

GER 7 ASSESSMENT REPORT

The GER 7 Assessment Report includes the Definition and Elaboration of GER 7 Criteria, a description of methodologies used in the assessment, and the Working Group's report of GER 7 courses. As specified in the schedule for GER assessments, we are submitting this Report to the Educational Policy Committee and the Assessment Steering Committee. We look forward to hearing the Committees' responses to the report.

Submitted by GER 7 Working Group members:

James Baron, WG Chair (Classical Studies)

John Charles (Kinesiology)

Adam Potkay (English)

Jennifer Taylor (Modern Languages)

GER 7 - PHILOSOPHICAL, RELIGIOUS, AND SOCIAL THOUGHT DEFINITION AND ELABORATION OF CRITERIA

(extracted from the EPC course designation form)

The course must take a critical view of important and influential approaches to philosophical, religious, or social thought. Not only must the course deal with matters of enduring concern to human life, such as meaning, value, justice, freedom and truth, but it must also aim at cultivating reasoned analysis and judgement in students who take it. Nothing in the criteria below rule out taking seriously skepticism, relativism, subjectivism, or nihilism in philosophical, religious, or social thought. The criteria exclude courses that take for granted or merely assume the basic norms or values addressed.

For a course to satisfy GER 7, it must satisfy three distinct necessary conditions. Any course which lacked one of these would not be acceptable. Moreover, these three conditions are jointly sufficient, that is, any course which met all three conditions would be acceptable.

BASIC NORMS OR VALUES: The content of the course must address some fundamental questions about what is good, worthwhile, valuable, desirable, holy, sacred, right, just, true, beautiful, and the like in philosophical, religious, or social thought. This criterion excludes courses which address only questions of policy or specific applications. However, a course which addressed both basic questions and specific applications could satisfy this criterion.

QUESTIONS OF JUSTIFICATION OF NORMS AND VALUES: The course must address questions about how to identify and justify philosophical, religious, or social norms and values. "To justify" need mean no more than being able to show that the preponderance of the relevant reasons support one norm or value in comparison to others in a given context. This criterion excludes purely descriptive or factual courses.

STUDENT ACQUISITION OF CRITICAL SKILLS: The course must involve some systematic way to engage students in active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories, concepts, and methods of reasoning and deliberation in philosophical, religious, or social thought. This criterion excludes courses which are not designed to ensure that students participate actively in the critical analysis of the values or norms addressed.

DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY AND PORTFOLIO METHODOLOGIES¹

When the general education curriculum was adopted, the faculty voted to assess the GERs using course portfolios and surveys. Each methodology is described briefly below.

PORTFOLIO METHODOLOGY

Faculty members were asked to submit course portfolios for each GER 7 course they taught in Fall 1999 and Spring 2000. A course portfolio is a collection of material from the course (e.g., syllabus, assignments, tests) that illustrates how the GER criteria are being met. Faculty members were asked to include examples of student work in their course portfolios.

Working Group members developed a scoring rubric that reflects the criteria used by the Educational Policy Committee to designate GER 7 courses. The scoring rubric was used to evaluate each portfolio. When a faculty member was teaching multiple sections of the same course, a single portfolio was collected.

Course portfolios collected 28/37 (76%)

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Working Group members developed a 9-item survey instrument. As with the portfolio scoring rubric, the items reflect the criteria used to designate GER 7 courses. All students with valid contact information who were enrolled in GER 7 courses in Fall 1999 and Spring 2000 were asked to complete questionnaires. Students were sent a questionnaire for each GER 7 course in which they were enrolled. Faculty members were sent parallel questionnaires for each GER 7 course they taught. They were sent a single questionnaire for multiple sections of the same course.

