

THREE RIVERS COLLEGE



College-wide Outcomes Assessment Report 2024-2025

Fall 2024 Collections

Communication Fluency and Information Literacy

Spring 2025 Collections

Critical Thinking, Cultural Awareness, and Information Literacy

Introduction

All members of the Three Rivers College faculty are responsible for the assessment of their courses related to four college-wide student learning outcomes adopted by the faculty. All Core Curriculum Transfer General Education Courses are considered for inclusion in each College-wide Outcomes (CWO) assessment cycle. Artifacts demonstrating student learning are collected and scored by the instructional faculty against faculty-developed value rubrics.

The findings from these assessments are collected and aggregated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The data are shared for analysis by the faculty through the Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC), which will identify strengths and areas for improvement for consideration by the Faculty Executive Committee and the faculty-at-large. This College-wide Outcomes Assessment Report includes the findings and executive summaries from the defined period of collection.

The College-wide Learning Outcomes are:

- **Communication Fluency** – The student will effectively communicate ideas that are clear and coherent.
- **Critical Thinking** – The student will analyze evidence and assumptions to formulate informed judgments and solutions.
- **Cultural Awareness** – The student will identify and analyze one's own culture, the culture of others, and examine the relationship and interactions among different cultures.
- **Information Literacy** – The student will access and use information from multiple sources while evaluating their accuracy and credibility.

The current College-wide Outcomes were developed by the faculty through participation in the Higher Learning Commission Assessment Academy. The outcomes and methodology were approved and adopted by the faculty-at-large. Any adjustments in the assessment process are reviewed by the Student Learning Improvement Committee and subject to faculty approval, as appropriate.

CWO Assessment Process Overview

Each academic term, individual sections are selected from the general education curriculum courses. To ensure the relevance and validity of our process, academic discipline, faculty status, instructional modality, and campus location are considered in developing a representational data set. Where courses are offered in multiple modalities or at multiple locations, at least one representative section is selected from each modality or location available.

Prior to being included in any collection, assignments for assessment are vetted by full-time faculty and disciplinary leads in collaboration with the director for academic assessment. New assignments are developed in alignment with existing *College-wide Outcome Assignment Guidelines* and tested against the established rubrics before being considered as available for collection.

Review and tracking of these data support faculty discussion and exploration focused on the particular criteria of the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes that may be improved. The ordinal data should not be the sole focus for the purpose of improving student learning but rather support interdisciplinary conversation about foundational academic skills and provides a point of reference when considering performance longitudinally.

Assessment of all College-wide Outcomes employs a four-point rubric model. The data represent the observed performance distribution as described in the evaluative rubric. The Roman numeral classification is used to show ordinal differentiation of student performance as defined in the applicable rubric, with IV indicating fully accomplishing the competency as described.

NOTE: Individual students may contribute artifacts in multiple courses, as they may be enrolled in more than one course identified for collection in each cycle. To avoid confusion, this report refers to section enrollments and the number of artifacts scored rather than students assessed.

Course Representation in College-Wide Outcome Assessment 2024-2025

Course Number and Title	Communication Fluency	Critical Thinking	Cultural Awareness	Information Literacy
ARTS 123 – History and Appreciation of Art				
BIOL 100 – Survey of Biological Principles	X			
BIOL 101 – General Biology	X			
BIOL 102 – Environmental Science				
BIOL 231– Anatomy and Physiology I		X		
BIOL 232– Anatomy and Physiology II	X			
CHEM 111 – Introductory Chemistry		X		
CHEM 121 – General Chemistry I				
ENGL 111 – College Writing				X
ENGL 112 – Advanced College Writing				
ENGL 221 – World Literature to 1600	X			
ENGL 222 – World Literature Since 1600				X
ENGL 231 – English Literature to 1798				X
ENGL 241 – American Literature to 1870	X			
ENGL 242 – American Literature Since 1870			X	
GOVT 121 – National and State Government		X		
HIST 111 – American History to 1877				X
HIST 112 – American History Since 1877				
MATH 161 - Mathematical Reasoning and Modeling		X		
MATH 163 - College Algebra for Calculus				
MUSC 123 – History and Appreciation of Music			X	
PHIL 200 Introduction to Philosophy	X			
PHIL 233 – Ethics	X			
PHIL 243 – Religions of the World			X	
PHYS 100 – Survey of Physics				
PHYS 101 – Physical Science		X		
PHYS 211 – General Physics I				
PSYC 111 – General Psychology	X			
PSYC 243 – Human Development Across the Life Span			X	
SCOM 110 – Public Speaking	X			
SOCI 111 – General Sociology	X			
SPAN 101 – Elementary Spanish I			X	
SPAN 102 – Elementary Spanish II				
THEA 120 – History and Appreciation of Theatre				

Communication Fluency

The student will effectively communicate ideas that are clear and coherent.

