General Education Artifact Evaluation
2021-2022 Artifacts
Report compiled and submitted by Cindy Lamberty
Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Planning (AIEP)
Presented to General Education Committee 6 September 2022

On 14 June 2022, 10 faculty members evaluated student work submitted as artifacts for Communication, Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, and Mathematics. General Education outcomes for each discipline had been approved in 2019 by the full-time faculty. This is the second comprehensive review of all the artifacts by faculty evaluators. All ten of the faculty members were readers and the Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Planning was the floater. The floater read and evaluated artifacts when the assigned readers differed by more than two points on an outcome. There were 20 instances (5 in communications, 6 in sciences, and 9 in social sciences) compared to 2020-2021 evaluation with only two instances. The scores of the floater was averaged in with the original scores.

Unlike 2020-2021 evaluation, each area had a faculty member from that content area outside of their expertise. The rationale for this change lies in the thought that the faculty member can better communicate within their content/departments about the types and scope of student artifacts. Any changes that need to be made in outcomes, assignments, or instruction to improve student learning can take place as the semester starts and be implemented if possible in Fall 2022.

Student artifacts were submitted in Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 for all content areas. A total of 5534 artifacts were submitted through Canvas. Artifacts submitted or obtained from courses were pooled into discipline specific folders. A sample set of 50 artifacts was prepared for each content area. The percent of students per location per content area was determined. The number of artifacts randomly selected from each location was determined (see charts below) to obtain 50 total per content area.

AY21 Communications General Education

Row Labels	Number Enrolled	% of Grand Total	number to select
Concordia	381	23.92%	12
Concurrent	743	46.64%	23
Geary County	94	5.90%	3
internet	375	23.54%	12
Grand Total	**1593**	**100.00%**	**50**

AY Humanities General Education

Row Labels	Number enrolled	% of Grand Total	number to select
Concordia	293	37.81%	19
Concurrent	102	13.16%	7
Geary County	48	6.19%	3
internet	332	42.84%	21
Grand Total	**775**	**100.00%**	**50**

AY Math General Education

Row Labels	Number enrolled	% of Grand Total	Number to select
Concordia	256	29.19%	15
Concurrent	271	30.90%	15
Geary County	67	7.64%	4

internet	283	32.27%	16
Grand Total	**877**	**100.00%**	**50**

AY Science General Education

Row Labels	Number enrolled	% of Grand Total	Number to select
Concordia	531	51.65%	26
Concurrent	42	4.09%	2
Geary County	114	11.09%	6
internet	341	33.17%	17
Grand Total	**1028**	**100.00%**	**50**

AY21 Social Science General Education

Row Labels	Number enrolled	% of Grand Total	Number to Select
Concordia	464	36.80%	18
concurrent	231	18.32%	9
Geary County	70	5.55%	3
internet	496	39.33%	20
Grand Total	**1261**	**100.00%**	**50**

Number of artifacts submitted

Year	Communications	Humanities	Math	Sciences	Social Sciences
2021-2022	1593	775	877	1028	1261
2020-2021	335	98	45	98	308

No attempt was made to sort by courses within the content areas as this would impact the random samples set and would require Director of AIEP to review the artifacts and make decisions that may impact the random nature.

The 50 artifacts were pulled from each content and placed in Artifact folders for each discipline, they were renamed using the convention of discipline moniker and number. The monikers used include CM for Communication, HU for Humanities, MA for Math, SC for Science and SS for Social Science. All identifying information (student name/course/instructor) was removed/redacted by Director of AIEP in all possible cases. It was determined by the communications department that detailed outlines of the persuasive speech would be submitted as artifact rather than videos of the presentations. This resulted in 1) ensuring anonymity of student and 2) decrease the time needed to evaluate the student work. Artifacts were printed out for communications and humanities. In all other disciplines, the evaluators accessed the artifacts from folders shared by Director of AIEP. In future years, all content will be accessed digitally.

In the instances involving videos, identifying information cannot be removed. All written student work was copied for readers. All images (photos) and videos were available via shared folders with the readers.

Artifact Collection process:
Submission of Artifacts
The majority of the faculty, adjunct and con-current submitted student work as directed as a zipped folder. A few submitted individual artifacts into Canvas, the director of AIEP will reach out to those instructors and provide training on the technology. Two or three faculty submitted the whole class work

in one pdf file. This does not work for randomly selecting student work. In the future, this will be made more clear. One or more instructors submitted student work after they had made comments on the student paper. This is not acceptable as artifact; instructions will be improved.

