

General Education Assessment Committee Report AY 2022-2023

GEAC - Critical Thinking

Compiled by Joseph Genslinger, Associate Professor – Physical Sciences

During the 2022-2023 academic year, critical thinking was assessed 138 times which is an increase of 35 assessments from the prior academic year. In regards to individual categories on the rubric, students were assessed on four subcomponents: perspective, analysis, vocabulary, and judgement. On a scale of 1-5, 3-5 is considered proficient, while 1-2 is considered to be not proficient.

Perspective: In 2022-2023, the students’ average score on the perspective category was 3.43, and in 2021-2022, the average was 4.14. In the proficiency category, out of 138 rubrics, 114 were proficient which is 82.6%. This is a 14.5% decrease from the 2021-2022 academic year. In the not proficient category, out of the 138 rubrics, 24 scored not proficient, which is 17.4%.

Analysis: In 2022-2023, the student’s average score on the analysis category was 3.36, and in 2021-2022, the average was 3.91. In the proficiency category, out of 138 rubrics, 107 were proficient which is 77.5%. This is a 9.9% decrease over the 2021-2022 academic year. In the not proficient category, out of the 138 rubrics, 31 scored not proficient, which is 22.5%.

Vocabulary: In 2022-2023, the student’s average score on the vocabulary category was 3.63, and in 2021-2022, the average was 4.10. In the proficiency category, out of 138 rubrics, 118 were proficient which is 85.5%. This is an 8.7% decrease from the 2021-2022 academic year. In the not proficient category, out of the 138 rubrics, 20 scored not proficient, which is 14.5%.

Judgement: In 2022-2023, the students’ average score on the judgement category was 3.62, and in 2021-2022, the average was 4.06. In the proficiency category, out of 138 rubrics, 121 were proficient which is 87.7%. This is a 7.5% decrease from the 2021-2022 academic year. In the not proficient category, out of the 138 rubrics, 17 scored not proficient, which is 12.3%.

	Perspective (5)	Analysis (5)	Vocabulary (5)	Judgement (5)
AY 2022/2023 Average Scores	3.43	3.36	3.63	3.62

AY 2021/2022 Average Scores	4.11	3.91	4.10	4.06
# of Scores 3 or Above out of 138	114	107	118	121
AY 2022/2023 Proficiency	82.6%	77.5%	85.5%	87.7%
AY 2021/2022 Proficiency	97.1%	87.4%	94.2%	95.2%
<i>% Change</i>	<i>-14.5%</i>	<i>-9.9%</i>	<i>-8.7%</i>	<i>-7.5%</i>

Analysis

After reviewing the data, it should be noted that the total number of students assessed increased by 35 students but despite the decrease in the average score overall, the rubric average stayed above a 3.0 in each category (P-3.43, A-3.36, V-3.63, J-3.62). The proficiency percentages decreased in all 4 categories, and while the change was significant, it was to be expected. Likely causes of the decrease in % proficiency:

- All students were assessed as opposed to just the GEAC cohort of students.
- Small sample size; Despite assessing all students (minus students who didn't complete the assessment) the overall assessment number only rose to 138.
- Only three faculty members submitted assessments in Critical Thinking for the AY22-23, 104 of the 138 assessments coming from one faculty member.
- First academic year returning to normal face to face sections without pandemic restrictions. Students assessed likely completed their junior/senior high school year or freshmen college year during pandemic and with pandemic restrictions.

In further analysis of the data, when looking at the assessment in totality, the average score was 14.04 out of a maximum of 20. This correlates to an 70.2%. If we average each category at 3, a minimum of 12 would be proficient. Of the 138 rubrics, 102 or 74.0% were 12 or higher. The 36 scores under 12 had the following grade distribution: A-1, B-14, C-17, D-2, and F-2. Of the 4 rubric submissions of students who received D or F in the course, the average score was 9 out of 20.

Intervention

A clear area of intervention within the critical thinking rubric is perspective and analysis. These two sections had the biggest drop in proficiency at 14.5% and 9.9% respectively. As mentioned above, I think this is largely a result of the assessment of all students as opposed to GEAC cohort students and student's lack of time in the classroom and lab (science) over the last two years. An intervention I think that would be beneficial and in particular the sciences, would be a hands-on approach to problem solving, experimentation and interpretation of the data. Allowing to work the problem and rework problems using different approaches and methodologies would be a potential approach.