	I	II	III	IV
Clarity of Ideas	Ideas are not supported with accurate details relevant to the topic.	Ideas are partially supported without regard for accuracy or relevancy to the topic.	With few exceptions, ideas are supported with accurate details relevant to the topic.	Ideas are fully supported with accurate and credible details relevant to the topic.
Coherent Organization	Does not use a pattern of reasoning that communicates consistency and relevancy to the ideas presented.	Uses a pattern of reasoning that lacks consistency and relevancy to the ideas presented.	With few exceptions, uses a pattern of reasoning that is consistent and relevant to the ideas presented.	Uses a pattern of reasoning that is fully consistent and relevant to the ideas presented.
Effective Communication	The purpose or effect of the idea is not apparent.	The purpose or effect of the idea is vague or unclear.	The purpose or effect of the idea can be discerned.	The purpose or effect of the idea is easily understood and clearly conveyed.

*The Roman numeral classification is used to show ordinal differentiation of student performance with IV indicating performance of fully accomplishing the competency described.

Communication Fluency Collection Overview

The Communication Fluency collection for the 2024-2025 academic year was drawn from courses offered in the fall 2024 semester and represents the first opportunity to broadly test the consistency of rubric application between individual sections of a single course and across disciplines, following the norming activities and rubric application workshops of the 2023-2024 academic year. The fall collection, like the spring pilot collection, was drawn from sections taught by full time faculty teaching in a variety of locations and included sections in face-to-face and online modalities. Dual credit course sections were included in the collection. In analysis, the Dual Credit sections are removed from summaries by modality but included in the overall numbers and in the comparison of 100 to 200 level courses.

At the time of this collection, there was not an established mechanism for random sampling within a single section. As a result, a few very large online sections dominate this collection. The largest six sections (23% of total sections) constitute nearly 60% of all collected artifacts.

2024-2025 Data Results Communication Fluency

Communication Fluency Fall 2024
10 Courses
22 Sections
582 Artifacts Assessed

Total	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	17	49	128	388	582
	2.9%	8.4%	22.0%	66.7%	100%
Coherent Organization	27	46	97	412	582
	4.6%	7.9%	16.7%	70.8%	100%
Effective Communication	15	45	97	425	582
	2.6%	7.7%	16.7%	73.0%	100%

Fall 2024-2025 Data Results by Modality

Communication Fluency

Face to Face Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	5	14	29	64	112
	4.5%	12.5%	25.9%	57.1%	100%
Coherent Organization	6	16	24	66	112
	5.4%	14.3%	21.4%	58.9%	100%
Effective Communication	6	17	25	64	112
	5.4%	15.2%	22.3%	57.1%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

Online Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	8	27	94	305	434
	1.8%	6.2%	21.7%	70.3%	100%
Coherent Organization	19	21	70	324	434
	4.4%	4.8%	16.1%	74.7%	100%
Effective Communication	8	26	60	340	434
	1.8%	6.0%	13.8%	78.3%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

2024-2025 Data Results by Course Level

100-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	16	41	60	195	312
	5.1%	13.1%	19.2%	62.5%	100%
Coherent Organization	26	36	44	206	312
	2.8%	28.4%	31.9%	36.9%	100%
Effective Communication	15	33	57	207	312
	4.8%	10.6%	18.3%	66.3%	100%

200-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	4	4	53	62	123
	0.4%	3.0%	25.2%	71.5%	100%
Coherent Organization	1	3	66	55	125
	0.4%	3.7%	19.6%	76.3%	100%
Effective Communication	1	7	58	59	125
	0.0%	4.4%	14.8%	80.7%	100%

Communication Fluency Trend Data

Clarity of Ideas	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Fall 2021	6%	17%	32%	45%	212
Fall 2022	2%	16%	35%	47%	284
Fall 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	6.1%	12.5%	40.2%	41.3%	264
Fall 2024	2.9%	8.4%	22.0%	66.7%	582
Coherent Organization	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Fall 2021	5%	11%	36%	48%	212
Fall 2022	1%	13%	35%	51%	284
Fall 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	1.9%	16.2%	41.7%	40.2%	266
Fall 2024	4.6%	7.9%	16.7%	70.8%	582
Effective Communication	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Fall 2021	6%	16%	39%	39%	212
Fall 2022	1%	15%	30%	54%	284
Fall 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	2.3%	16.9%	40.6%	40.2%	266
Fall 2024	2.6%	7.7%	16.7%	73.0%	582