Student survey responses	Fall 1999:	453/845	(54%)
	Spring 2000:	388/764	(51%)
	Total:	841/1609	(52%)
Faculty survey responses		30/37	(81%)

COURSES / SECTIONS INCLUDED IN GER ASSESSMENT

Tables 1a and 1b illustrate the number of GER courses and course sections that were offered during the 1999 – 2000 academic year, and the number of faculty members teaching GER 7 courses.² Table 1a presents the distributions by department and program. Four departments offered a total of ten GER 7 courses in the Fall, and eight departments and programs offered fifteen courses in the Spring. The number of sections taught was distributed evenly between the Fall (N=30) and Spring (N=29) semesters.

Table 1b shows the number of single and multiple sections taught during the 1999 – 2000 academic year. Note that some instructors taught single sections of more than one course (portfolios were requested for each course), and some taught multiple sections of the same course (one portfolio requested for multiple sections taught by the same instructor). In sum, 22

¹ The Office of Assessment prepared the Description of Methodologies and tables in this report

² The Office of Institutional Research provides the Office of Assessment with information about GER courses, course sections, faculty members, and enrolled students.

faculty members in eight departments and programs taught 59 GER 7 course sections. Faculty members were asked to submit portfolios and complete questionnaires for 37 sections. The remaining 22 sections were duplicates taught by the same instructor. Students in 58 of the 59 course sections were surveyed (enrollment information was not available for one freshman seminar).

TABLE 1a: 1999 – 2000 GER 7 Courses by Department					
	Courses		Sections		Instructors
	Fall 99	Spr 00	Fall 99	Spr 00	Fall 99 & Spr 00
Departments:					
Anthropology	0	1	0	1	1
Government	2	2	4	3	2
Interdisciplinary Studies	0	2	0	2	2
Kinesiology	1	1	1	1	1
Philosophy	4	4	22	17	12
Religion	3	3	3	3	2
Theatre & Speech	0	1	0	1	1
Women's Studies	0	1	0	1	1
Subtotals	10	15	30	29	22

TABLE 1b: 1999 – 2000 GER 7 Courses by Department		
SECTIONS TAUGHT BY SAME INSTRUCTOR:		
1 section of a course:	23 courses	(23 sections)
2 sections of a course:	8 courses	(16 sections)
3 sections of a course:	4 courses	(12 sections)
4 sections of a course:	2 courses	(8 sections)
Total:	37 courses	(59 sections)

SUMMARY

COURSES: 59 course sections included in GER assessment
37 non-redundant course sections (taught by different faculty members)

SURVEYS: 58 of 59 course sections -- students responded to survey
33 of 59 course sections -- at least 50% of students responded to survey
30 of 37 courses -- faculty members responded to survey

PORTFOLIOS: 28 of 37 course portfolios received

WORKING GROUP REPORT OF GER 7 COURSES

The working group's report of GER 7 courses is based on the attached summary tables of portfolio scores and survey results, and our review of student work and course materials. A list of questions that guided this report also is attached.

I. Analysis of Course Portfolios

Based on analysis of student work and other course portfolio materials, the GER 7 assessment working group has found that in most regards the GER 7 criteria are being successfully met. Of the 28 portfolios reviewed, 25 complied with the GER 7 criteria, and the overwhelming majority of courses *clearly* met each criterion. The lowest portfolio rating involved the question of "active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories"; two possible ways of explaining this would be:

- a.) it was not clear that the instructor promoted the interaction necessary for active critical analysis
- b.) class size was in some cases too large. (In the next section, this explanation is explored further in a comparison of portfolio scores and survey responses by class size.)

Courses that do meet the GER 7 criteria successfully address basic norms and values, the question of how to justify norms and values, and teach students a systematic way to engage in an active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories.

Courses that are less likely to meet each criterion tend to focus too narrowly on single issues such as social, gender, or ethnological differences, rather than the active assessment of fundamental philosophical questions.

II. Portfolio and Student Survey Results

In general, student survey responses do support our portfolio analysis (see Tables 2a and 2b). Survey results reinforce our conclusion that, for the most part, GER 7 courses are meeting the criteria for designation. On average, students report that specific criteria are addressed at least somewhat in their GER 7 courses.