Style of Artifacts
- *Textboxes*: Based on 2020-2021 artifact analysis, textboxes were discouraged, but some student work was submitted in this format although none were selected as artifacts in the random selection process. Information shared with instructors will continue to discourage as the content can be very limiting.
- *PowerPoints*: In printing off the student work, dark backgrounds in PowerPoint are more difficult to print and then read. As artifacts move to all digital, this will not pose a problem. PowerPoints tend to have limited information and may pose challenges to ensure all outcomes are met. If notes are included, this may prove beneficial.
- *Google Docs*: This did not pose a problem in the artifacts selected for evaluation. Some artifacts in all that were submitted could not be opened by AIEP. Care must be taken to ensure anyone can have access. A reminder to faculty will be included in instructions.
- Images as jpeg files was fine when artifacts were viewed digitally; issues arise with printing. The main complaint is that the work was not accompanied by any supporting documentation addressing the outcomes.
- *PDF:* Some student work was submitted to instructor as PDF, this is more difficult to remove the student information. In one case, the student information was redacted from one page but missed on the second page. Again this year, some instructors downloaded all student work in one PDF for submission. It was good to get the student work from the instructors but this adds time and difficulty in separating out student work. A zipped file is requested.
- *Video*: Videos were not submitted. Going forward, videos as evidence will not be accepted as the students will be identified.
- *Incomplete work*: In a few instances, notably humanities (art) the students must have submitted two different but related items for the course and these separated items were pooled with all artifacts. The director of AIEP did not realize the separated items "should go together" until artifacts had been pulled. An example was a piece of student artwork was submitted but the student reflection which would have addressed three of the four outcomes was not present. The Director of AIEP will meet with Art instructors to encourage slight modification in how the complete work can be submitted.

Communications

1593 artifacts submitted with 50 selected for evaluation: 12 from Concordia, 23 from Concurrent, 3 from Geary County and 12 from Internet. The artifacts were evaluated by Julia Galm, Communications and Kim Smith, Nursing; Cindy Lamberty AIEP evaluated five of the artifacts as floater. Two of the artifacts were not scored as identifying information was discovered. Artifacts were submitted from CM 101-Composition I, CM 102-Composition II, CM 120 Technical Writing, CM 115-Public Speaking, CM 240-Interpersonal Communications.

The artifacts included long research papers, short essays, outlines of speeches.

Results

Student mastery level per outcome from all evaluators

	1. Recognize communication conventions unique to multiple discourses and make appropriate communications choices according to those conventions.	2. Apply fundamental communication theories to rhetorical choices in both written and spoken formats.	3. Engage through listening and reading and respond thoughtfully with evidence to conflicting viewpoints using both written and spoken forms.	4. Ethically synthesize sources and communicate that synthesis coherently in written and spoken forms.	5. Identify the core elements of both written and spoken arguments and evaluate the quality of those arguments.	6. Compose a logical, evidence-based argument.
Eval 21-22	**3.45**	**3.19**	**3.09**	**2.96**	**2.92**	**3.12**
FA21	**3.21**	**3.12**	**3.15**	**3.17**	**3.20**	**3.27**
SP22	**3.16**	**3.22**	**3.15**	**3.15**	**3.19**	**3.34**
Eval 20-21	2.99	3.15	2.80	2.88	2.85	2.81
FA20	3.30	3.33	3.30	3.30	3.35	3.35
SP21	3.33	3.36	3.32	3.27	3.29	3.35

Overall the average scores per outcome were higher from the 2021-2022 evaluators than in 2020-2021. The instructor scores summed from Canvas data is lower than the evaluators with outcome GEC1 but higher for all the other outcomes.

54.2% (26 out of 48) of the artifacts had student mastery level of Met Expectations or higher. This is an increase from 2020-2021 evaluations when 42.0% scored at comparable levels.

Year	5.0	4.9-4.0	3.9-3.0	2.9-2.0	1.9-1.0
2021-22	**0%**	**18.8%**	**35.4%**	**45.8%**	**0%**
2020-21	2%	20%	20%	44%	14%

While there were no 5.0 scores, there were no artifacts scoring below 2.0 (nearly meets expectations). The percentage in the Exceeds Expectations (4.0) decreased slightly but Meets Expectations increased significantly and Nearly Meets Expectations increased slightly.