Communication Fluency: Analysis Summary

Within the *Clarity of Ideas* competency, in the first two years, 2021 and 2022, the data demonstrates a slight improvement in higher-level clarity, with more students performing at the III and IV levels. By 2024, however, the results revealed a striking improvement in that about two-thirds of all students scored in the Level IV range. Whether this is due to a more refined process in creating the assignments, better instructional practices, or the rubric application norming activities of the previous year is not clear. At the same time, the number of lower-level scores (Levels I and II) dropped significantly to a combined total of approximately 11%, indicating that more students were scoring better on the associated assignments.

For the *Coherent Organization* competency, there were steady gains in performance from 2021 to 2022, potentially indicating consistent improvement in the students' organizational skills. Although the observations from the spring of 2024 denoted a slight decrease in level IV scores, these improved significantly the next fall. The fall of 2024 semester demonstrated the highest outcomes measured to date, with 70.8% of students reaching Level IV. This could also be due to a more refined process in creating the assignments, better instructional practices, or the rubric application norming activities of the previous year.

In the *Effective Communication* competency, in the fall semesters between 2022 and 2024, there was a significant increase in the number of students scoring in the IV level, almost 20% difference. During that same time frame, there was a consistent decline in frequency for scores in the I and II levels, indicating possible overall growth in student proficiency. The Fall 2024 results demonstrate significant mastery across all communication outcomes, marking it as the strongest performance among all measured categories.

There does not appear to be a significant difference between student performance on the different competencies. There is, however, a significant difference between the face-to-face and online sections in the percentage of artifacts receiving a level IV evaluation in all three competencies. What seems surprising is that the face-to-face level IV percentage is lower than online.

The data, when separated by course level, follow expectations. In one hundred level sections, level IV percentage is lower than in the 200 level sections for all competencies. It may be worth disaggregating the scores by modality within the course levels. In other words, if students are expected to do better in 200 level courses (data supports this assumption), but we also often assume that students do better the face-to-face modality (data do not support this assumption); are the 200 level course enrollments so low they do not sway the face-to-face numbers or are they predominantly online. In this collection, the 200 level sections were predominantly online. Can future collections be designed to achieve more modality balance? If they are more often face-to-face, then maybe we need to further separate into face-to-face vs. online, 100 vs. 200, AND 100 face-to-face vs. 100 online.

Considering the noted increase in frequency for the IV level results in Fall 2024; this was the first regular collection after a semester of rubric discussion and norming and significant discussion related to the understanding of levels and IV is no longer treated as "above and beyond", but rather the highest level of learning for the standard student experience.

The significant discussion surrounding rubric interpretation and application in the previous year along with the increase in the sample sizes during the fall 2024 semester reflects positively on the perception of reliability for the results.

Communication Fluency: Instructor Feedback

When submitting rubric scores on the artifacts collected, instructors are afforded the opportunity to provide comments on the results and process. Approximately three-quarters of the sections are represented by faculty comments. Themes prevalent in comments from this collection were related to instructional strategies, challenges particular to specific modalities or learning environments, the interdependence of CWO skills, and general comments on student performance.

The most common theme was student performance, which accounted for twenty-five percent of those submitted. The next broadly identified theme was in comments related to instructional strategies. These included observations connected to group work, assignment scaffolding, guiding topic selection, and discussion board use. Multiple comments were also submitted acknowledging challenges particular to a modality or instructional environment. In two cases, the discussion was specifically related to reconciling face-to-face and online experience with a particular assignment or instructional activity. Other themes that appeared in multiple comments were, ensuring original work, the importance of critical thinking skills to organizational skills, and the value of prerequisites, specifically the first level writing class.

No submitted comments indicated concern about the process or confusion about the purpose of College-wide Outcome assessment.

Information Literacy

The student will access and use information from multiple sources while evaluating their accuracy and credibility.