However, we could not evaluate whether or not there was a significant difference between our review of portfolios and student responses to survey questions because of the differences in questions and the differences in scales. The portfolio scoring sheet and the student and faculty survey questions were developed independently. Although the scoring sheet and survey items are based on the GER 7 criteria, they are not parallel and a direct comparison of results from the two methodologies is not possible.

A number of tables presented specific comparisons (i.e., students and faculty, instructor ranks, course levels, class sizes, student class statuses, departments, and courses with portfolios and those without them). For the most part, differences were nominal, but there were several worth noting. We are listing them in decreasing order of importance:

- 1.) The most consistent discrepancies occur in Tables 6a and 6b, "Summary of Responses by Class Size"; whereas the GER 7 working group did not consciously assess courses by class size, students in smaller classes (under 23) found that their classes better fulfilled all GER 7 criteria. For each survey item, the average scores of smaller classes (under 23 students) are higher than those with larger enrollments, but there are some larger classes that are clearly meeting the GER 7 criteria.

This fact strongly suggests to us that classes meeting the GER 7 requirement should either be capped at 20-25 students, or that larger classes be regularly broken down into small discussion groups.

Note that differences in portfolio scores of smaller and larger classes are negligible and that course materials and examples of student work suggest that criteria are being met. Portfolios are not available for all course sections and this might explain the differences between student survey and portfolio results.

- 2.) Courses with portfolios and those without portfolios: Table 9 reveals that students responded considerably less favorably to courses for which portfolios were not available to the GER 7 working group. The greatest discrepancy occurred in response to the question, did this class "help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values": students in courses for which portfolios were available responded on average, with a 3.9, while students in courses for which portfolios were not available responded on average, with a 3.0.

This suggests to us that measures need to be enacted whereby faculty who do not submit portfolios for analysis should lose GER 7 status pending the submission of those materials.

- 3.) We also found notable differences in Table 3 between faculty and student responses on the question of "did this course help address fundamental questions defining norms and values"? Faculty rated their courses at the average of 4.7; students rated their courses at the average of 3.7. The working group is satisfied that the faculty are addressing GER 7 criteria, but it might be useful for faculty members to engage students in more frequent discussion about how their course contents relate to the broader goals of GER 7.
- 4.) In Tables 4a and 4b, summaries by rank of instructor point to differences. Overall differences of survey responses are negligible, and the portfolio ratings for the two groups are very similar, except for item 6. On average, the portfolio scores indicate that courses taught by tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members clearly include active critical analysis while courses taught by faculty members not eligible for tenure include active critical analysis at least somewhat.
- 5.) Students rated Philosophy courses in Table 8a lower than the GER 7 working group rated those courses in Table 8b. This can be explained in part, by the greater range of course means in Philosophy than in the other courses, and the portfolios that were available for review.

III. Overall Assessment

Based on these assessment results, the GER 7 assessment working group would like to make the following suggestions to the EPC and the ASC:

1. That all GER 7 course faculty should comply with requests for portfolios. As stated above, this suggests to us that measures need to be enacted whereby faculty who do not submit portfolios for analysis should lose GER 7 status pending the submission of those materials.
2. That, in order to allow for active critical analysis on the part of all students, courses fulfilling GER 7 should be limited in size: ideally, 20 – 25 students or, for larger classes, frequent small discussion sections should be designed into every syllabus.
3. That department chairs should be more sensitive to their duty to oversee the fulfillment of GER 7 criteria.
4. That courses designed to fulfill GER 7 criteria not come, as those courses change or new instructors come to teach them, to focus too narrowly on social or ethnological concerns, but address questions about how to identify and justify fundamental philosophical, religious, or social norms and values.

The GER 7 working group also has the following suggestions concerning the assessment process:

1. Student questionnaires should be identical or similar to portfolio scoring sheets in order to facilitate productive comparison.
2. In future assessments, the working group should be able to make more specific comments about individual courses (not instructors).