Evaluator comments

Strengths

-
Types/formats that worked well
- The essays were all fine.

Areas for improvement
-
Types/formats that did not work well.
- The ones that appeared to be project reports of some sort were difficult to assess because we had no info about the assignment or what students were asked to do.

Suggestions for modifications to outcomes.
- We've already updated our outcomes, but next year will be the first time using them.

Suggestions for modifications to assignments submitted for artifacts.
- It would be helpful to have assignment sheets on hand as well. I've done assessment rating in the past, and instructors would submit their assignment sheet with their artifacts; we then had a single binger of these that we could look at if we were confused about what students were tasked with. It would have been helpful to have something similar here.

Humanities
775 artifacts submitted with 50 selected for evaluation: 19 from Concordia, 7 from Concurrent, 3 from Geary County and 21 from online. The artifacts were evaluated by Brandon Galm, Chair of Communications and Paul Gardner, chair of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Both instructors teach courses in Humanities (Brandon teaches literature and theatre courses; Paul teaches history courses). Two artifacts were not evaluated as identifying information was present.

The student ranged from written reports that reflected the outcomes to images of artwork with no explanation.

Artifacts collected from AR 100, HI 108, HI 120, HI 121, HI 122, HI 123, HI 124, CM 106, CM 121, CM 125, CM 127, CM 140, CM 148, JN 100, MU 100, MU 103, PH 100
Work not collected from FL 111 (in Spanish), The following classes are humanities general education but not offered in AY2021: CM 122, CM 123, CM 124, HU 201, HU 202, JN 100, PH 105, RE 104

Results
Student mastery level per outcome from all evaluators

	1. Explain the interrelated nature of humanities: how humanities shapes the world and who the world shapes the humanities.	2. Demonstrate understanding of the humanities in a diverse, global context	3. Produce a work that engages with the creative and/or analytical process.	4. Demonstrate how the humanities can allow for introspection, self-discovery, and growth.
EVAL 21-22	**3.07**	**3.09**	**2.89**	**2.66**
FA21	**3.68**	**3.71**	**3.72**	**3.69**
SP22	**3.48**	**3.50**	**3.71**	**3.80**
EVAL 20-21	2.20	2.15	3.43	2.35
FA20	not scheduled to be assessed			
SP21	3.46	3.51	3.64	3.56
SU21	3.82	3.27	3.73	3.82

The average scores from the evaluators improved in three of the outcomes (GEH1, GEH2, ang GEH4) while one outcome score decreased. The evaluator average scores are lower than the summation of faculty scores in fall and spring semesters. One reason or this may be that only one portion of a multi-part assignment was used for evaluations but all parts would be available to the instructor during the regular semesters.

43.8% (21 out of 48) of the artifacts had student mastery level of Meets Expectations or higher. This is a significant increase from the previously year when only 24% reached that level.

Year	5.0	4.9-4.0	3.9-3.0	2.9-2.0	1.9-1.0
2021-22	**0%**	**4.2%**	**39.6%**	**54.2%**	**2.1%**
2020-21	0%	0%	24.0%	66%	10%

While there were no 5.0 scores in either year, this year there were two scored as Exceeds Expectations. The percent of artifacts scored as Meets Expectations increased this year while the percent at Nearly Meets Expectations and Does Not Meet Expectations both decreased.

Evaluator comments

Strengths

- Most of the documents did well on most of the requirements.

Types/formats that worked well

- Essay.

Areas for improvement

- The discussion of how the information affected the author overall seemed the weakest.

Types/formats that did not work well.

- Slides and pictures.

Suggestions for modifications to outcomes.

Suggestions for modifications to assignments submitted for artifacts.

-

Math

The number of artifacts submitted in the 2021-2022 year increased significantly from 45 to 877, 50 artifacts were selected for evaluation: 15 from Concordia, 15 from Concurrent, 4 from Geary County and 16 from Internet. The artifacts were evaluated by Rob Zima, Math and Sara Beikman, Nursing. One artifact was not scored as the content was not available digitally.

Work was collected from MA 110, MA 111, MA 112, MA 114, MA 115, MA 120.
The artifacts were primarily applications problems. In a few cases, the instructor submitted an exam summary of the number of problems answered correctly. These did not adequately show the student work.