	I	II	III	IV
Access Information	Does not access information to accomplish the purpose of the assignment.	Accesses information that fails to contribute to the purpose of the assignment.	Accesses information to accomplish the purpose of the assignment but inappropriately accesses the specified number and kind.	Accesses the specified number and kind of information to accomplish the purpose of the assignment.
Use information appropriately to accomplish a specific purpose	Does not use the required sources to accomplish the purpose of the assignment.	Uses the required sources inappropriately.	Uses the required sources appropriately but does not accomplish the purpose of the assignment.	Uses the required sources appropriately to accomplish the purpose of the assignment.
Evaluate information and sources critically	Does not evaluate information and fails to assess accuracy and credibility.	Evaluates information but fails to assess both accuracy and credibility.	Evaluates information but only assesses either accuracy or credibility.	Evaluates information to assess both accuracy and credibility.

*The Roman numeral classification is used to show ordinal differentiation of student performance with IV indicating performance of fully accomplishing the competency described.

Information Literacy Collection Overview

The 2024-2025 academic year collection of Information Literacy represents the first opportunity to broadly test the consistency of rubric application between individual sections of a single course and across disciplines, following the norming activities and rubric application workshops of the 2023-2024 academic year. Seventeen of the sections were collected from the fall 2024 semester and focus on the 100 level college writing courses. Artifacts from three 200 level courses were collected from the spring 2025 semester. The fall collection, like the spring pilot collection, was drawn from sections taught by full time faculty, teaching in a variety of locations and included both face-to-face and online modalities. Dual credit course sections were included in the collection, but in analysis the Dual Credit sections are removed from summaries by modality but included in the overall numbers and in the comparison of 100 to 200 level courses.

Although the average section enrollment for online courses was greater than the average enrollment of face-to-face sections, all section enrollments were twenty-two students or less.

2024-2025 Data Results Information Literacy

Information Literacy 2024-2025
4 Courses
20 Sections
270 Artifacts Assessed

Total	I	II	III	IV	Total
Access Information	3	14	63	190	270
	1.1%	5.2%	23.3%	70.4%	100%
Use Information	6	29	74	161	270
	2.2%	10.7%	27.4%	59.6%	100%
Evaluate Information	4	95	71	100	270
	1.5%	35.2%	26.3%	37.0%	100%

2024-2025 Data Results by Modality

Information Literacy

Face to Face Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Access Information	1	4	7	37	49
	4.5%	12.5%	25.9%	57.1%	100%
Use Information	2	3	15	29	49
	5.4%	14.3%	21.4%	58.9%	100%
Evaluate Information	1	26	13	9	49
	5.4%	15.2%	22.3%	57.1%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

Online Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Access Information	1	6	31	88	126
	0.8%	4.8%	24.6%	69.8%	100%
Use Information	0	14	42	70	126
	0.0%	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%	100%
Evaluate Information	2	26	33	65	126
	1.6%	20.6%	26.2%	51.6%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

2024-2025 Data Results by Course Level

Information Literacy

100-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Access Information	3	11	48	127	189
	1.6%	5.8%	25.4%	67.2%	100%
Use Information	6	22	46	115	189
	3.2%	11.6%	24.3%	60.8%	100%
Evaluate Information	4	91	46	48	189
	2.1%	48.1%	24.3%	25.4%	100%

200-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Access Information	0	3	15	63	81
	0.0%	3.7%	18.5%	77.8%	100%
Use Information	0	7	28	46	81
	0.0%	8.6%	34.6%	56.8%	100%
Evaluate Information	0	4	25	52	81
	0.0%	4.9%	30.9%	64.2%	100%

Information Literacy Trend Data

Access Information	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Spring 2021	7%	13%	24%	56%	268
Spring 2022	13%	15%	13%	59%	182
Spring 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	1.1%	9.0%	20.2%	69.7%	188
2024-2025	1.1%	5.2%	23.3%	70.4%	270
Use Information	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Spring 2021	13%	4%	18%	65%	268
Spring 2022	18%	7%	20%	55%	182
Spring 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	3.2%	16.5%	33.0%	47.3%	188
2024-2025	4.6%	7.9%	16.7%	70.8%	582
Evaluate Information	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Spring 2021	16%	13%	26%	45%	268
Spring 2022	18%	10%	30%	42%	182
Spring 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	6.8%	24.2%	26.3%	42.6%	190
2024-2025	2.6%	7.7%	16.7%	73.0%	582

Information Literacy: Analysis Summary

All the competencies show a fairly low level IV achievement percentages as compared to other CWOs. This offers a clear place for improvement.

