

**General Education Program and Assessment
Committee (GEPAC)**

**Fall 2024 Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 7
Assessment Report**

Prepared Fall 2025 Semester

Approved 20, November, 2025

Executive Summary

Methodology:

All faculty members teaching *FYSM – Discovering College and the First Year Seminar Course* in the Fall 2024 semester were asked to submit 5 randomly selected student work products, or artifacts. Submitted artifacts were redacted over the Spring 2025 semester and rated during an in-person rating day at the end of the Spring 2025 semester using an analytic rubric. Scores were determined for each artifact by consensus between rater pairs that had participated in a norming session during the morning of the rating day. The analytic rubric was newly revised from the holistic version used previously in the assessment of SLO 7 in the Fall 2020 semester.

Results:

The compliance rate for these artifacts was 93%. All 174 of the artifacts submitted were rated. The number of artifacts scored 0 (unable to rate) varied between the five dimensions within the rubric in the range of 38-49%. For each dimension, over 50% of artifacts were not rated (scored 0) because of an apparent lack of alignment between assignments and SLO 7's rubric. Of the artifacts that were ratable, the benchmark that 70% of students score a 2 or higher was generally not met.

Recommendations:

We recommend that the GEPAC increase communication with FYSM instructors, department chairs, and deans, as well as continue to engage in meta-assessment and determine how individual FYSM seminar topics figure into GEPAC's recertification process. Additionally, we recommend that FYSM Fellow and/or the AVP for Accreditation, Assessment and curriculum share the analytic rubric prior to each semester with FYSM faculty, regardless of designated artifact collection semester. We also recommend that GEPAC and FYSM Fellow ensure alignment of all curricular elements that impact SLO 7, and that FYSM instructors make the General Education outcomes explicit on the first day handouts/course guides for all FYSM sections, in addition to discussing the expected outcomes with students.

Introduction and Context:

This report focuses on the assessment of *Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 7: Demonstrate an Understanding of Various Models for the Development of the Whole Self*, which is met by courses falling under *FYSM – Discovering College and the First Year Seminar Course*. All *FYSM* courses offered in the Fall 2024 semester falling under *SLO 7* were scheduled to be assessed.

In Spring 2024 semester, the GEPAC revised the rubric from a holistic to analytic format for *SLO 7* using feedback from faculty members who teach the course. One goal of using analytic rubrics is to help faculty better understand where students need to improve achieving the *SLOs*, so that teaching interventions or curricular changes are discussed, developed, and implemented. In Fall 2024 semester, faculty teaching *FYSM* submitted student artifacts for *SLO 7*.

A Spring 2025 General Education Retreat was scheduled on May 29, 2025, at the University's McFarland Student Union (MSU) to provide independent rating of student artifacts from *FYSM* courses related to *SLO 7*.

The definition for *SLO 7* is that students identify best practices for self-development in areas such as finance, wellness, spiritual well-being, academic success, and professional motivation. Life skills and life-long learning are emphasized. In *SLO 7*, 'models' refers to the set of best practices for college-level student success in several areas, including but not limited to: observing financial literacy, reaching personal or spiritual wellness, or attempting academic or professional accomplishment.

Methodology:

At the end of the University's add/drop period in the Fall 2024 semester, faculty members teaching *FYSM* were contacted by email with instructions to submit student artifacts via D2L from five randomly selected students from the roster in each section of their course(s) as provided by Kutztown University's Office of Institutional Research. After faculty submitted student artifacts for *SLO 7* at the end of the Fall 2024 semester, the artifacts were prepared by Graduate assistants in the Office of Assessment during the Spring 2025 semester for independent rating at the May 2025 General Education Retreat. Each artifact was given an accession number to maintain student and instructor identity confidential. Faculty were invited to supply additional context or information about their artifacts. Some faculty provided detailed information while others provided little or none. To keep artifact context as consistent as possible, abbreviated notes of any information that was provided by faculty were made available to raters when necessary. Faculty volunteers were asked to rate student artifacts to determine performance levels using the revised analytic rubric for *SLO 7*, which focuses on demonstrating an understanding of various models for the development of the whole self. The rubric was developed so that areas of strengths and needs for improvement, based on ratings, could be determined. Consequently, faculty teaching general education classes in *FYSM* will have a

benchmark against which they can potentially adjust their teaching practice in a responsive way. The GEPAC's current student performance benchmark level is a 2, on a scale of 0 to 4.