**TABLE 2a: Course Portfolios – Mean Ratings
Distribution of Portfolio Ratings for 28 Course Sections**

Extent to which courses:	Portfolio ratings*					
	Clearly=3	Mixed 2&3	Somewhat=2	Mixed 1&2	Not at all rating=1	Could not judge
1. Take a critical view of important influential approaches to philos., religious, or social thought	86% 24 sections	7% 2 sections	4% 1 section	4% 1 section	0	0
2. Deal with matters of enduring concern to human life, such as meaning, value, justice, freedom, and truth	89% 25 sections	11% 3 sections	0	0	0	0
3. Cultivate reasoned analysis and judgments in students	86% 24 sections	4% 1 section	11% 3 sections	0	0	1
4. Basic norms or values: address some fundamental questions about what is good, worthwhile, valuable, desirable, holy, sacred, right, just, true, beautiful, and the like in philosophical, religious, or social thought	89% 25 sections	7% 2 sections	0	4% 1 section	0	0
5. Questions of justification of norms and values: address questions about how to identify and justify philos., religious, or social norms and values	82% 23 sections	7% 2 sections	4% 1 section	0	7% 2 sections	1
6. Active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories, concepts, and methods or reasoning and deliberation in philos., relig., or social thought	64% 18 sections	21% 6 sections	7% 2 sections	0	7% 2 sections	1

*Two Working Group members had difficulty evaluating one portfolio used in the calibration exercise. Mean scores for the three criteria they could not judge are based on the ratings of the other two members (#3=2, #5=1, and #6=1).

Reliability:

In a calibration exercise, two portfolios were scored by all four Working Group members. Differences in scores and interpretations of criteria were discussed. Each of the remaining 26 portfolios were scored independently by two Working Group members. There was considerable consistency across scores, and raters agreed that scores reflected a common evaluation of the portfolios. The Office of Assessment calculated mean scores for each portfolio.

TABLE 2b: Summary of Student Responses To GER 7 Survey

SCALE: 1=very little, 3=somewhat, 5=very much

N=58 course sections

Questionnaire Item: To what extent did this course:	Mean for all courses	Percent of course sections with mean of:		
		4 & above	3 & above	2 & above
1. help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	3.8	43.1% 25 sections	89.7% 52 sections	100% 58 sections
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	4.2	74.1% 43 sections	98.3% 57 sections	100% 58 sections
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	4.0	65.5% 38 sections	96.6% 56 sections	100% 58 sections
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	3.9	55.2% 32 sections	93.1% 54 sections	100% 58 sections
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	4.0	58.6% 34 sections	96.6% 56 sections	100% 58 sections
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	4.0	55.2% 32 sections	98.3% 57 sections	100% 58 sections

TABLE 3: Summary of Faculty & Student Responses To GER 7 Survey

SCALE: 1=not at all, 3=somewhat, 5=to a great extent

Questionnaire Item:	Mean Scores	
	Faculty members (N=30/37)	Students (N=841/1609)
To what extent did this course:		
1. help you (students) address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	4.7	3.7
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	4.8	4.2
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	4.8	4.0
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	4.7	3.9
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	4.8	4.0
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	4.7	4.0

TABLE 4a: Summary of Student Survey Responses by Rank of Instructor
 (SCALE: 1=not at all, 3=somewhat, 5=to a great extent)

Questionnaire Item:	Mean Student Scores & Range of Course Means	
	Tenured/eligible 669/1275 students 47 sections	Non-tenure eligible 172/334 students 11 sections
To what extent did this course:		
1. help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	Mean: 3.6 Range: 2.0 – 4.9	Mean: 3.9 Range: 3.3 – 4.6
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.1 Range: 2.9 – 4.9	Mean: 4.3 Range: 3.5 – 4.7
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.0 Range: 2.8 – 4.7	Mean: 4.0 Range: 3.7 – 4.6
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.5 – 5.0	Mean: 3.9 Range: 3.1 – 4.7
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	Mean: 4.0 Range: 2.8 – 4.7	Mean: 3.9 Range: 3.6 – 4.4
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	Mean: 4.0 Range: 2.3 – 4.7	Mean: 4.0 Range: 3.5 – 4.7

