

# Illinois Valley Community College



## Course(s) Assessment Report: Interpreting and Reflecting Upon Assessment Results

Assessment Reports describe how faculty approached assessing a course or series of courses, what their results indicate, especially over time, and what the implications are for the future of the teaching, assessing, and evaluation of the course or courses. These build on the Assessment Plans that list which ILOs are permissible avenues for collecting, based on the objectives and competencies from the master course outline. Data submitted here is property of our committee but is an institutional document that may be shared across the institution for other purposes, including forwarding to the stakeholders mentioned in the report, but not for faculty evaluation.

**Course Subject:** GEN

**Course Number(s):** 2000, 2001 and 2002

**Assessed Section #(s):** Multiple, See Below or Attached Data

**Initial Report Date:** 22 April 2025

**First Follow-up Report Date:** Ideally April 2026

**Report Author(s) Name(s):** Kimberly M. Radek-Hall

**Department/Discipline:** Gender Studies

**Division:** Humanities, Fine Arts, & Social Sciences

**Program:** Transfer

**Which ILOs were assessed? Please check the applicable boxes.**

<i><b>Goal 1. Communication: To communicate effectively</b></i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>communicating to or with a specific audience?</b> (Outcome 1.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>demonstrating purpose and organization?</b> (Outcome 1.2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>synthesizing and supporting ideas?</b> (Outcome 1.3)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i><b>Goal 2. Inquiry: To apply critical, logical, creative, aesthetic, or quantitative analytical reasoning to formulate a judgment or conclusion</b></i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>gathering and selecting information?</b> (Outcome 2.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>analyzing or investigating data?</b> (Outcome 2.2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>articulating reasons for decisions or solutions?</b> (Outcome 2.3)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i><b>Goal 3. Social Consciousness: To articulate what it means to be a socially conscious person, locally and globally</b></i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>describing a social system, theoretical framework, culture, or lifestyle?</b> (Outcome 3.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>appreciating diverse perspectives or differences within social, theoretical, or cultural systems?</b> (Outcome 3.2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i><b>Goal 4. Responsibility: To recognize how personal choices affect self and society</b></i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>articulating an assessment of self in relation to others?</b> (Outcome 4.1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>demonstrating awareness of personal responsibility and positioning within a larger context, culture, community, or system of thought?</b> (Outcome 4.2)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe how these were assessed. Feel free to comment upon or describe significant differences across sections.

The master course outlines for GEN 2000, GEN 2001, and GEN 2002 cover all the IVCC ILOs, so I combine the data here. In each course, the ILOs have been assessed through writing, either on a paper or an essay exam—although I do hope to implement some test-question assessments, too, as I begin to grow more comfortable with Brightspace.

What were your assessment results?

My collected data is attached to this report in an Excel document. In all, it shows that I assessed 30 ILOs across these courses, and 7 of them had proficiency rates below 75%. 9 ILOs, though, had rates of 90% or higher.

The collected data allows me to quickly identify that my Highest Proficiency ILOs were: GEN-2000-01.24/SP (COM 1.3) and GEN-2002-100.24/SP (SOC 3.2), both at 100% proficiency rate. My lowest were GEN-2000-01.24/FA (COM 1.3) at a 50% proficiency and GEN-2002-100.24/SP (INQ 2.1 & INQ 2.2), which were both at 56% proficiency.

The most interesting thing is that the GEN 2002-100.24/SP class (see chart below) had my highest and second lowest proficiency rates, of all courses. This indicates to me that students understood one of the class’s core concepts, but they were not good at finding sources on their own or articulating explanations for their arguments.