The competencies are in order of level-of-learning according to Bloom's Taxonomy. *Access* is easier than *Use*, which is easier than *Evaluate*. It does not seem a surprise that the percentage of students who meet the level IV achievement steadily decreases from *Access* to *Use* to *Evaluate*. In the courses that teach and evaluate this CWO, perhaps rethinking the amount of time spent on each aspect should be reconsidered. Are the courses focused on accessing and using the information, without much time or attention for evaluating the information? Is there any learning assignment or process wherein the students are only

asked to evaluate the information? These data may highlight a very real place that a small shift in focus or assignment scaffolding could result in dramatic shifts in percentages up to level III and IV.

The committee did not find it surprising that online students demonstrate significantly higher achievement in accessing information. Students self-sort into the type of delivery they want. Those who are more comfortable online will more often sort into online sections. The assumption is that the face-to-face assessment assignments that are used, ask those face-to-face students to access information online. These are the students that self-sorted to not be online. It is not clear how to imagine improvement in design, delivery, or assessment, but these data are exactly as might be expected if face-to-face students are asked to complete the same assessment artifact as online students. One faculty member even commented that between assignments #1 and #2, face-to-face students notably improved, whereas online students didn't. An obvious recommendation is to better support face-to-face students with more of this type of assignment and practice, but this may create tension with the concept of delivering courses in different modalities that do not differ substantially in content coverage.

Within the *Access Information* competency, the results demonstrated steady improvement in the highest level IV with approximately a 14% increase from 2021 to 2024–2025 academic year. The 2024 data detail a significant gain in performance at the IV level and a sharp decline in frequency for lower-level scores, suggesting that students became more skilled at accessing and interpreting the information. In the *Use Information* competency, the frequency of student scores in IV level fluctuated initially, with a decline from 2021 to 2022; however, there was a strong recovery in 2024–2025. This may indicate that there was major improvement in students' scores in this area. The previous decrease in scores from the Spring 2024 semester could be temporary as the instructors refine their teaching methods around the core assessment. The data under the *Evaluate Information* competency, showed a slight improvement in 2021 and 2022; however, there was a significant improvement in the 2024-2025 school year of approximately 30%! This increase suggests that the students' skills in these areas are improving, and likely due to improved course design and assessment.

If not noted in the collection analysis, it is important to mention that we see a dramatic increase in level IV frequency in the results for fall 2024. This was after a broad rubric discussion and norming and accompanied by a significant change to the understanding of levels and IV is no longer treated as 'above and beyond, but rather the highest level of learning for the standard student experience.

The significant discussion surrounding rubric interpretation and application in the previous year along with the increase in the sample sizes during the fall 2024 semester reflects positively on the perception of reliability for the results.

Information Literacy: Instructor Feedback

As part of the collection process, instructors are afforded the opportunity to comment on the results and process. Just less than half of the sections are represented by faculty comments. The majority of the comments can be characterized as generally related to student performance. Assignment scaffolding, the importance of foundational concepts, and differences in performance by modality were all specifically addressed.

No comments were submitted that might be interpreted as an indicating concern about the process or confusion about the purpose of College-wide Outcome assessment.

Critical Thinking

The student will analyze information and assumptions to formulate informed judgments and/or solutions.

	I	II	III	IV
Evaluate Information**	Relevance of information is not established.	Recognizes relevant information.	Analyzes relevant information.	Evaluates relevant information.
Analyze Assumptions	No context for information is identified. (Information is not related to prior knowledge or set in context of disciplinary conventions.)	Information is related to relevant assumptions. (Prior knowledge and/or related disciplinary conventions are recognized.)	Information is analyzed within the context of relevant assumptions. (Prior knowledge and/or related disciplinary conventions are analyzed.)	Information is Evaluated within the context of relevant assumptions. (Evaluation of information is supported by analysis of prior knowledge and/or related disciplinary conventions.)
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	Judgments or solutions are not formulated.	Formulates judgments or solutions. (Implications may not be understood, counterarguments are not offered.)	Articulates reasons for judgements or solutions. (Implications are understood, counterarguments are recognized.)	Articulates reasons for judgements or solutions and recognizes potential implications of judgments and solutions. (Implications are followed, counterarguments are evaluated.)

*The Roman numeral classification is used to show ordinal differentiation of student performance with IV indicating performance of fully accomplishing the competency described.

**The credibility of the source of information is assumed. If not from a credible source, the information may not be considered relevant.