TABLE 4b: Summary of Portfolio Scores by Rank of Instructor**SCALE: 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=clearly**

Criteria	Mean Ratings	
	Courses taught by tenured/eligible instructors	Courses taught by instructors not eligible for tenure
	23 portfolios	5 portfolios
1. Take a critical view of important influential approaches to philos., relig., or soc. thought	2.9	2.8
2. Deal with matters of enduring concern to human life, such as meaning, value, justice, freedom, and truth	3.0	2.9
3. Cultivate reasoned analysis and judgments in students	2.9	2.8
4. Basic norms or values: address some fundamental questions about what is good, worthwhile, valuable, desirable, holy, sacred, right, just, true, beautiful, and the like in philos., religious, or social thought	2.9	3.0
5. Questions of justification of norms and values: address questions about how to identify and justify philosophical, religious, or social norms and values	2.8	2.5
6. Active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories, concepts, and methods or reasoning and deliberation in philosophical, religious, or social thought	2.8	2.2

TABLE 5a: Summary of Student Survey Responses by Course Level

(SCALE: 1=not at all, 3=somewhat, 5=to a great extent)

Questionnaire Item:	Mean Student Scores & Range of Course Means	
	Lower (100-200) 428/796 students 29 sections	Upper (300-400) 413/813 students 29 sections
To what extent did this course:		
1. help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	Mean: 3.4 Range: 2.0 – 4.4	Mean: 3.9 Range: 3.1 – 4.9
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.0 Range: 2.9 – 4.9	Mean: 4.3 Range: 3.5 – 4.9
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.8 – 4.7	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.3 – 4.7
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	Mean: 3.7 Range: 2.5 – 4.8	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.1 – 5.0
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.8 – 4.7	Mean: 4.0 Range: 3.2 – 4.7
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.3 – 4.7	Mean: 4.0 Range: 3.4 – 4.7

TABLE 5b: Summary of Portfolio Scores by Course Level**SCALE: 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=clearly**

Portfolio Item	Mean Ratings	
	Lower (100-200) 13 portfolios	Upper (300-400) 15 portfolios
1. Take a critical view of important influential approaches to philos., relig., or soc. thought	2.9	2.8
2. Deal with matters of enduring concern to human life, such as meaning, value, justice, freedom, and truth	3.0	3.0
3. Cultivate reasoned analysis and judgments in students	2.8	2.9
4. Basic norms or values: address some fundamental questions about what is good, worthwhile, valuable, desirable, holy, sacred, right, just, true, beautiful, and the like in philos., religious, or social thought	2.9	2.9
5. Questions of justification of norms and values: address questions about how to identify and justify philosophical, religious, or social norms and values	2.8	2.8
6. Active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories, concepts, and methods or reasoning and deliberation in philosophical, religious, or social thought	2.8	2.7

TABLE 6a: Summary of Student Survey Responses by Class Size
(SCALE: 1=not at all, 3=somewhat, 5=to a great extent)