Another intervention that could take place would be addressing if students understand the assignment vocabulary. Faculty could explain what vocabulary is expected in the assignment and what is appropriate. One way to do this is to relate the assignment or material back to the textbook or review the vocabulary that should be included in the assignment via a rubric. This would ensure students knew what vocabulary is expected. Another intervention that would support the students' understanding would require faculty using the rubric to make sure students are helped to analyze their work in a way that the instructor expects for the assignment to be done, via a rubric for the individual assignment.

The overall score of not proficient is low but could be improved through the lead working with faculty directly to determine if students need to work on these skills or if an intervention, such as an assignment rubric, could be developed.

GEAC - Diversity Awareness

Compiled by Louise Jett, Assistant Professor, Program Coordinator for Graphic Design and Web Design & Development

During the Fall 2022, Spring 2023, and Summer 2023 semesters, 104 different students were assessed using the Diversity Awareness rubric for the General Education Assessment Committee. Students were assessed on assignments asking them to identify, compare, contrast, and appreciate the interdependencies and conflicts of diverse communities on national, regional, local, and/or personal levels. Components include similarities, connections, and differences.

Scores were documented for 23 different assignments in 19 different courses across campus in FA2022, SP2023, and SU2023, offering a much higher sample size of 104 different students and 149 total assessments. The averages were: 4.09 for Identify, 3.87 for Compare, 3.88 Contrast, and 4.13 for appreciate.

Diversity Awareness Averages

Identify	Compare	Contrast	Appreciate
4.09	3.87	3.88	4.13

During the FA2021 and SP2022 semesters, there was a much lower sampling size of 38. The larger sampling size of 104 could account for the lower averages in student scores during the FA2022, SP2023, and SU2023 semesters. All averages are still well above 3.0.

	Students	Identify	Compare	Contrast	Appreciate
Fall 2022	53	3.88	3.71	3.72	4.09
Spring 2023	43	4.21	4.03	4.04	4.18
Summer 2023	8	4.18	3.87	3.88	4.13

Diversity Awareness Proficiency Rates (percent of all scores that were 4 or 5)

Fall 2022 - Spring 2023 - Summer 2023

Identify	Compare	Contrast	Appreciate
78%	63%	63%	79%

The FA2022, SP2023 and SU2023 averages are lower across each rubric category, but the larger sampling size and lack of Gen Ed Cohorts, may account for this difference. We are now testing all students. Before we only tested students that met the Gen Ed Cohort criteria of being “generally educated.” Still, the scores reflect a similar trend (higher scores on Identify and Appreciate, lower scores on Compare and Contrast) as previous GEAC reports. This signals that students are more able to identify diversity issues and appreciate the need for a range of diverse opinions, and students are less able to show evidence in comparing and contrasting different points of view. Strengthening analytic thinking skills in general, while also giving students more opportunities to compare and contrast diverse cultures, will help them better provide clear and supported examples of both interdependencies, connections and similarities, as well as differences and conflicts, between nations, regions, communities, individuals or concepts.

Increased faculty engagement with GEAC in general will allow us to better assess our students. We can increase faculty participation and the effectiveness of the assignments used to assess diversity awareness by helping instructors and program coordinators see the ways in which GEAC outcomes can help them improve their courses and programs. Faculty members can explore the GEAC outcomes for their students and brainstorm approaches to intervene when students fall short of campus-wide results or expectations, in general. Instructors and program coordinators can also use the data to set benchmarks and implement interventions that can lead to better results. This process will help us create new narratives for program reviews and program/course level assessments, while improving the skills of our students. Those faculty members who have results higher than campus-wide averages can share their approaches and, hopefully, help their colleagues improve their students' GEAC scores.

Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Excellence Mya Lawrence and I would like to update the GEAC definition for Diversity.

Currently, the definition is: “**Diversity Awareness:** effective skill in identifying, comparing, contrasting, and appreciating the interdependencies and conflicts of diverse communities on national, regional, local, and/or personal levels. Components include similarities, connections, and differences.”

We would like to propose something along the lines of: “**Diversity Awareness:** effective skill in identifying, comparing, contrasting, and understanding the interdependencies and conflicts of diverse communities on national, regional, local, and/or personal levels. Diverse communities are underserved and underrepresented groups including, but not limited to: race, gender, religion, sexuality, differently abled, and accessibility. Components include equity, biases, intersectionality, privilege, similarities, and differences.”

This updated definition will broaden and modernize our thinking around the topic of Diversity Awareness and help us better educate our students while fostering equity in our classrooms. Under this new definition, instructors may be able to more easily identify and create assignments that can be utilized when assessing students' Diversity Awareness.

