

Liberal Studies
Assessment Report on First Year Seminar Courses
January 2008

Prepared by: Debra Burke, Claire Eye, George Ford, & Eleanor Prochaska

“To prepare students to become contributing and informed citizens in a global community”

Contents

I. Executive Summary

II. Introduction

III. Evaluation of Syllabi and Student Work

A. Syllabi

B. Student Work

C. Instructor Surveys

D. Strengths

E. Limitations

IV. Conclusion

A. Recommendations

B. Summary

V. References

VI. Appendices

I. Executive Summary

A team of faculty members was assembled to review the First Year Seminar (FYS) courses included in the Liberal Studies Program at Western Carolina University to determine if published learning objectives were being met. Course syllabi, samples of student work, and faculty survey feedback were provided as evidence of compliance with the objectives of the overall University Liberal Studies Program (LSP) and of the FYS component. The committee concluded that a majority of FYS courses address the LSP learning objectives but was not convinced that the FYS was sufficiently distinguished from other Liberal Studies Courses, particularly those in the Perspectives area. Evidence of student perceptions concerning the existence or nonexistence of distinguishing traits was unavailable. The documentation available failed to demonstrate to the committee that the specific goals of the first year seminar were being met. Since First Year Seminar enrollments are lower than enrollments routinely targeted for Western Carolina University courses, the Committee questioned the wisdom of subsidizing the FYS unless objectives can be achieved and the achievement of those objectives is regarded in the institutional context as being a worthwhile goal. Many of the Committee's recommendations suggest minor modifications which, incrementally, can enable the goals to be met more uniformly.

II. Introduction

This report evaluates teaching and assessment practices in First Year Seminar (FYS) courses as part of the ongoing review of the Liberal Studies Program (LSP). This assessment is based upon a review of FYS course syllabi, instructor surveys and completed student coursework. The goal for this report was to determine if LSP goals and FYS learning objectives are being met by the courses and instructors.

The First-Year Seminar is a requirement for all entering freshmen in the Liberal Studies program at Western Carolina University. The primary goal of Western's FYS is to introduce students to intellectual life at the university level.

Learning objectives for this course are:

- To learn about the importance of Liberal Studies in a university education;
- To consider how reasoning skills and communication skills are the foundations for life-long intellectual and professional growth;
- To see that cultural, social, economic and political issues of a global society are not limited to one academic discipline or one profession;
- To discuss serious ideas and develop rigorous intellectual habits.

A quick review of current literature shows that in the United States, about 94% of accredited four-year colleges and universities offer a first year seminar to first year freshman students (Porter & Swing, 2006; & Goodman & Pascarella, 2006). The reasons for providing first year seminar courses range from: improving student retention; enhancing institutional reputation; marketing; and institutional mission fulfillment (Porter &

Swing, 2006). Student retention and persistence (to graduation) are the primary recurring theme with documented improvements in freshman retention of between seven and 13 percent. Many universities such as the University of South Carolina, Columbia, offer “College 101” type courses that are orientation courses introducing “students to study skills, research and writing skills, and to the educational environment as a whole” (Barff, 1995, p. 2). These “College 101” courses are different from purely academic first year seminar courses, but may have similar objectives.

First year seminar courses are generally smaller classes, with significant student-teacher interaction (Goodman & Pascarella, 2006) and often include research components (Barff, 1995). They frequently include group discussion and writing assignments (Marx & Knouse, 2005; and Barff, 1995), and meaningful interaction with faculty (Goodman & Pascarella, 2006). First year seminars have been around since the 1960s, but broader implementation of these courses is a recent trend in higher education, with FYS becoming common during the mid-1990s. Maximum student class sizes of 16 students with average class sizes of 14 students have been offered at institutions such as Dartmouth College in New Hampshire (Barff, 1995). First year seminars have also been used as recruiting tools within a university community for programs and are often cited as students’ best freshman or sophomore course (Barf, 1995).

Western Carolina University’s FYS program generally follows the trends cited in the literature. Class sizes are restricted to maximum 22 students. The courses include introductory material to a specific academic area and many program managers use the seminar course as a marketing and recruiting tool for the substantial undeclared student community at Western. The report that follows discusses the correlation between Fall 2007 FYS course syllabi, student work and instructor surveys and the stated goals of the LSP and learning objectives of the FYS. In addition, perceived strengths, limitations and recommendations are also provided.