Results
Student mastery level per outcome from all evaluators

	1. Recognize the mathematical concepts that are applicable to a scenario.	2. Apply technology in analysis.	3. Accurately interpret, validate, and communicate the result.
EVAL 21-22	**2.98**	**2.09**	**2.72**
FA21	**3.59**	**3.58**	**3.37**
SP22	**4.07**	**3.35**	**3.72**
EVAL 20-21	2.46	1.66	2.01
FA20	not scheduled to be assessed		
SP21	3.98	3.98	3.80
SU21	3.36	2.43	2.93

As indicated in the table above, the average scores on all outcome from the evaluators increased this year compared to last year. One outcome (GEM1) was very close to Meets Expectations. Outcome GEM2 Nearly Meets Expectation overall and outcome GEM3 increased significantly.
The evaluator scores are lower than instructor scores. A rubric with performance indicators needs to be created and available to all math instructors.

36.5% for the artifacts scored at Meets Expectation or above compared to 26.7% last year.

Year	5.0	4.9-4.0	3.9-3.0	2.9-2.0	1.9-1.0
2021-22	**0%**	**8.2%**	**28.6%**	**40.8%**	**22.5%**
2020-21	0%	11.1%	15.6%	6.7%	66.7%

No artifact scored 5.0 in either year. The percent of artifacts scoring at the Exceeds Expectations level decreased slightly this year but the percentage at Meets Expectation increased significantly. The percent of Nearly Meets Expectation also increase significantly from 6.7% to 40.8% and the percent which of Does Not Meet Expectations dropped all scores per artifact: No artifacts scored a 5.0, 11.1% (5 out of 45) scored 4.0-4.99, 15.6% (7 out of 45) scored 3.00-3.99, 6.7% (3 out of 45) scored 2.00-2.99, and 66.7% (5 out of 45) scored 1.00-1.99.

The Math and Engineering Department provided common problems for most of the general education math courses which accounts for both the increase in number of artifacts submitted and the overall mastery scores. The common problems could be used as is or as a guide for the instructors to develop similar problems. A common rubric with performance indicators for each outcome needs to be created to supplement the common assignments.

Evaluator comments

Strengths

- There was consistency in how we evaluated the assignments.

Types/formats that worked well

- Assignments that allowed students to show their work were better than a multiple choice assignment.

Areas for improvement

- Assignments and level of difficulty for a particular assignment were inconsistent for the same class, but different instructors.

Types/formats that did not work well.

- Multiple choice assignments that did not show a students work were more difficult to assess.

Suggestions for modifications to outcomes.

Suggestions for modifications to assignments submitted for artifacts.

- None

Sciences

1028 artifacts submitted, 50 selected for evaluation: 26 from Concordia, 2 from Concurrent, 6 from Geary County, and 17 from Internet. The evaluator were Taryn Cipra, Sciences, and Amy Kern, Art. Cindy Lamberty, AIEP evaluated six documents as floater. Two of the artifacts were not scored as they were duplicate items submitted by teams of students. In future terms, faculty will be counseled to not allow group work for artifacts.

Courses include SC 101, SC 103, SC 104, SC 107, SC 110, SC 120, SC 126, SC 130, SC 131, SC 137, SC 140, SC 151.
SC 103, SC 140, SC 142 and SC 146 are science general education courses but none of them were taught in 2021-2022.

Results
Student mastery level per outcome from all evaluators

	1. Apply the scientific process to evaluate current issues and circumstances.	2. Demonstrate scientific literacy and knowledge about the study of matter, life, and the universe.	3. Critically analyze events through a scientific lens.	4. Demonstrate quantitative reasoning and problem-solving.
EVAL 21-22	**3.49**	**3.49**	**3.16**	**3.27**
FA21	**3.68**	**3.74**	**3.42**	**3.37**
SP22	**3.47**	**3.51**	**3.57**	**3.77**
EVAL 20-21	2.66	2.63	2.53	2.46
FA20	4.33	4.00	4.04	4.22
SP21	3.93	3.96	4.00	4.00
SU21	not assessed			

The mastery scores based on evaluators increased over for all outcomes compared to the previous year. and all were over 3.00 indicating Meets Expectations. The evaluator scores and instructor scores are fairly closely aligned although the instructors are higher than evaluators. This may be due to the fact that instructors know the instructions for the assignment while the evaluators do not.