Summary of ILO Proficiency in GEN Courses

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	ILO Groups	ILO	Course ID	Number of Students	Proficient	Percentage of Students Achieving	Semester Code
1	COM	1.1 is the student proficient in communicating to or with	GEN-2000-01.24FA	26	24	0.92	24FA
2	COM	1.1 is the student proficient in communicating to or with	GEN-2000-01.24SP	12	10	0.83	24SP
3	COM	1.1 is the student proficient in communicating to or with	GEN-2002-100.24SP	18	16	0.89	24SP
4	COM	1.1 is the student proficient in communicating to or with	GEN-2001-100.24SU	39	38	0.97	24SU
5							
6							
7	COM	1.2 is the student proficient in demonstrating purpose	GEN-2000-01.24FA	26	24	0.92	24FA
8	COM	1.2 is the student proficient in demonstrating purpose	GEN-2000-01.24SP	12	10	0.83	24SP
9	COM	1.2 is the student proficient in demonstrating purpose	GEN-2002-100.24SP	18	16	0.89	24SP
10	COM	1.2 is the student proficient in demonstrating purpose	GEN-2001-100.24SU	40	35	0.88	24SU
11							
12	COM	1.3 is the student proficient in synthesizing and	GEN-2000-01.24FA	26	13	0.50	24FA
13	COM	1.3 is the student proficient in synthesizing and	GEN-2000-01.24SP	12	12	1.00	24SP
14	COM	1.3 is the student proficient in synthesizing and	GEN-2002-100.24SP	18	14	0.78	24SP
15	COM	1.3 is the student proficient in synthesizing and	GEN-2001-100.24SU	42	36	0.86	24SU
16							
17	INQ	2.1 is the student proficient in gathering and selecting	GEN-2002-100.24SP	18	10	0.56	24SP
18	INQ	2.1 is the student proficient in gathering and selecting	GEN-2001-100.24SU	42	34	0.81	24SU
19							
20	INQ	2.2 is the student proficient in analyzing or	GEN-2002-100.24SP	18	10	0.56	24SP
21	INQ	2.2 is the student proficient in analyzing or	GEN-2001-100.24SU	39	29	0.74	24SU
22							
23	INQ	2.3 is the student proficient in articulating reasons for	GEN-2002-100.24SP	18	16	0.89	24SP
24	INQ	2.3 is the student proficient in articulating reasons for	GEN-2001-100.24SU	41	31	0.76	24SU
25							
26	SOC	3.1 is the student proficient in describing a social	GEN-2000-	52	46	0.88	23FA
27	SOC	3.1 is the student proficient in describing a social	GEN-2000-01.24FA	25	21	0.84	24FA
28	SOC	3.1 is the student proficient in describing a social	GEN-2000-01.24SP	15	14	0.93	24SP
29	SOC	3.1 is the student proficient in describing a social	GEN-2002-100.24SP	16	14	0.88	24SP
30	SOC	3.1 is the student proficient in describing a social	GEN-2001-100.24SU	34	32	0.94	24SU
31							
32	SOC	3.2 is the student proficient in appreciating diverse	GEN-2000-	50	38	0.76	23FA
33	SOC	3.2 is the student proficient in appreciating diverse	GEN-2000-01.24FA	25	16	0.64	24FA
34	SOC	3.2 is the student proficient in appreciating diverse	GEN-2000-01.24SP	15	15	1.00	24SP
35	SOC	3.2 is the student proficient in appreciating diverse	GEN-2002-100.24SP	16	16	1.00	24SP
36	SOC	3.2 is the student proficient in appreciating diverse	GEN-2001-100.24SU	34	32	0.94	24SU
37							
38	RES	4.1 is the student proficient in articulating an	GEN-2000-	52	42	0.81	23FA
39	RES	4.1 is the student proficient in articulating an	GEN-2000-01.24FA	25	18	0.72	24FA
40	RES	4.1 is the student proficient in articulating an	GEN-2000-01.24SP	5	3	0.60	24SP
41							
42							
43							
44							

GEN 2002: Women in Literature, SP24

1.1 Is the student proficient in communicating to or with...	1.2 Is the student proficient in demonstrating purpose...	1.3 Is the student proficient in synthesizing and...	2.1 Is the student proficient in gathering and selecting...	2.2 Is the student proficient in analyzing or investigati...	2.3 Is the student proficient in articulating reasons for...	3.1 Is the student proficient in describing a social...	3.2 Is the student proficient in appreciating diverse...
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient
0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient
1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient
0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	0/1 -	0/1 -
1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Not Yet Pro...	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient	1/1 Proficient
0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -	0/1 -

This chart shows how students’ proficiency appears in Brightspace’s Mastery View, which may indicate that I should do more to teach or hold students in this course accountable for demonstrating analytical skills.