Questionnaire Item:	Mean Student Scores & Range of Course Means		
	Class size: 8-23 155/246 students 16 sections	Class size: 27-32 315/641 students 22 sections	Class size: 33-41 371/722 students 20 sections
To what extent did this course:			
1. help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.3 – 4.9	Mean: 3.5 Range: 2.0 – 4.4	Mean: 3.6 Range: 2.5 – 4.3
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philos., religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.5 Range: 3.8 - 4.9	Mean: 4.0 Range: 2.9 – 4.8	Mean: 4.2 Range: 3.1 – 4.8
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.4 Range: 4.0 – 4.7	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.8 – 4.3	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.9 – 4.6
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	Mean: 4.3 Range: 3.3 – 5.0	Mean: 3.7 Range: 2.8 – 4.8	Mean: 3.8 Range: 2.5 – 4.6
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	Mean: 4.4 Range: 3.8 – 4.7	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.8 – 4.5	Mean: 3.8 Range: 2.8 – 4.6
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	Mean: 4.4 Range: 4.0 – 4.7	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.3 – 4.6	Mean: 3.9 Range: 3.0 – 4.3

TABLE 6b: Summary of Portfolio Scores by Class Size

SCALE: 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=clearly

Portfolio Item	Mean Ratings	
	Class size: 8-23	Class size: 27-41
	13 portfolios	15 portfolios
1. Take a critical view of important influential approaches to philos., relig., or soc. thought	2.8	2.9
2. Deal with matters of enduring concern to human life, such as meaning, value, justice, freedom, and truth	2.9	3.0
3. Cultivate reasoned analysis and judgments in students	2.8	2.9
4. Basic norms or values: address some fundamental questions about what is good, worthwhile, valuable, desirable, holy, sacred, right, just, true, beautiful, and the like in philos, religious, or social thought	2.8	3.0
5. Questions of justification of norms and values: address questions about how to identify and justify philosophical, religious, or social norms and values	2.7	2.8
6. Active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories, concepts, and methods or reasoning and deliberation in philosophical, religious, or social thought	2.8	2.7

TABLE 7: Summary of Student Responses by Class Status
(SCALE: 1=not at all, 3=somewhat, 5=to a great extent)

Questionnaire Item:	Mean Scores			
	Freshman (168/257)	Sophomore (303/530)	Junior (230/468)	Senior (138/342)
To what extent did this course:				
1. help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.9
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.2
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	3.9	3.8	3.7	4.2
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.1
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	4.3	3.8	3.8	4.1

TABLE 8a: Summary of Student Survey Responses by Department
(SCALE: 1=very little, 3=somewhat, 5=very much)

Questionnaire Item:	Mean Student Scores & Range of Course Means	
	Philosophy 600/1134 students 39 course sections	Other 241/475 students 19 course sections
To what extent did this course:		
1. help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	Mean: 3.6 Range: 2.0 - 4.4	Mean: 4.0 Range: 3.1 - 4.9
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.2 Range: 2.9 - 4.9	Mean: 4.2 Range: 3.5 - 4.9
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.8 - 4.6	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.3 - 4.7
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	Mean: 3.8 Range: 2.5 - 4.6	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.2 - 5.0
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.8 - 4.7	Mean: 4.0 Range: 3.2 - 4.7
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	Mean: 3.9 Range: 2.3 - 4.6	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.5 - 4.7

TABLE 8b: Summary of Portfolio Scores by Department

SCALE: 1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=clearly

Portfolio Item	Mean Ratings	
	Philosophy 14 portfolios	Other 14 portfolios
1. Take a critical view of important influential approaches to philos., relig., or soc. thought	3.0	2.8
2. Deal with matters of enduring concern to human life, such as meaning, value, justice, freedom, and truth	3.0	2.9
3. Cultivate reasoned analysis and judgments in students	3.0	2.8
4. Basic norms or values: address some fundamental questions about what is good, worthwhile, valuable, desirable, holy, sacred, right, just, true, beautiful, and the like in philos, religious, or social thought	3.0	2.8
5. Questions of justification of norms and values: address questions about how to identify and justify philosophical, religious, or social norms and values	3.0	2.6
6. Active critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical theories, concepts, and methods or reasoning and deliberation in philosophical, religious, or social thought	2.9	2.5

TABLE 9: Summary of Student Survey Responses by Availability of Portfolios

(SCALE: 1=very little, 3=somewhat, 5=very much)