During the May 2025 General Education Retreat approximately 21 raters were in attendance consisting of faculty volunteers and GEPAC members. Raters were paired, and when possible, each pair consisted of one professor that teaches *FYSM* courses, and one that does not. A norming session was conducted in the morning with three anchors, i.e., samples of student artifacts, that were shared by faculty teaching courses in these categories in previous semesters. The five individual skills or dimensions of the *SLO 7* rubric were unpacked so that raters could have a common understanding of each skill and performance level measure. The skills include ***Dimension 1*** – *The student identifies a self-development model*, ***Dimension 2*** – *The student translates a self-development model's processes and procedures to their own situation*, ***Dimension 3*** – *The student applies a self-development model to their own situation*, ***Dimension 4*** – *The student assesses the current and future successes of a self-development model after its implementation*, and ***Dimension 5*** – *The student modifies a self-development model to reflect self-awareness of its success and challenges*.

Norming procedures during the rating day included the following steps: *Step 1* – Read or view the entire artifact, *Step 2* – Re-read (or re-view) and highlight evidence, *Step 3* – Assign points using the rubric, *Step 4* – Discuss artifact and rubric scoring with partner, *Step 5* – Recalibrate and enter one score into online system as a pair. No half-points were permitted in this analytic rubric. Performance levels were either a 4 (excellent), 3 (good), 3 (fair), 1 (poor), or 0 (unable to rate). An artifact scored 0 (unable to rate) for any, one or more, dimension required an explanation for why it was unratable. Rating pairs were expected to rate independently, then converse to come to a consensus. If a pairs' scoring differed by one point on more than two dimensions, a third rater was called in to participate. Rating of the student artifacts submitted for *SLO 7* assessment occurred in the afternoon, and all scores were uploaded to a Microsoft Form using the artifact accession number.

Analysis of scores assigned to each artifact related to *SLO 7: Demonstrate an Understanding of Various Models for the Development of the Whole Self* are summarized as the overall frequency distribution of performance level scores for each of the five dimensions based on all *SLO 7* courses.

Results:

The compliance rate for submitting student artifacts was 93.2% for *FYSM* sections, with 41 of 44 course sections submitting at least one artifact from the list of five randomly selected students provided to instructors. Overall, 174 *FYSM* student artifacts were submitted, which represent 79.1% of the total number expected (n= 220) from 44 sections that were provided a list of five randomly selected students on their roster. All 174 student artifacts were scored after the norming session during the May 2025 General Education Retreat.

The number of items scored 0 (unable to rate) varied for each of the five dimensions, with 42% in *Dimension 1*, 38% in *Dimension 2*, 41.4% of *Dimension 3*, 48.8% of *Dimension 4*, and 45.4% of *Dimension 5* (**Figure 1**). Of the artifacts that were ratable (scored >0 by the independent raters), 59.4% of *Dimension 1* items (n= 101), 64.8% of *Dimension 2* items (n= 108), 64.7% of *Dimension 3* items (n= 102), 56.2% of *Dimension 4* (n= 89), and 59% of *Dimension 5* items (n= 95) were scored 2 (fair) and above (**Figure 1**).