The ● represents dual credit students.

In synthesizing and...		In describing a social...		In appreciating diverse...		In articulating an...		evidence that the student...	
<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>		<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>		<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>		<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>		<div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-
0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
0/1	-	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Not Yet Pro...	1/1	Proficient	1/1	Proficient	0/1	-
0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-	0/1	-

The GEN-2000-01.24/FA course, where I saw the lowest proficiency was a parent-child course, and as the chart to the left illustrates, most (but not all) of the *Not Yet Proficient* students were in the Dual Credit course, which is taught at a local high school. The ILO with that low 50% success rate, which is the left-most column, is about how well they communicate synthesizing sources and supporting their ideas.

For ILOs 3.2 and 4.1, which I consider more integral to the course's content, all of the *Not Yet Proficient* designations were to the Dual Credit sections' students.

**GEN 2000: Women through Cultures and Centuries, FA23**

This may be a trend, as the Fall 2023 dual credit class was also responsible for most of the *Not Yet Proficient* markings, too (see right, where the ●s represent the only two students in the on-campus section with *Not Yet Proficients*. As the Excel data and the color distribution of these tables show, the FA24 course may be an anomaly for those low success rates.

Teacher	S.1 is the student proficient in handwriting exercise -		S.2 is the student proficient in handwriting exercise -		S.3 is the student proficient in handwriting exercise -	
	Proficient		Proficient		Proficient	
Seader, Madelyn	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Seader, Madelyn	US	Proficient	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Not Yet Prof.
Clark, Emma	US	-	US	-	US	-
Dean, Leana	US	-	US	-	US	-
Denay, Logan	US	-	US	-	US	-
Diamond, Carly	US	-	US	-	US	-
Dorson, Kyle	US	Proficient	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Proficient
Figueras, Joshua	US	-	US	-	US	-
Freu, Rita	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Gray-Ross, Vanessa	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Grant, Kalyn	US	Proficient	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Proficient
Hammers, Bryan	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Huang, Kirby	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Johnson, Kiana	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Jones, Aubree	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Not Yet Prof.
Jones, Ava	US	Proficient	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Proficient
Lambert, Lily	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Lopez, Adria	US	-	US	-	US	-
Martin, Daniel	US	Proficient	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Not Yet Prof.
McGinn, Briagret	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Proficient	US	Not Yet Prof.
McKinnin, Alexa	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Miller, Sydney	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Michael, Palmarola	US	-	US	-	US	-
Navarro, Isiah	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	-	US	Not Yet Prof.
Piazza, Emma	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Ramirez, Rosaura	US	-	US	-	US	-
Selinas, Natalia	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Sims, Jay	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Songworth, Rungth	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Not Yet Prof.	US	Proficient
Vasquez, Miriam	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Vera, Brianna	US	-	US	-	US	-
Warner, Grace	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
White, Emma	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Wuolle, Emma	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient
Yanger, Madeline	US	Proficient	US	Proficient	US	Proficient

**Did students meet, exceed, or fall below expectations? Why? (Feel free to delineate each ILO separately and include supporting explanation.)**

Clearly, I would like students to achieve higher than 50% on ILOs associated with my coursework, and these results indicate that I can do more to prepare them for certain assignments and to make clear the importance of meeting those standards. A big opportunity, of course, exists in that I should add assignments to assess ILO 4.2 across these courses, which I have been lax in doing since the switch to Brightspace.

Devoting more supportive resources to the Dual Credit students may help, too; however, there are complications with that given that they are not on our campus and seem to be even more busy than our traditional students who may be here at school while juggling family and work obligations. These students have tended to be very involved in their high school extra-curricular activities, as well as also having family and work considerations.

The high points, of course are the 9 ILOs where my students demonstrated proficiency rates of 90% and above. My Summer semester course, GEN 2001: Women in Ancient Cultures, is particularly positive, as it shows high proficiency levels across multiple ILOs. For example, GEN-2001-100.24/SU showed 97% proficiency in COM 1.1 and 94% proficiency in SOC 3.1 and SOC 3.2. Likewise, the proficiency rates for the INQ ILOs are significantly higher during the Summer semester compared to Spring, too. Of course, this could indicate that Summer students are particularly well-prepared compared to students in Spring and Fall and/or that the curriculum enables them to be more engaged or to better demonstrate their skills.