III. Evaluation of Syllabi & Student Work

A. Syllabus Review

Thirty-four syllabi were submitted for review. Overall, the syllabi address the currently stated Liberal Studies Learning goals in some form. The LSP goals are seldom explicitly stated, but are easy to see in the course description, class work description, assignments, use of content, and so on, in most of the courses. Sometimes, the goals are implied and a typical execution of the course would cover the goals, but assignments are not described in enough detail to say for certain that the goals are met in the course. Some courses do not address all of the goals. The goal involving “locate, analyze and evaluate information” is often implied by the presence of some kind of research assignment, but seldom explicitly addressed as a goal in itself. The goal of synthesis was probably not as institutionally prominent during the semester in which these particular courses were taught, but will become more important since the recent emphasis on the institutional QEP. While

synthesis is naturally a part of the educational process (though perhaps in an introductory way only in a FYS), it was not explicitly identified in most syllabi. The goal to “critically analyze arguments” is also difficult to identify from syllabus descriptions of course activities, though it is another of those qualities that is necessarily a part of a seminar course. In some disciplines (technology, sciences) this activity takes less obvious forms and can be difficult to identify unless the instructor is very intentional about it in the syllabus. Finally, the goal related to “behaviors and choices for lifelong well-being” is not always obvious in the syllabi.

The FYS objectives are seldom explicitly stated in the syllabi, but the descriptive material in the syllabi indicate that the spirit of the objectives are probably addressed in most courses. It is noteworthy that the FYS objective most missing from syllabi is the one of introducing students to the importance of Liberal Studies in a University education. In fact, this topic probably comes up at some point in all LS courses (“Why do I have to take this course?”), but it probably should be explicitly stated if for no other reason than to forestall that discussion. The objective of “discussing serious ideas and development of intellectual habits” is also inherent in any good seminar course, but often not explicit within the syllabus descriptions.

Beyond the basic goals, the syllabi address the course calendar; course description (often, but not always, the catalog description); philosophy; attendance policy; the importance of class participation to the seminar format; grading policies, including late work policies, class participation grades, class behavior expectations, particularly regarding electronic devices, participation grades, policies for disruptive or inappropriate behavior, and eating and drinking in classes; plagiarism and cheating policies; assignment descriptions, particularly for major assignments (papers, presentations, exams and out-of-class activities).

B. Student Work

Twenty-five examples of student work were reviewed, representing FYS courses in various disciplines. Overall, student work examples imply the learning goals and objectives of the First Year Seminar. Examples of above average, average, and below average work generally reflect the objectives and goals as stated in the assignment description.

Student work assessed as above average indicates a clear grasp of the goals and objectives of a First Year Seminar course. A solid demonstration of data interpretation and in-depth analysis is evident, rather than a simple reporting of results. Many of the assignments creatively encourage students to explore the cultural, social, economic and political issues indicated in the learning objectives, and those falling in the above average range seem to have taken full advantage of that developmental opportunity. In some cases, when the goals and objectives were not explicitly stated in the assignment, the student work indicates that students have found the correlation on their own. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the attitude of both the instructor and the student, as well as the value of the course. Writing and small group discussion examples display a developing skill in communication and comprehension.

Overall, the student work designated as average demonstrates learning on a par with those in the above average category, but lacks the in-depth analysis and synthesis of the latter. While it is important to note that FYS students are in the process of developing these kinds of intellectual habits, often the average-level work indicates that the student either didn't understand the depth of the assignment, or simply didn't engage in more depth or analysis than that which would garner the desired score. Work also seems to reflect a comfort level and adjustment period to this type of course, with such feedback as "this class is different from my other classes. We actually talk about things that matter to us. But sometimes I'm not comfortable talking out loud – I'm afraid I might say something wrong."

Student work designated as below average appears to reflect the most strongly on how explicitly the goals and learning objectives were stated in the assignment, as well as the adjustment period to university life and effective habits. Examples indicate students who follow the instructions but go no further in analyzing or assimilating information, those who neither fully read or comprehend assignments, and those who simply print and turn in resources without including much, if any, analysis. Below average work indicates underdeveloped writing and oral communication skills, and lacks connection to issues in the student's life, and/or a correlation to global communities. It is clear that in some cases this is a result of the adjustment period that often accompanies students new to university life. It is also an indicator, as reported by some instructors, of the work habits of students who simply don't put the effort into the assignment.