Student artifacts scored 0 (unable to rate) in each of the five *Dimensions* had the following as the most common reason(s) for receiving that rating. For *Dimension 1*, a total of 73 artifacts were scored 0, with 41.1% of these not rated because there was no self-development model identified and 54.8% because the assignment did not align with SLO 7's rubric (**Figure 2**). For *Dimension 2* a total of 66 artifacts were scored 0, with 53% of these not rated because the assignment did not align with SLO 7's rubric (**Figure 3**). For *Dimension 3*, a total of 72 artifacts were scored 0, with 50% of these not rated because the assignment did not align with SLO 7's rubric (**Figure 4**). For *Dimension 4*, a total of 85 artifacts were scored 0, with 43.5% of these not rated because the assignment did not align with SLO 7's rubric (**Figure 5**). Finally, for *Dimension 5*, a total of 79 artifacts were scored 0, with 43% of these not rated because the assignment did not align with SLO 7's rubric (**Figure 6**).

Key Points, Recommendations and Action Plans:

Based on the assessment of the General Education Program's *SLO 7: Demonstrate an Understanding of Various Models for the Development of the Whole Self* using a new analytic rubric to score student assignments from Fall 2024 semester *FYSM* courses, the GEPAC makes the following key points and recommendations about the process and the results.

Key Points – Assessment Data Collection Process

There were relatively few challenges in collecting student artifacts from all faculty and course sections, which clearly influenced the high compliance rate in the assessment of *SLO 7*. Some sections that failed to submit artifacts did so because some faculty simply did not comply. Other faculty submitted artifacts for some, but not all the five students on the list in a course, which typically occurred because students dropped the course or did not submit the assignment used by the faculty for assessment of *SLO 7*.

The rating of student artifacts during the May 2025 General Education Retreat was the first implementation of the new *SLO 7* analytic rubric. During the norming session, as well as the discussion that occurred after artifacts were rated, multiple suggestions for revision of the rubric itself were shared on a Parking Lot Board where participants placed notes. In addition, some participants shared suggestions about the rubric via an online Feedback Survey after the Retreat. As has occurred for other GEPAC SLOs in this first cycle of assessment with revised analytic rubrics, discussion revolved on the clarity of the language defining the dimensions in the rubric. For example, discussion during the norming session of ***Dimension 1 – The student identifies a self-development model*** centered on whether first year students would be capable of identifying a

model and applying it, what examples of model were, what source(s) might be defining what a model is, and whether model was meant to be something conceptual or a person as a “model”. Clarity was thought to be necessary on what is meant by “variety” and “some” in the definition of the performance levels. Questions were also posed about whether benchmarks are necessary in the implementation of analytic rubrics. With regard to **Dimension 2** – *The student translates a self-development model’s processes and procedures to their own situation*, there was discussion about what is meant by “hypothetical” vs. “own” situation in the definition of the performance levels. Concerning **Dimension 3** – *The student applies a self-development model to their own situation*, it was suggested that clarity in the use of adverbs in the definition of the performance levels is necessary. Discussion of **Dimension 4** – *The student assesses the current and future successes of a self-development model after its implementation* questioned the idea of how a first-year student thinks of the future beyond their first semester, and that more likely their definition of the future is the next week or a few weeks. Finally, during discussion of **Dimension 5** – *The student modifies a self-development model to reflect self-awareness of its successes and challenges*, suggested lack of clarity in the use of the adverbs “comprehensively” and “guidance” in the definition of the performance levels. Overall, some participants of the norming session suggested there is a disconnect between *SLO 7* and rubric, but that the rubric was strong and that offering assignment alignment workshops using a backward design might be necessary. Some suggestions as a next step were to provide more guidance and require faculty to include GEPAC SLOs in *FYSM* course guides so that instructors understand that they need to be assessing the dimensions in those SLOs.

There was discussion about *SLO 7* only being assessed with the *FYSM* course, whereas other *SLOs* are assessed by multiple courses across the University in several of the General Education *Categories*, and how difficult a course *FYSM* is to teach given the vulnerable period students are as they transition into the university, especially given the current large enrollment size of its sections. The point that faculty teaching *FYSM* feel isolated because so few faculty teach this course was also brought up, and concernedly, it was noted that this sentiment exists even though resources such as CEL and the *FYSM* Coordinator are available. Several ideas for improvement were suggested, including the addition of a common assignment given that existence of a primary syllabus for *FYSM* with requirements outlined, better communication with instructors when assignments submitted for assessment were not assessable, and revising the course learning objectives to reflect the *SLO* more correctly. Furthermore, it was suggested that topics for *FYSM* be part of the recertification process for courses in the General Education *curriculum*, and that faculty instructing *FYSM* be given training in composing and using analytic rubrics. All points raised will be considered by the GEPAC and, whenever possible, incorporated to the next revision of *SLO 7*’s rubric before it is scheduled for assessment again.