**What does studying the data suggest as an area that could or should be focused upon for improvement?**

First, analyzing and then addressing the lack of proficiency in the Dual Credit course.  
Second, adding the RES 4.1 ILO to my assessment repertoire.  
Third, preparing students in GEN 2002 more thoroughly for the analytical work I expect from them.

**What methods or resources are within your control to use to try to enact positive change?**

I can begin to address all of the above issues with supportive content or curricular changes, although I expect that more intervention from a systemic approach might be necessary for the Dual Credit sections.

**What institutional changes might be implemented to improve these results?**

With just this data, it may be hasty to tinker with too many things, especially in Dual Credit where there are a large number of stakeholders. If the lower attainments among those students continues, then perhaps looking at how students qualify for the class might be an option. I do recollect students in that section doing much better during the pandemic online, the first time I taught the class for that high school. Simple interventions might be having the high school explain to the parents what these courses are and how the parents might help, encourage, or support their students. I am interested, too, in whether other Dual Credit courses have these issues, or if they are unique to mine—or related to the content I am teaching.

**Who else should know about these results? How do they fit with the mission, values, and strategic or other plans of the college?**

The academic dean and the transfer coordinator should be aware of these results, as well as the Vice-President for

Academic Affairs. The Dual Credit high school principal and/or liaison might want to see this data, too. However, I do think that it is very early to sound any alarm bells about lack of preparation or equity.

Of course, in my not-so-humble opinion, these GEN courses represent everything that our college and any college should be trying to teach: the importance of intellectual study of cultural issues and justice and the understanding that people are equal, even if they fall into constructed categories that see them as different from each other. It is frightening and frustrating to me that the current federal administration is not concerned with discovering ways to make all students more knowledgeable and successful. You cannot identify or solve problems by eliminating some of the relevant variables in their equations. I am also worried that the current political atmosphere may predispose students against this class and its content, which could mean that they are not demonstrating the excellent skills they have, because they might perceive that in service to something corrupt.

**Please submit the completed report to the Assessment Committee.**

Follow-up Report #1 Date: Ideally April 2026

Which ILOs were assessed? Please check the applicable boxes.

<b>Goal 1. Communication:</b> <i>To communicate effectively</i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>communicating to or with a specific audience?</b> (Outcome 1.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>demonstrating purpose and organization?</b> (Outcome 1.2)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>synthesizing and supporting ideas?</b> (Outcome 1.3)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Goal 2. Inquiry:</b> <i>To apply critical, logical, creative, aesthetic, or quantitative analytical reasoning to formulate a judgment or conclusion</i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>gathering and selecting information?</b> (Outcome 2.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>analyzing or investigating data?</b> (Outcome 2.2)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>articulating reasons for decisions or solutions?</b> (Outcome 2.3)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Goal 3. Social Consciousness:</b> <i>To articulate what it means to be a socially conscious person, locally and globally</i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>describing a social system, theoretical framework, culture, or lifestyle?</b> (Outcome 3.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>appreciating diverse perspectives or differences within social, theoretical, or cultural systems?</b> (Outcome 3.2)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Goal 4. Responsibility:</b> <i>To recognize how personal choices affect self and society</i>	
Is the student proficient in <b>articulating an assessment of self in relation to others?</b> (Outcome 4.1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the student proficient in <b>demonstrating awareness of personal responsibility and positioning within a larger context, culture, community, or system of thought?</b> (Outcome 4.2)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please describe how these were assessed. Feel free to comment upon or describe significant differences across sections.

What were your assessment results? Did the students' performance improve or decline compared to the past assessment results? Why? (Feel free to delineate each ILO separately and include supporting explanation.) What are possible reasons for these changes, if any? --

(Please copy the above form to add another assessment cycle to this report.)--

What does studying (and comparing) the data suggest is an area that could or should be focused upon for improvement? What methods or resources are within your control to use to try to enact positive change? What institutional changes might be implemented to improve these results?--

Please submit the completed follow-up report to the Assessment Committee.