The GEAC guide also needs to be updated to reflect the fact that all students are now GEAC-eligible. In his FA2021 and SP2022 report, Assistant Professor of English Justin Bernaix proposed embedding assessments in certain courses, as well as building specific partnerships with selected faculty. These are changes that could also improve faculty engagement and therefore improve the accuracy of GEAC results.

GEAC - Mathematical Reasoning

Compiled by Abby Stephens, Assistant Professor of Biology

The following is an analysis of the mathematical reasoning data gathered from the academic year Fall 2022-Summer 2023. There were 41 submitted scores from two science courses. A larger sample size would be more ideal and a better representation of the entire campus community. Although there have been no scores submitted previously, this year's data is still a

valuable point of comparison for subsequent academic years when more scores will be submitted.

Instructors use the following criterion to assess the mathematical reasoning proficiency of their assignments:

Identify: the student has examined the given information and has identified an appropriate mathematical model/strategy to address the problem.

Apply: the student has demonstrated how to apply the appropriate model/strategy to the problem

Calculate: the student has accurately carried out the computations and logical reasoning involved in solving the problem

Label: the student has applied correct units of measurement to the problem

Interpret: the student has demonstrated a correct interpretation for the result of his/her computation within the context of the problem.

Every criterion is evaluated on a scale from 1-5. A score of 1 represents “unacceptable/non-existent”. A score of 2 represents “below average”. A score of 3 represents “average”. A score of 4 represents “good”. A score of 5 represents “superior”.

To be considered proficient in a criterion, students must score a 4 or 5.

	Identify (out of 5)	Apply (out of 5)	Calculate (out of 5)	Label (out of 5)	Interpret (out of 5)
Average Score	4	4	4	3	4
Proficiency Rates	78%	58.5%	63.4%	41.5%	70.7%

Proficiency rates: percent of all scores that were 4 or 5.

Based on these scores, we did not meet proficiency in the **Label** criterion. It is my opinion that this can be easily remedied. Knowing it is an area that needs improvement, instructors can focus on making it a priority for students to consistently include the units of measurement to their answers in order to teach students the importance of clear communication.

The **Apply** and **Calculate** criterion also have room for improvement. While we did meet proficiency in these criteria, I believe these are criteria that can easily be improved upon. The **Apply** criterion is evaluated based on the student writing out their work. If a student does the math in their head and tries to work too quickly, they will not complete this step and then receive a lower score. This is directly linked to the **Calculate** criterion. When students do not write out their work, then it is harder for them to catch their mistakes as well as harder for instructors to help them. As with the **Label** criterion, knowing it is an area that needs

improvement means instructors will now know to make it an actual action item on their assignments and we should see higher proficiency rates in the future.

The highest proficiency rates are in the **Identify** and **Interpret** criteria. This means the evaluated students are proficient in their ability to recognize the problem and figure out which formula they need to use to solve the problem. They also are proficient in their ability to take the answer of their problem, come to the appropriate logical analysis and interpretation of the problems they are solving.

The fact that this data set only includes scores from students in science courses could also explain the relative lower proficiency rates in **Label, Apply** and **Calculate**. When students are not in a math class, they may not be using the math skills that are enforced in those courses. For example, they will choose to do calculations in their head instead of writing them out. It is easy for students to get out of practice, especially when they are not doing mathematical calculations on a daily basis.

The higher **Identify** and **Interpret** proficiency rates helps reinforce this opinion. Regardless of type of assignment in science courses, students are always asked to recognize the proper way to solve a problem as well as drawing logical conclusions. The students evaluated have shown they are adept at analyzing problems and using deductive reasoning skills.

GEAC - Oral Communication

Compiled by Jeff Harrison, Associate Professor of Speech Communication

During the 2022-23 academic year 39 students were assessed in the general education area of oral communication for the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC). This was 55 fewer students than the previous year. AY 2022-23 was the second year the committee used the cohort method of selecting students to assess rather than assessing all students in a class, as had been past practice. Some of these students were assessed more than once. Overall, the average score of students on the speaking rubric for this time period was 44.7 (out of 50) or 89.4%. This score falls well within the boundaries set for proficiency (80%). Below is a table indicating the average total scores on the Oral Communication rubric, compared to the overall average scores of the previous year.

Average Total Scores

Academic Year	Average (Out of 50)	Percentage (%)
2022-23	44.7	89.4%
2021-22	44.3	88.6%
Overall Average	44.5	89.0%

The table above shows an increase in the overall average scores of 0.4 (0.8%) between AY 2022-23 and AY 2021-22. Below is a table indicating the average scores for each individual category on the speaking rubric for AY 2022-2023 compared to the previous year.