Key Points – Results

The GEPAC’s benchmark level that 70% of students be scored at a performance level 2 was not met. Results of the analysis of the independent scores for the ratable artifacts used in the

assessment of *SLO 7* with an analytic rubric indicate that between 56.2% and 64.8% of students are performing at the GEPAC's benchmark level of 2 across the *SLO*'s five dimensions. The lowest proportion of students meeting the performance benchmark was in *Dimension 4* (56.2%), which measures a student's ability to assess the current and future successes of a self-development model after its implementation, whereas the highest was in *Dimension 2* (64.8%), which measures whether a student translates a self-development model's processes and procedures to their own situation. These data may have been impacted by the lack of clarity in the definition of the performance levels, as well as the apparent disconnect between *SLO 7* and its rubric, as highlighted by the comments raised by raters during the assessment process and discussed in the previous section on *Key Points – Assessment Data Collection Process*. It's also possible that the high percentage of items scored 0 (unable to rate) across the five *Dimensions* is indicative of poor alignment between the assignment used in many *FYSM* course sections and *SLO 7*'s rubric. This was indicated by the raters in their comments that student responses frequently did not address the dimensions in the rubric.

There are two additional points to consider about *SLO 7* and the implementation process of its rubric as it occurred during the rating of student artifacts in May 2025. First, not only is there a disconnect between *SLO 7* and its rubric, but there is further disconnect between the *SLO 7* and the *FYSM Course Learning Objectives*, as was also noted during the group discussion after artifacts were rated in May 2025. Specifically, *SLO 7*'s title and its five *Dimensions* expect understanding of “models” for the development of the whole self, yet the *FYSM Learning Objective #2* is about identifying a “goal” and evaluating the process of setting and achieving that “goal”. This might then partially explain why raters scored many artifacts as 0 (unable to rate). The second point concerns how the norming process and subsequent rating of the student artifacts may not have appropriately implemented the revised analytic rubric. When implementing the rubric, *Dimension 1* aims to assess the student's identification of a self-development model and during norming some volunteer raters scored artifacts 1 because they deduced that student could not identify a model. If this was indeed the case, then those student artifacts should not have been scored for *Dimensions 2 – 5*, yet sometimes they were scored 2 or higher in those *Dimensions*, when logically they should not have been scored at all. The GEPAC should consider how to revise its procedures for the implementation of this and other rubrics with scaffolded dimensions when rating student artifacts during the assessment process.

Overall, the first implementation of the analytic rubric for *SLO 7* supports the suggestion that revising it to this format can be more informative to instruction and student learning. For example, results on why artifacts submitted were not ratable can help the *FYSM* course coordinator and the *FYSM* instructors identify what course assignments might better align with a revised version of *SLO 7* that addresses rating results and the feedback from instructors and raters on the rubric itself. This should help the rubric as an assessment tool evolve in its content, definition, and implementation, which in turn will help improve KU students' performance in

SLO 7: Demonstrate an Understanding of Various Models for the Development of the Whole Self.