The analysis of students work indicates that programmatic goals for Liberal Studies seemed to be met, whereas the achievement of the specific goals of the First Year Seminar was much less evident. For example, assessment of student work, as noted previously, indicates that the following goals of the LS goals were met:

- Demonstrate the ability to locate, analyze, and evaluate information
- Demonstrate the ability to synthesize information
- Demonstrate the ability to interpret and use numerical, written, oral and visual data
- Demonstrate the ability to read with comprehension, and to write and speak clearly, coherently, and effectively as well as to adapt modes of communication appropriate to an audience¹

On the other hand, it was less evident that the following goals were met:

- Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze arguments
- Demonstrate the ability to recognize behaviors and define choices that affect lifelong well-being

Accurate assessment was likely compromised by the inherent limitations in the language of the goal relating to the critical analysis of *arguments*. The submitted assignments generally indicated that students could critically evaluate concepts or ideas, but does not indicate that arguments specifically were analyzed. If the actual goal is

¹ While the first part of this objective was capable of assessment, there was little, if any, information available to ascertain whether or not communication was adapted to any audience other than the reader.

the exercise of critical thinking skills as per *Bloom's Taxonomy*,² then student work demonstrates compliance. Achievement of the goal regarding lifelong well-being seemed less capable of generic achievement, and more dependent on the nature of the course.³

It was much less apparent, however, that the specific goals for First Year Seminar were met, that is:

- Students will be introduced to the importance of Liberal Studies in a university education.
- Students will see the necessity for reasoning and communication proficiencies as foundations for life-long intellectual and professional growth.
- Students will see that important cultural, social, economic and political issues of a global society are not limited to traditional boundaries of academic disciplines or the specializations of the professions.
- Students will discuss serious ideas and develop rigorous intellectual habits.

None of the students' work provided specifically addressed the importance of Liberal Studies in a university education. Further, while examples demonstrated reasoning and communication proficiencies, it was not apparent that students noted the link between such proficiencies being the "foundations for life-long intellectual and professional growth." As was the case with the goal of demonstrating the ability to recognize behaviors and define choices that affect lifelong well-being, the goal of seeing that important cultural, social, economic and political issues of a global society are not limited to traditional boundaries of academic disciplines or the specializations of the professions seemed course-dependent.⁴ Finally, the objective that "[S]tudents will discuss serious ideas and develop rigorous intellectual habits" suffered from two distinct problems. First, the committee had difficulty discerning the intended meaning of the term "serious"⁵ in order to be able to accurately assess its accomplishment. Second, the committee was unable to ascertain by the sample work whether or not students had *developed* rigorous intellectual *habits*,⁶ although many of the samples indicated that the students had undertaken rigorous intellectual exercises.

C. Instructor Surveys

FYS instructors were asked to complete a survey pertaining to attributes of the FYS program during the Fall 2007 semester. The FYS sections offered during the fall semester were all in person, face-to-face courses. There were no distance or hybrid FYS courses. Of the reported responses (N=39), 90 percent of instructors indicated that they spent time involving class discussion with at least a weekly frequency. All FYS professors were full-time university employees, and 59% were tenured or tenure-track assistant (33%), associate (15%), or full (10%) professors. None of the instructors were part-time. Most of the instructors perceived that they formally or informally assessed all FYS objectives during the semester. However, more than 10 percent of

² BENJAMIN BLOOM ET AL., *TAXONOMY OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES: THE CLASSIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL GOALS* (1956).

³ For example, student work in courses such as CMCR 190, EDCI 191, HSCC 190 and ND 190 more clearly evidenced meeting this objective.

⁴ For example, student work from CHEM 190, CMCR 190, and EDCI 191 more clearly indicated achievement of this objective.

⁵ Query, is the term to be defined as meaning complicated, socially important, or thought-provoking?

⁶ It would seem that a course is too much of a snap-shot experience to ascertain the development of a habit.

instructors rated three objectives as not assessed in their classes, (An introduction to life at the university level; an understanding of the importance of LS in a university education; and an understanding that important cultural, social, economic, and political issues of a global society....).

Many of the qualitative instructor comments indicated that FYS objectives were met in their class. However, given the ambiguity of the language, it was unclear if the faculty subjectively had the same concepts in mind when framing their responses. Moreover, qualitative responses seemed to address general liberal studies objectives, rather than the specific goals enunciated for First Year Seminar.

D. Strengths of the FYS Program

Syllabi indicate a rich, diverse and engaging offering of courses by a committed faculty, who show an appreciation of FYS concept, as well as a good variety of student work, including the appropriate use of technology. Syllabi emphasize the importance of attendance and participation for the seminar concept and for first year students, and provide detailed information about course policies in order to give students a good idea of the demands of the course. Many courses incorporate seminar format discussions prominently. Special sections of the FYS are offered for Honors College students.