Average Individual Scores

Category	Average 2022-23 (1-5)	Average 2021-22 (1-5)
Grabber/Preview	4.7	4.6
Main Points	4.6	4.6
Support	4.7	4.6
Conclusion	4.3	4.4
Organization	4.5	4.5
Does Not Read	4.0	4.0
Language	4.5	4.5
Vocal Elements	4.2	4.2
Nonverbal Elements	4.4	4.2
Meets Criteria	4.8	4.7
Total (out of 50)	44.7	44.3

The individual scores on the speaking rubric ranged from 4.8 (Meets Criteria) to 4.0 (Does Not Read Presentation). The area Meets Criteria is consistently in the top tier of scores. This year they are followed closely by the categories of Grabber/Preview, Support, and Main Points. It is not unusual to see these categories hold this distinction. Once again, the category of Does Not Read Presentation was on the bottom, however it still meets the criteria for proficiency, with an average score of 4.0. In past years that category has seen average scores between 3.5-3.8 (below proficiency). When analyzing the average scores for individual categories on the speaking rubric, all categories fell within the boundaries of proficiency (4.0). While the average score of the category Does Not Read Presentation fell within the proficiency level during this time, it still remains the category with the lowest average score. These scores were brought to the attention of the Speech Communication faculty and strategy sessions were held to discuss ways to improve the scores of this element. This area is something the Speech faculty deal with every semester. To help improve these scores Speech faculty hold impromptu speaking exercises as often as possible in their classes. Impromptu speaking is delivering your thoughts with little or no time for preparation. Having students speak more frequently in class helps strengthen their self-confidence which, in turn, helps them realize they can effectively speak extemporaneously and not have to rely on their notes quite so much. The Speech faculty realizes not every non-Speech class has the time or means to hold impromptu sessions during the semester, however they do have other suggestions for faculty across campus to aid in raising this category's scores.

First, instructors should encourage students to not write out their entire oral presentation and take it to the podium with them. Students will then not be tempted to read their speech. Suggesting the use of a speaking outline or notes that contain only keywords and/or phrases to help students remember what they want to say will help with an extemporaneous delivery. Templates and examples of speaking outlines can be obtained in the Communications Lab or from any Speech faculty member.

Faculty should also address the topic of speech anxiety when the oral presentation is assigned. Speech anxiety is natural, and talking about ways to help reduce anxiety symptoms before speaking will help make speakers more comfortable about delivering their presentations extemporaneously. Both the Communications Lab and Speech faculty can be contacted for suggestions as to how to help reduce speech anxiety.

Instructors should encourage their students to practice their presentation out loud several times before delivering it for a grade. Practicing will help instill confidence in the speaker, knowing they are well-prepared. As students become more confident, they rely less on notes.

Finally, instructors should encourage their students to visit the Communications Lab where they can receive one-on-one help with speeches and/or presentations. The tutors in the lab can help students do everything from choosing a topic, to properly structuring and organizing a speech, to choosing appropriate presentation aids, to practicing their speech extemporaneously. Students have the option of having their practice session videotaped, where the tutor will then sit with the student and immediately review the presentation, pointing out both the positive elements the speaker possesses along with any elements that still may need work. The Communications Lab is located in Trimpe 241. Appointments can be made for specific times/dates, but walk-ins are also welcome. It is important to note that the lab is not just for Speech students. Any student needing assistance with a speech or oral presentation, for any class or occasion, is encouraged to visit the lab.

According to Mary Busler, lead tutor in the Communications Lab, during AY 2022-23 she made 21 in-person visits to various classrooms to speak to students about the lab. She states there was a total of 342 visits to the Communications Lab by students seeking assistance with speeches/oral presentations before presenting them in class for a grade. Some of the disciplines from which these students came include Architectural Technology, Career Development, Economics, Medical Assisting, Psychology, Sociology (Honor's College), Speech Communication, Study Skills, and Supported College Transition. With all average scores being within the proficiency level, we can surmise these visits to the Communication Lab help contribute to those positive scores.

It should be noted that not all disciplines who visited the Communications Lab participated in assessing oral presentations for GEAC, and those students and their scores are not represented in this report.

The decision has been made to return to the method of assessing all students, and not just cohort students, for AY 2023-24. After consultation with Speech department faculty members, it has been decided to set a goal of having 70% of all assessed students score at or above the proficiency level (80%) as an overall score, for AY 2023-24.