Questionnaire Item:	Mean Student Scores & Range of Course Means	
	Portfolios available 627/1197 students 43 course sections	Portfolios NOT available 214/412 students 15 course sections
To what extent did this course:		
1. help you address fundamental questions about defining norms and values?	Mean: 3.9 Range: 3.1 – 4.9	Mean: 3.0 Range: 2.0 – 4.5
2. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental theories in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.3 Range: 3.5 – 4.9	Mean: 3.7 Range: 2.9 – 4.7
3. involve you in critical analysis of fundamental assumptions in philosophical, religious, or social thought?	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.3 – 4.7	Mean: 3.7 Range: 2.8 – 4.6
4. involve you actively in critical analysis of evaluative and/or ethical concepts	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.1 – 5.0	Mean: 3.3 Range: 2.5 – 4.7
5. teach you to critically examine the arguments for and against philosophical, religious, or social norms and values?	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.2 – 4.7	Mean: 3.7 Range: 2.8 – 4.5
6. contribute to your thinking about philosophical, religious, or social thought in a new or different way?	Mean: 4.1 Range: 3.4 – 4.7	Mean: 3.7 Range: 2.3 – 4.7

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

ANALYSIS OF COURSE PORTFOLIOS: TABLE 2a

1. Based on analysis of student work and other course portfolio materials, how well are the GER 7 criteria being met?
 - a. What types of courses would clearly meet each criterion?
 - b. What types of courses would not meet each criterion?

PORTFOLIO & SURVEY RESULTS: TABLES 2a and 2b

Student & Faculty Comments (attached) and Responses to Open-ended survey responses (on enclosed disk)

2. Do student survey responses support the portfolio analysis? If not, please explain.

COMPARATIVE SURVEY FINDINGS: TABLES 3 – 8

Survey results are provided for all comparisons. Portfolio results are provided for instructor rank, course level, and class size because at least three portfolios were scored for each comparison group (i.e., for courses taught by tenured track faculty and non-tenure track faculty, for lower and upper level courses, and for different class sizes.)

3. For the GER 7 course criteria, do you find any substantively significant differences between:
 - a. Faculty and Student responses (Table 3)
 - b. Instructor ranks (Tables 4a & 4b: rank = tenure track, non-tenure track)
 - c. Course levels (Tables 5a & 5b : level = 100-200 and 300-400)
 - d. Class sizes (Table 6a: size = 8 to 23, 27 to 32, 33 to 41;
Table 6b: size = 8 to 23, 27 to 41)
 - e. Student class status (Table 7: class = freshman, sophomore, junior, senior)
 - f. Departments (Tables 8a and 8b: departments = Philosophy and Other departments/programs)
 - g. Courses with portfolios and those without portfolios (Table 9)

GER 7: OVERALL ASSESSMENT

4. To what extent are GER 7 courses meeting the overall goals of the Philosophical, Religious, and Social Thought requirement?
5. Based on the portfolio and/or the survey analyses, do you have additional comments about GER 7 courses?
6. Did you have any difficulty interpreting the Definition and Elaboration of Criteria for GER 7? If so, please explain.

7. Is the EPC's GER designation request clear (<http://www.physics.wm.edu/~cooke/EPC/>)? If not, please explain.
8. Does the EPC's GER designation request address the GER 7 criteria? If not, please explain.
9. Based on GER 7 assessment results, do you have any suggestions for the EPC?
10. Were the expectations for this assessment clear? If not, please explain.
11. Was the assessment process clear? If not, please explain.
12. Did you have difficulty developing the portfolio scoring sheet and surveys? If so, please explain.
13. Did you have difficulty scoring the portfolios? If so, please explain.
14. Did you have difficulty interpreting results of the surveys (e.g., understanding tables/charts, determining appropriate standards)? If so, please explain.
15. Do you have any suggestions about the assessment process?

Please include any additional comments or recommendations you have about the GER 7 assessment results and the GER 7 assessment process.