Student work exemplifies the challenge and creative opportunities provided by the variety of assignments and courses. Samples reflect attempts to develop skills in comprehension and communication aided by faculty feedback. Student work indicates an ability to locate, analyze and evaluate information with a critical eye, coupled with the appropriate use of technology. Most student work reflects an enthusiasm toward important issues of a global society. Most student work indicates rigorous intellectual applications.

All of the FYS courses in the Fall semester 2007 were reported to be taught by full-time instructors. This staffing pattern facilitates community building and promotes meaningful faculty interaction. 100% of the courses were reported to be face-to-face format further facilitating student/faculty interaction.

E. Limitations of the FYS Program

It is generally agreed that course section scheduling for FYS courses has been inconsistent semester-to-semester and year-to-year since the LSP has been in existence. FYS can be a negative experience if students do not have enough choice about courses during the registration process and are forced to take a FYS that is of little interest to them, although the Committee did not have sufficient materials from students to validate that predication. Some FYS sections have been allowed to grow too large, and enrollment pressures on departments do not favor offering small sections.

The achievement of learning goals and objectives are not always evident for those students falling into average or below average categories. Student work examples do not always indicate an opportunity for feedback and results discussions, to aid the student in improving the quality of work. Some student work indicates a lack of creativity in the assignment with regard to synthesis or to life-long intellectual and professional growth. Some student work does not indicate an understanding of the importance of a Liberal

Studies education. Some assignments do not provide opportunities for small group discussion to aid development of communication skills, particularly in those courses where writing assignments are not extensive, such as in some of the sciences.

The faculty surveys indicated that 13 percent of the respondents never spent time in small group activities. Much of the literature indicates that small group discussions are especially helpful in retaining freshman students and in producing meaningful classroom experiences. Many of the FYS instructors are visiting or lecturers (41%). Of the 39 respondents, eight (20.5%) reported teaching two or more seminar course sections. There is no central FYS coordinator or authority to provide consistency and assure compliance with the LSP and FYS goals and objectives.

IV. Conclusion

A. Programmatic Recommendations

The Committee recommends that syllabi explicitly state both the Liberal Studies educational goals and the First Year Seminar objectives. Course or department goals, objectives and outcomes should be included as well. Assignments should include specific statements of how they will address the goals, objectives, and outcomes, and state explicitly the importance of analysis and synthesis. To this end, the Committee suggests that a syllabus template be developed, and examples made available to new instructors. The Committee recommends that the LSP goals and FYS objectives be reworded in a way that makes them more transparent to faculty developing syllabi, and so that they are more easily assessed. The Committee also suggests that the stated goals and objectives could simply be fragmented into a series of single, less complex objectives. Since one FYS objective is to develop rigorous intellectual habits, the Committee recommends that a common attendance framework for the number of permissible absences without consequences should be developed.⁷

The Committee recommends that the First Year Seminar be taught by established instructors who are familiar with our student body and have had adequate time to prepare their courses. The use of last-minute hire, fixed-term instructors should be avoided, but not because these instructors aren't capable, but because serious thought, planning and preparation are needed to do the courses well. The sensitive task of connecting with our first-year student population requires some familiarity with that population, which short-term hires do not have. Further, the Committee recommends that no instructor should teach more than two seminars in a given semester. The number of students should be limited to at most 22, although smaller classes are more desirable in order to have a true seminar format. The Committee recommends that the University explore ways to support departments teaching small FYS sections without budgetary penalties that arise from the mandated 30 student-per-class minimum.

⁷ Likewise, the concept of more uniform consequences should be explored.

The Committee recommends that faculty be reminded that seminar students have not completed their Freshman Composition sequence. This is not an effort to discourage the use of writing, but only to temper expectations. For example, journaling, daily writing, and more informal writing might be better assignment choices than large scale, formal research papers. Faculty should continue to generate more variety and creativity in assignments to address variable learning styles. Further, assignment scores and grades should be accompanied by clear feedback with regard to achieving those objectives. In order to aid in the development of communication and comprehension, opportunities for peer evaluated assignments and post-assignment discussions should be provided, as well as opportunities for written assignments that foster class discussion and provide feedback for improvement. Much of the literature indicates that small group discussions are especially helpful in retaining freshman students and in producing meaningful classroom experiences; therefore, the Committee recommends that faculty include small group activities in all FYS courses.