GEAC – Teamwork Skills

Compiled by Rebecca Gockel, Professor of Paralegal Studies

During the 2022-2023 academic year, the General Education Assessment rubric for Teamwork Skills was utilized to assess a sample of students for which data was collected from faculty and peer evaluations of students participating in team-based projects where the four criteria (Cooperation, Contribution, Preparation and Member Responsibility) could be appropriately applied. Twenty-five (25) students were assessed (Fall 2022 through Summer 2023) by one instructor this cycle. One large section of one course in one discipline participated in assessing teamwork skills at Lewis & Clark Community College.

All partnering faculty members continue to use the same standardized assessment rubric to evaluate students' teamwork skills proficiency levels. The instructor submitted the rubric scores electronically. Point values on the rubric ranged from 1-5, with one being Nonexistent/Unacceptable and five being Superior. A perfect score of 5 on the evaluation deemed proficient, therefore a score of 4 or higher on individual elements is considered proficient. Theoretically, it would be possible for a student to receive a score below proficiency level on an individual criterion and yet score at or above proficiency overall. A total score between 60-80% is deemed to be below proficiency, and a total score below 60% is deemed not to be proficient. There were four criteria for measuring social relations proficiency: Cooperation, Contribution, Preparation, and Member Responsibility.

Overall, the average score of students assessed using the Teamwork Skills rubric in AY 2022/2023 was 100%. This average is above the boundaries set for proficiency. The four criteria all received the highest scores possible (5/5). When analyzing the mean scores for individual criteria on the Teamwork Skills rubric, I found that no categories fell within the "below proficiency" or "not proficient" levels. Changes from the previous reporting period are as follows: Total number of students assessed remained the same as last reporting period (25 students). Cooperation level (4.72 v. 5.0) increased by 106%. Contribution level (4.4 v. 5.0) increased by 114%. Preparation level (4.6 v. 5.0) increased by 109%. Member Responsibility level (4.6 v. 5.0) increased by 109%. The overall level of proficiency average (89% v. 100%) increased by 11%.

Teamwork Skills Results AY 2021/2022 vs. AY 2022/2023:

	Cooperation (5)	Contribution (5)	Preparation (5)	Member Responsibility (5)
AY 2021/2022 Average Scores	4.72	4.40	4.60	4.60
AY 2022/2023 Average Scores	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
<i>% Change</i>	<i>1.06%</i>	<i>1.14%</i>	<i>1.09%</i>	<i>1.09%</i>
AY 2021/2022 Proficiency	94%	88%	92%	92%
AY 2022/2023 Proficiency	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>% Change</i>	<i>106%</i>	<i>114%</i>	<i>109%</i>	<i>109%</i>

Faculty members at L&C are asked to use the General Education Teamwork Rubric. The teamwork skills lead provides consulting, mentoring, assistance, expertise, analysis and other support to the teamwork skills partners with the intent to determine areas for future improvement within their respective classes/programs. The teamwork skills lead follows up with the faculty-partners through either written or face-to-face communications. The teamwork skills lead provides assistance with interpreting data, creating appropriate tools for measuring teamwork skills, identifying areas for improvement, suggesting actions to take, and analyzing the impact of interventions.

All levels of proficiency increased from the last reporting cycle. This is the first time that all students in the sample received perfect scores for all four criteria. It could be speculated that the high proficiency levels in all four criteria is a direct result of the interventions done by our faculty at L&C who design projects and utilize the teamwork skills rubric, because they have developed a solid understanding of the definitions of each criterion and how to assess those skills (Cooperation, Contribution, Preparation and Member Responsibility). Historically, there has been a wide variety of assignments given by faculty using the rubric. Over time, there has been an impressive list of creative assignments in certain areas of disciplines which may not be obvious for teams. Our data continues to support the fact that our students at L&C demonstrate high proficiency levels in their abilities to participate, cooperate, contribute, and share responsibility when working together as a team.

GEAC - Writing

Compiled by Emily Corby, Professor of English

This GEAC Writing outcome report captures the final year of the Gen Ed Cohort method of assessing students' writing skills. Following feedback from the Higher Learning Commission in Spring 2023, the Cohort method will be discontinued, and we'll be returning to a full cross-campus writing assessment.

The semesters included in this report are Fall 2022, Spring 2023, and Summer 2023. Courses where students were assessed include ART 130, ART 140, ART 141, ART 153, CRMJ 141, ENGL 132, HIST 131, HIST 132, HIST 135, HIST 231, HIST 232, HUMN 231, HUMN 241, LITT 135, and LITT 140. There were 61 sets of writing scores submitted through Blazernet, a 24% increase over the previous year.

