Students wrote their written responses and data analyzed using the attached rubric.   **Data Coding**   Ed Hoffman and Sara Brady individual rated the two courses using the attached rubric. When analyzing the interrater reliability of categorical ratings for two coders, the percent agreement across each of the five categories was low (ranging between 0% to 36.80%) with Krippendorff's alpha estimates below the threshold for adequate interrater reliability (< .09). Therefore, a meeting was held whereby both the rubric criteria and individual artifacts were discussed. After discussion, EH and SB discussed all decisions whereby differences were 3 points apart or greater and arrived at a final code. For differences 2 points apart, the coding was adjusted toward the midpoint. For differences 1 point away, whichever code was lower was retained in order to be as conservative as possible.   A point of disagreement was noted regarding the criteria for applying Biblical values, perspectives, and concepts. A low threshold was applied to the artifacts, such that students needed to only mention a Biblical concept (e.g., treating others with respect) without referencing the Bible itself. A higher threshold was also applied, such that students needed to also mention the Bible, Scripture, or other doctrinal principle in order to meet benchmark. Because the rubric is not clear on whether the Bible should be cited when referencing Biblical concepts, we included both thresholds for the purpose of the assessment. The table below shows the low threshold and high threshold ratings for the Biblical concepts column.

Summary of RESULTS*:
 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):
 Question 1: What proportion of students across psychology, behavioral science, criminal justice, and DCE courses MEET the benchmark requirements for:
     1. recognizing an ethical issue;
     2. evaluating differing ethical perspectives or concepts;
     3. maintaining ethical self-awareness;
     4. applying ethical perspectives or concepts; and
     5. applying Biblical values, perspectives, or concepts?
 	
 Question 2: What proportion of students across psychology, behavioral science, criminal justice, and DCE courses EXCEED the benchmark requirements for:
     1. recognizing an ethical issue;
     2. evaluating differing ethical perspectives or concepts;
     3. maintaining ethical self-awareness;
     4. applying ethical perspectives or concepts; and
     5. applying Biblical values, perspectives, or concepts?
 	
 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. To answer Question 1, 100% of students across the DCE and behavioral sciences courses meet all benchmark requirements if students need only mention a Biblical concept but not necessarily reference that this concept is Biblical. If, however, students must also mention the Bible, Scripture, or specific doctrinal concept, then only 53% of students met this benchmark (91% of DCE students and 0% of behavioral science students).
 	
 To answer Question 2, 63% exceeded the benchmark requirements for maintaining ethical self-awareness, 89% exceeded the benchmark for recognizing an ethical issue, 100% exceeded the benchmark for applying

ethical perspectives or concepts, and 84% exceeded the benchmark for evaluating different ethical perspectives or concepts. If only mentioning a Biblical concept without reference to the Bible, then 42% exceeded the benchmark for understanding and applying Biblical concepts. If, however, students must also reference the Bible itself when referencing Biblical concepts, then only 32% exceeded the benchmark.

ID	Course	Ethical Self-Awareness	Understanding Biblical Ethical Perspectives/ Concepts		Ethical Issue Recognition	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts
			Low Threshold	High Threshold			
1	CEL 480	1	2	2	1	2	2
2	CEL 480	1	1	**0**	2	2	2
3	CEL 480	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	CEL 480	2	3	3	3	3	2
5	CEL 480	1	1	1	2	2	1
6	CEL 480	3	3	3	3	2	2
7	CEL 480	2	1	1	3	3	3
8	CEL 480	1	1	1	3	3	2
9	CEL 480	2	3	3	3	3	3
10	CEL 480	1	2	2	2	2	1
11	CEL 480	1	1	1	1	2	1
2	SW 201	3	1	**0**	4	3	2
3	SW 201	3	1	**0**	4	4	3
4	SW 201	2	1	**0**	3	4	3
5	SW 201	2	1	**0**	3	3	3
6	SW 201	2	1	**0**	4	3	2
7	SW 201	1	1	**0**	3	3	2
8	SW 201	3	1	**0**	4	4	3
9	SW 201	2	1	**0**	4	3	3

3). INTERPRETATION - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).
Overall, 100% of students met the basic benchmark to recognize an ethical issue, evaluate a different ethical perspective, maintain ethical self-awareness, and apply ethical perspectives and concepts. More than half of students exceeded the benchmark for these four domains. Depending upon the threshold criteria for the benchmark for understanding Biblical concepts, anywhere from 53% to 100% of students met this benchmark and 32% to 42% exceeded this benchmark.
4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)
In addition, to low interrater reliability, EH and SB noted that the instructions were not entirely consistent across both courses for to what extent students needed to use Biblical concepts. The DCE case study made this connection much more obvious for students, whereas the case study for behavioral science students did not explicit mention the Christian faith in the instructions or case study itself.

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date*: 7/2/2020
How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email

Submitted by: Sara Brady   **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 8/18/2020

Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:8/18/2020

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na