The Committee strongly recommends that the university provide enough FYS course sections each semester to ensure that students may be registered in a course that appeals to them. The Committee perceives that students are often enrolled in a FYS outside their personal choices due to closed or over-enrolled popular courses. This reality is further problematic because of the potential redundancy of FYS topics with other aspects of the Liberal Studies program. The Committee suggests the development of a “generic” FYS that might be opened for late registration students, so they are not forced into a topical seminar that is of no interest to them. For example, a “contemporary issues” seminar might examines topics chosen by students, as well as topics of current general interest, such as political campaigns.

The Committee suggests that a Faculty Fellow position in the Coulter Faculty Center would be a valuable resource to assist FYS instructors, to oversee the development of a syllabus template, assure consistency in syllabi and course practices, and support instruction throughout the FYS component of the LSP. This position would be of particular help to new faculty who may not be aware of the LSP or FYS learning objectives. This position also might be used to promote the FYS program to academic departments and advocate for policies and resources for the FYS program.

B. Summary

In sum, the Committee was not convinced that the First Year Seminar was sufficiently distinguished from other Liberal Studies Courses, particularly those in the Perspectives area, as evidenced by either the syllabi or student work. Evidence of student perceptions concerning the existence or nonexistence of distinguishing traits was unavailable. Nevertheless, there was only limited documentation that the specific goals of the first year seminar were being met directly; in some cases, the actual objective lacked clarification so as to permit assessment. Since First Year Seminar enrollments are lower than those numbers routinely targeted for courses, it is unwise to subsidize First Year Seminars unless there are unique objectives that can be achieved and the

achievement of those objectives is regarded in the institutional context as being a worthwhile goal. Many of the Committee's recommendations and suggestions offer minor modifications which, incrementally, can enable the goals to be met more uniformly.

However, if in fact, as the materials reviewed suggested, some of the FYS goals are content dependent, then more uniformity of general content may be a desirable change, and a more wholesale revision to the FYS warranted. For example, on an annual basis, a topic could be selected for the First Year Seminar Experience, such as Environmental Issues, perhaps in conjunction with the First Year Reading Assignment. Seminars then could address that issue from different perspectives, for example, *Green Investing*, *Eco-tourism*, *Green Building*, *Environmental Health and Climate Change*, *the Politics of Climate Change*, *Science Fiction and the Environment*, *Environmental Law for the 21st Century and Beyond*, etc. A common theme could facilitate interdisciplinary visiting lectures, allow the scheduling of speakers and student services activities in support of the theme, and perhaps even the scheduling of a climatic celebration of the work product of the various seminars offered for that year. In other words, rather than have a discipline-specific course meet the goals of the First Year Seminar, i.e.,

- To learn about the importance of Liberal Studies in a university education;
- To consider how reasoning skills and communication skills are the foundations for life-long intellectual and professional growth;
- To see that cultural, social, economic and political issues of a global society are not limited to one academic discipline or one profession;
- To discuss serious ideas and develop rigorous intellectual habits,

the focus instead could be coordinated activities in support of the goals, facilitated by institutional resources, such as the Service Learning Department, Student Affairs, and Academic units through relevant content delivery.

However the achievement of FYS goals is addressed, be it through more minor revisions that flesh out the objectives more clearly, or through a more substantial macro revision, the institution also must decide, given the limited resources available, not only how to meet the FYS goals, but also if the goals themselves justify that commitment of resources.

V. References

- Barff, R. (1995). Small classes and research experience for new undergraduates: A first year seminar programme in a geography department. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 19(3), 299-305.
- Despeaux, S., Lawson, J. and Stone, W. (2007). Liberal Studies report on C2 (Mathematics) Course Assessment. Retrieved from <http://www.wcu.edu/liberalstudies/> on January 10, 2006.
- Dulaney, W., Connelly, D. and Brennan, K. (2007). Liberal Studies report on C3 (Oral Communications) Course Assessment. Retrieved from <http://www.wcu.edu/liberalstudies/> on January 10, 2006.
- Goodman, L. and Pascarella, E. (2006). First-year seminars increase persistence and retention: A summary of the evidence from How College Affects Students. *Peer Review*, Summer 2006.
- Mamary, A. (2003). An all-woman first year college seminar. *Feminist Studies*, 29(2), 453-460.
- Marx, J. and Knouse, W. (2005). Helping students connect science coursework to the "Real World". 2005 *Physics Education Research Conference*.
- Porter, S. and Swing, R. (2006). Understanding how first-year seminars affect persistence. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(1), 89-109.