Like last year, we expect to see "generally educated" students performing well in our six outcomes. This second year of testing that theory reinforced the evidence that students in the Cohort were writing very well in their classes across campus. The tables at the end of the writing report show the two most recent years of Cohort scores compared to the previous six-year, non-Cohort study (2014-2020).

The six writing criteria which are assessed by instructors include Thesis, Support, Organization, Critical Thinking, Grammar, and Word Choices. Point values range from 1-5, with 5 representing a superior score, 4 representing a good score, 3 an average score, 2 below average, and 1 unacceptable or nonexistent. A score of 4 or 5 is considered proficient in this report.

A proficient **thesis** contains a clear subject and argument and is placed close to the beginning of the assignment, addressing the prompt; it may also be presented creatively. The Cohort samples submitted in AY (Academic Year) 2022-2023 demonstrate 96.7% thesis proficiency. This proficiency rate is well above the previous study's 76.6% thesis proficiency, when a student in any course, with any range of course completions in their educational background could be part of the sample.

A proficient score for **support** requires at least two strong main points and/or examples which relate to the main topic, and if a word count requirement is established, it meets or exceeds that sum. The Cohort samples submitted in AY 2022-2023 demonstrate 90.1% support proficiency. This is also a higher proficiency rate than the previous study's 73.2%.

A proficient **organization** score indicates that the writing assignment is well organized with good topic sentences and possibly even transitions to smoothly guide the reader from one point to the next. The Cohort samples submitted in AY 2022-2023 demonstrate 95.1% organization proficiency. The previous study indicated a 74.3% proficiency rate for organization.

A proficient **critical thinking** score demonstrates analysis-, synthesis-, and/or evaluation-level thinking. The Cohort samples submitted in AY 2022-2023 demonstrate 96.8% proficiency. The critical thinking proficiency rate for the previous study was 70.6%.

A proficient **grammar** score is assigned to a paper with no more than one major grammar error (typically subject-verb agreement errors, fragments, or run-on sentences) and no more than ten minor grammar errors (for example, misspelled words or typos, missing or misplaced articles or prepositions, missing or misplaced commas or apostrophes, pronoun-antecedent agreement errors, or inconsistent application of capitalization rules). The Cohort samples submitted in AY 2022-2023 demonstrate 93.4% grammar proficiency. This compares favorably to the previous study's 72.1% proficiency in grammar.

A proficient score for **word choices** means there are no more than two problems with word choice, awkward phrasing, or inconsistent point of view in the writing assignment. The Cohort samples submitted in AY 2022-2023 demonstrate 96.7% proficiency in word choices. The previous study indicated that only 72.4% of students were proficient in this area.

Samples from the AY 2022-2023 Cohort scored 93.1% of the **total** possible points on the GEAC writing rubric. The previous study, from Fall 2014 to Fall 2020, showed that students were scoring 80.3% of the total available points.

Across the board, the AY 2022-2023 Cohort sample performed very well in all categories, even better than last year, averaging well above four points in all six criteria and outperforming the 2014-2020 non-Cohort sample in all categories.

Our shift to a Gen Ed cohort eliminated some of the unknown variables of concern from the previous study, such as students' educational background (courses/sequences completed), total course credits completed, and course level at which the writing was assessed. All students in the Cohort have completed ENGL 131 or ENGL 137, for example, so they've had at least one full semester of practicing their essay writing skills. This can help explain their higher writing scores.

Score averages and proficiency rates indicate that GEAC Cohort students are writing well in their classes across campus. Data demonstrating this appear on the following page.

Writing Averages

	Thesis (out of 5)	Support (out of 5)	Organization (out of 5)	Critical Thinking (out of 5)	Grammar (out of 5)	Word Choices (out of 5)	Total (out of 30)
AY 2022-2023	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.8	28.0
SP 2021-SU 2022	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6	27.2
Previous: FA 2014-FA 2020	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	24.1

Writing Proficiency Rates (percent of all scores that were 4 or 5)

	Thesis	Support	Organization	Critical Thinking	Grammar	Word Choices
AY 2022-2023	96.7	90.1	95.1	96.8	93.4	96.7
SP 2021-SU 2022	95.9	81.6	79.6	83.7	87.7	89.8
Previous: FA 2014- FA 2020	76.6	73.2	74.3	70.6	72.1	72.4