64.6% of the artifacts had student mastery level of Met Expectations or higher. This is higher than the 44% in 2020-2021

Year	5.0	4.9-4.0	3.9-3.0	2.9-2.0	1.9-1.0
2021-22	**6.3%**	**29.2%**	**29.2%**	**25.0%**	**10.4%**
2020-21	0%	2.0%	42.0%	38.0%	18.0%

Three artifacts were scored as Substantially Exceeds Expectations (5.0) for 6.3% of the artifacts. The percentage of artifacts obtaining Exceeds Expectation increased significantly from 2.0% to 29.2%; this increase was offset with a decrease in Meets Expectation scores from 42% to 29.2%. Then percentage of Nearly Meets Expectations and Does Not Meet Expectations both decreased.

Evaluator comments:
Strengths
- I think there were some really great artifacts that met the standards really well.

Types/formats of artifacts that worked well for evaluations.

- Projects, experiments.

Areas for improvement
- No team assignments.
- Need to add problem solving to the rubric selection description if it is in the title. "Concisely" is subjective and some of the best artifacts were thorough but not concise.
- I would love to just have standardized tests or assignments to cross compare to other course sections of the same class.

Types/formats of artifacts that did not work well for evaluations.
- Detailed questions on global warming.
- Plant based meats is mediocre in response. Some are good though

Suggestions for modifications to outcomes
- Criterion 3 title change and concisely already mentioned.

Suggestions for modifications to assignments submitted for artifact.
-

Social Sciences
1261 artifacts were submitted and 50 artifacts were selected: 18 from Concordia, 9 from Concurrent, 3 from Geary County, and 20 from Internet. The artifacts were evaluated by Kristina Frost, Social and Behavioral Sciences and Mark Whisler, chair of Math. Cindy Lamberty, AIEP evaluated nine of the artifacts as the floater. Common assignment presented asked students to compare two cultural groups, other assignments had student report on concepts from the courses.

General Education courses for Social Science include EC 101, EC 102, GE 101, SS 101, SS 105, SS 106, SS 125, SS 130, SS 140, SS 142, SS 201.
No work collected from SS 141 and SS 150 as they were not taught in Spring 2021

Results
Student mastery level per outcome from all evaluators

	1 Demonstrate critical thinking in understanding of psychological and social aspects of the human experience.
EVAL 21-22	**2.56**
FA21	**3.94**
SP22	**3.91**
EVAL 20-21	2.90
FA20	not scheduled to be assessed
SP21	3.72
SU21	3.71

The average score from 2021-2022 evaluators (2.56) dropped a bit from the previous year (2.90). The mastery scores determined by the faculty were much higher, than the evaluators scores. A larger number of evaluator scores were different, only nine differed by more than 2 points, but few of the artifacts had similar scores. Norming of the student samples may need to be re-visited.

Only 17 (34.0%) of the artifacts were scored at Meets Expectations or higher. This is significantly lower than the previous year when 62% met this goal. The results will need to be reviewed with the Social and Behavioral Science Department to determine the interventions that are needed. The common assignment is fairly broad to be implemented in multiple courses, this may need to be narrowed down to better address the outcome. A common rubric with performance indicators is available but it may need to be revised.

Year	5.0	4.9-4.0	3.9-3.0	2.9-2.0	1.9-1.0
2021-22	**0%**	**10.0%**	**24.0%**	**42.0%**	**24.0%**
2020-21	8.0%	12.0%	42.0%	26.0%	12.0%

Compared to the previous year, there was a decrease in the percentage of outcomes at Substantially Exceeds Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, and Meets Expectations as indicated in the table above. The percentage of artifacts at Nearly Meets Expectations and Does Not Meet Expectations increased significantly.

Evaluator comments:

Strengths

- *Broad areas covered
- *Heavy emphasis on culture
- *Addresses the human experience both socially and psychologically
- *Many artifacts were excellent representations of critical thinking and analysis,
- * Many artifacts were very efficient at juxtaposition of cultures, cultural practices and/or evaluation of ethics and values within groups, cultures, or social institutions.

Types/formats of artifacts that worked well for evaluations.