VI. Appendices

Liberal Studies Objectives

Liberal Studies Objectives (for the entire program)

This course is a Liberal Studies course. The learning goals of the Liberal Studies Program are for students to:

- Demonstrate the ability to locate, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information;
 - Demonstrate the ability to interpret and use numerical, written, oral and visual data;
 - Demonstrate the ability to read with comprehension, and to write and speak clearly, coherently, and effectively as well as to adapt modes of communication appropriate to an audience;
 - Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze arguments; demonstrate the ability to recognize behaviors and define choices that affect lifelong well-being;
 - Demonstrate an understanding of
 - Past human experiences and ability to relate them to the present;
 - Different contemporary cultures and their interrelationships;
 - Issues involving social institutions, interpersonal and group dynamics, human development and behavior, and cultural diversity; scientific concepts and methods as well as contemporary issues in science and technology;
 - Cultural heritage through its expressions of wisdom, literature and art and their roles in the process of self and social understanding.
-

First Year Seminar

This course is a **First-Year Seminar**, one of the Core courses in the Liberal Studies program. The primary goal of the **First-Year Seminar** is to introduce students to intellectual life at the university level.

In this course you will:

- learn about the importance of Liberal Studies in a university education;
- consider how reasoning skills and communication skills are the foundations for life-long intellectual and professional growth;
- see that cultural, social, economic and political issues of a global society are not limited to one academic discipline or one profession;
- discuss serious ideas and develop rigorous intellectual habits.

Completed Assessment Rubric

The tables on the following pages provided an outline for the assessment. Note regarding syllabi: there are three level of address of each goal/objective: A – goal or objective is stated or obvious from syllabus content; B – goal or objective is strongly implied by syllabus content; C – goal or objective is missing or could not be determined from syllabus content.

Note regarding student work: the assessment follows the general holistic rubric of 1 – Unsatisfactory – student work reflects a level of mastery below that expected of a college graduate; 2 – Meets expectations – student work reflects a level of mastery consistent with that of a college graduate; 3 – Exceeds expectations – student work reflects a level of master above that expected of a college graduate.

Overarching Learning Goals of the Liberal Studies Program: TABLE 1

Learning Goal	# of syllabi addressing each goal	# of student products reflecting each level of mastery as described above	Survey data results from faculty addressing each goal
Demonstrate the ability to locate, analyze, and evaluate information	A – 20 B – 8 C - 6	1 -- 1 2 -- 13 3 -- 11	Not assessed
Demonstrate the ability to synthesize information	A – 27 B – 6 C – 1	1 -- 3 2 -- 16 3 – 7	Not assessed
Demonstrate the ability to interpret and use numerical, written, oral and visual data	A – 33 B – 1	1 2 -- 13 3 – 12	Not assessed
Demonstrate the ability to read with comprehension, and to write and speak clearly, coherently, and effectively as well as to adapt modes of com. appropriate to an audience	A - 34	1 -- 2 2 -- 14 3 – 9	Not assessed
Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze arguments	A – 23 B – 4 C - 7	1 -- 3 2 -- 16 3 – 6	Not assessed
Demonstrate the ability to recognize behaviors and define choices that affect lifelong well-being	A – 24 B – 8 C - 2	1 2 -- 18 3 – 7	Not assessed

First Year Seminar Objectives: TABLE 2

Learning Objective	# of Syllabi Addressing Each Goal	# of Students at Various Levels of Mastery as Described Above	Survey Data Results from Faculty Addressing Each Goal
Students will be introduced to the importance of Liberal Studies in a university education.	A – 12 B – 2 C – 20	1 -- 2 2 -- 15 3 – 8	Formally assessed: 7.7% Informally assessed: 59% Not assessed: 33.3%
Students will see the necessity for reasoning and communication proficiencies as foundations for life-long intellectual and professional growth.	A – 31 B – 2 C - 1	1 -- 2 2 -- 15 3 – 8	Formally assessed: 74.4% Informally assessed: 23.1% Not assessed: 2.6%
Students will see that important cultural, social, economic and political issues of a global society are not limited to traditional boundaries of academic disciplines or the specializations of the professions.	A – 29 B – 2 C – 3	1 -- 3 2 -- 12 3 – 10	Formally assessed: 61.5% Informally assessed: 23.1% Not assessed: 15.4 %
Students will discuss serious ideas and develop rigorous intellectual habits.	A – 30 C - 4	1 -- 3 2 -- 15 3 – 6	Formally assessed: 76.9% Informally assessed: 17.9% Not assessed: 5.1%