Recommendations and Action Plans –

GEPAC:

- Increase communication with FYSM instructors, department chairs, and deans.
 - Notify chairs and deans of non-compliance
 - Engage in direct communication with those faculty whose artifacts were not assessable.
 - Share the SLO 7 report directly with chairs and deans. Discuss at Chair Net and Deans Council.
- Continue to engage in meta-assessment
 - Revise and test the SLO 7 as indicated by alignment processes
- Determine how individual FYSM seminar topics figure into GEPAC’s recertification process

FYSM Fellow and/or AVP for Accreditation, Assessment and Curriculum:

- Share the analytic rubric prior to each semester with FYSM faculty, regardless of designated artifact collection semester

GEPAC and FYSM Fellow:

- Ensure alignment of all curricular elements that impact SLO 7
 - Organize a professional learning workshop to enact the following steps of backward design:
 - Unpack the SLO and the “essential question” implicit in the goal
 - Identify the understanding
 - Identify the assessments/performance tasks that demonstrate that understanding
 - Move from criteria to a revised rubric
 - Create aligned assignments/activities
 - Consider creating a signature assignment/performance task for all sections of FYSM
 - Revise the primary FYSM syllabus incorporating the alignment work and move it through the curricular approval process.

FYSM Instructors:

- Make the Gen Ed outcomes explicit on the first day handouts/course guides for all FYSM sections
- Discuss the expected outcomes with students

Trend Analysis:

The GEPAC would like to highlight the differences in student performance to achieve *SLO 7* in its last assessment during Fall 2018 (reported Spring 2019) relative to the Fall 2024 assessment results in this report. In 2018, compliance for *SLO 7* was determined as the proportion of faculty asked to submit student artifacts who submitted them, with a total of 87% of the 30-faculty teaching what was then called *FYS* courses submitting student artifacts. In this report, compliance is measured as the percentage of *FYSM* sections submitting student artifacts, *i.e.*, 93.2% of 44 sections. In 2018, analysis of independent rater scores from a subset of *FYS* student artifacts submitted revealed nearly 72% of students sampled performed at or above performance level 2. In this report, student performance at or above a 2 varied across *Dimensions 1 – 5* between 56.2% to 64.8%.

Figure 1. The percentage of all (N= 174) oral communication student work (artifacts) scored 0 (unable to rate), 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), or 4 (excellent) by pairs of volunteer raters during assessment of the five dimensions (D1-D5) in the analytic rubric for SLO 7 – *Demonstrate an understanding of various models for the development of the whole self*. Artifacts were submitted for assessment in Fall 2024 semester by courses in FYSM of the KU General Education Program.

Figure 2. The percent of student artifacts from Fall 2024 semester courses in FYSM of the KU General Education Program that scored 0 (unable to rate) in **Dimension 1** (*The student identifies a self-development model*) of the SLO 7 analytic rubric (*Demonstrate an understanding of various models for the development of the whole self*) grouped according to reason, or explanation, for not rating by pairs of volunteers.

Figure 3. The percent of student artifacts from Fall 2024 semester courses in FYSM of the KU General Education Program that scored 0 (unable to rate) in **Dimension 2** (*The student translates a self-development model's processes and procedures to their own situation*) of the SLO 7 analytic rubric (*Demonstrate an understanding of various models for the development of the whole self*) grouped according to reason, or explanation, for not rating by pairs of volunteers.

Figure 4. The percent of student artifacts from Fall 2024 semester courses in FYSM of the KU General Education Program that scored 0 (unable to rate) in **Dimension 3** (*The student applies a self-development model to their own situation*) of the SLO 7 analytic rubric (*Demonstrate an understanding of various models for the development of the whole self*) grouped according to reason, or explanation, for not rating by pairs of volunteers.

Figure 5. The percent of student artifacts from Fall 2024 semester courses in FYSM of the KU General Education Program that scored 0 (unable to rate) in **Dimension 4** (*The student assesses the current and future successes of a self-development model after its implementation*) of the SLO 7 analytic rubric (*Demonstrate an understanding of various models for the development of the whole self*) grouped according to reason, or explanation, for not rating by pairs of volunteers.

Figure 6. The percent of student artifacts from Fall 2024 semester courses in FYSM of the KU General Education Program that scored 0 (unable to rate) in **Dimension 5** (*The student modifies a self-development model to reflect self-awareness of its successes and challenges*) of the SLO 7 analytic rubric (*Demonstrate an understanding of various models for the development of the whole self*) grouped according to reason, or explanation, for not rating by pairs of volunteers.