- Research papers with analysis steps
- Compare/contrast research
- Evaluative papers
- Research projects that include evaluation of findings

Areas for improvement

- *Some artifacts need more emphasis on citations both in-text citation and works cited
- *It might be beneficial to use a standard citation across the discipline such as APA
- *Some artifacts were basic "reports." There needs to be a focus on "critical thinking" and "demonstration of critical thinking."
- *Also important to some of the artifacts is the "analysis" step and some artifacts were lacking this step.
- *The PowerPoints, for example, represented reports and did not include "critical thinking" or "analysis.
-

Types/formats of artifacts that did not work well for evaluations.

- PowerPoint presentations

Suggestions for modifications to outcomes

- A second outcome is being added in Fall 2022 to extend the PLO/GEO from one to two

Suggestions for modifications to assignments submitted for artifact.

-

Conclusions

Overall the results of general education artifact evaluation show an increase in 1) student learning and 2) the number of student artifacts collected. Three (Communications, Math and Science) of the five disciplines had an increase in evaluator scores for all outcomes, one area (Humanities) increased for three of the outcomes but a decrease for one. One area Social Sciences) saw a decrease in the evaluators score for the one outcome. The number of artifacts 5534 up from 884 in 2020-2021. It should be noted that Social Sciences, Math, and Humanities were not scheduled to collect artifacts in the original plan approved in Fall 2018. In Spring 2021, artifact collection was implemented for all areas.

The overall number and percentage of artifacts scoring at a 3.0 or higher increased in the 2021-2022 year (47.3%) compared to the previous year (40.0%)

Number of artifacts scoring 3.0 or higher by evaluators.

Number of artifacts at each mastery level

	Communications		Humanities		Math		Science		Social Science		Overall	
	20-21	21-22	20-21	21-22	20-21	21-22	20-21	21-22	20-21	21-22	20-21	21-22
5.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	5	3
4.0-4.9	10	9	0	2	5	4	1	15	6	8	22	38
3.0-3.9	10	17	12	19	7	14	21	13	21	11	71	74
2.0-2.9	22	22	33	26	3	20	19	12	13	19	90	99
1.0-1.9	7	0	5	1	30	11	9	5	6	12	57	29
Sum of artifact number	50	48	50	48	45	49	50	48	50	50	245	243
3.0 or higher	21	26	12	21	12	18	22	31	21	19	98	115
Meets Mastery or above	42.0%	54.2%	24.0%	43.8%	26.7%	36.7%	44.0%	64.6%	62.0%	38.0%	40.0%	47.3%

Based upon the 2020-2021 results two interventions were implemented for the 2021-2022 academic year: 1) common assignments and 2) common rubrics with performance indicators for each student mastery level. These interventions were expected to improve student learning and ensure quality, rigor and consistency regardless of modality and based on the results, they were successful.

Opportunities for continuous improvement remains for all areas. The faculty in Communications and Humanities revised the outcomes in their areas to better represent the student learning expected. The faculty in Social and Behavioral Sciences developed an additional outcome for their area. These changes go into effect Fall 2022. Revision and development of common assignments aligned with general education outcomes in math and science continue to take place.

In addition, Instructor Guides for all general education courses with multiple instructors have been developed. These guides have the outcomes, common assignment, and scoring rubric in one document to better communicate the expectations for these courses for adjunct and new instructors. The guides are prepared by Director of AIEP with final approval by Department chairs.

Artifacts

All artifacts need to be submitted into the department shell or some other electronic location. Artifacts should be submitted as a zipped folder. Student work cannot be combined into one pdf document.

Problems occur when the evaluators do not know the assignment/directions given to the students. Some of the works represented good assignments but not good artifacts because the outcomes were not clearly addressed in the student work.

Artifacts could not be collected from FL 111 as the student work was all in Spanish.

Strengths

The student work being available. The process of evaluating artifacts in teams all in one place.

Areas of Improvement

Common assignments have the following advantages: all outcomes addressed, transparency regarding the reason for the can be presented in the introduction of the assignment (letting the students know the outcomes, the expectation of content, the parameters of the assignment) and are authentic assessments. It is not appropriate to assess student learning of an outcome if that outcome has not been covered.

Process:

Suggestions from evaluators on the process:

- Loved the snacks and the fruit!
- None. I thought this was effectively done.
- Just standardized testing where it would work.
- I think it could be streamlined a bit by having everyone enter their own scores into a google doc, that way the data is already in place in real time without shuffling sheets back and forth. As mentioned above, I also think an assignment binder would be helpful. Also, doing this survey on the day of assessment would have been a nice way to wrap things up while everything was still fresh in our minds.