Critical Thinking Collection Overview

The 2024-2025 academic year collection of Critical Thinking represents the first opportunity to broadly test the consistency of rubric application between individual sections of a single course and across disciplines, following the rubric modification based on feedback and discussion during the two-semester pause in CWO data collection to refine our processes and improve collective understanding of College-wide Outcome purposes and application. The eighteen sections identified for collection in spring 2025 were drawn from courses in life sciences, physical science, math, and government. Artifacts from 100 level courses dominated this collection. Several sections at the 200 level had artifacts in development and may be included in future collections for a better comparison by course level. Like the spring pilot collection of 2024, this collection was drawn from sections taught by full-time faculty teaching in a variety of locations and included both face-to-face and online modalities. Dual credit course sections at the 100 level were included but no 200 level dual credit sections were available for collection in the spring semester of 2025.

Although the average section enrollment for online sections was slightly more than double that of the face-to-face sections. The largest collected artifact count was 52 and the lowest was just one; both were from online sections.

2024-2025 Data Results

Critical Thinking

Critical Thinking 2024-2025
5 Courses
18 Sections
287 Artifacts Assessed

Total	I	II	III	IV	Total
Evaluate Information	36	44	72	135	287
	12.5%	15.3%	25.1%	47.0%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	30	60	86	110	286
	10.5%	21.0%	30.1%	38.5%	100%
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	25	69	91	102	286
	8.7%	24.1%	31.8%	35.7%	100%

2024-2025 Data Results by Modality

Critical Thinking

Face to Face Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Evaluate Information	5	4	18	36	63
	7.9%	6.3%	28.6%	57.1%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	2	12	21	29	63
	3.2%	19.0%	33.3%	46.0%	100%
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	2	16	15	31	63
	3.2%	25.4%	23.8%	49.2%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

Online Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Evaluate Information	29	32	44	75	180
	16.1%	17.8%	24.4%	41.7%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	26	42	54	56	179
	14.5%	23.5%	30.2%	31.3%	100%
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	22	43	65	49	179
	12.3%	24.0%	36.3%	27.4%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

2024-2025 Data Results by Course Level

Critical Thinking

100-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Evaluate Information	33	39	59	123	254
	13.0%	13.0%	23.2%	48.4%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	30	51	70	102	253
	11.9%	11.9%	27.7%	40.3%	100%
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	23	63	75	93	253
	9.1%	9.1%	29.6%	36.8%	100%

200-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Evaluate Information	3	5	13	12	33
	9.1%	9.1%	39.4%	36.4%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	0	9	16	8	33
	0.0%	0.0%	48.5%	24.2%	100%
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	2	6	16	9	33
	6.1%	6.1%	48.5%	27.3%	100%

Critical Thinking Trend Data*

Evaluate Information	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Fall 2021	8%	19%	30%	43%	215
Fall 2022	10%	16%	25%	49%	258
Fall 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	7.4%	13.9%	20.9%	57.8%	296
2024-2025	12.5%	15.3%	25.1%	47.0%	287
Analyze Assumptions	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Fall 2021	9%	13%	34%	44%	210
Fall 2022	8%	12%	26%	54%	258
Fall 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	9.5%	10.8%	21.6%	58.1%	296
2024-2025	10.5%	21.0%	30.1%	38.5%	286
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Fall 2021	9%	25%	31%	35%	212
Fall 2022	9%	17%	31%	43%	258
Fall 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	15.5%	17.8%	21.2%	45.5%	297
2024-2025	8.7%	24.1%	31.8%	35.7%	286

*Changes to the Critical Thinking Rubric were approved in the spring of 2025. Although these changes were intended primarily as a clarification and to improve transdisciplinary application, they reduce confidence in comparisons with past collections.

Critical Thinking: Analysis Summary

Overall scores are down from scores submitted in the Spring 2024 pilot, particularly in regard to the frequency of scores at the highest achievement level. The course representation is similar but with two notable differences. There were fewer courses in Mathematics, and the Social Sciences courses showed significant variation between sections of a single course, even where the sections were taught by the same instructor. This perhaps indicates the degree of difference in critical thinking skills that is possible in the populations we serve. In both collections, artifacts collected in dual credit sections trended higher than those with traditional-admit students.

Differences in scoring patterns were noted by modality, particularly in sections of the social sciences. Assignment design and adaptation of instructional strategies were discussed as a potential contributor to the observed differences.

This was the first collection with a revised Critical Thinking rubric. It was expected that the changes would improve compatibility of the CWO in some disciplines, particularly in Mathematics, Life Science, and Physical Science. Discussion did not advance speculation in regard to the effect on the score distribution. In any case, this collection should serve as a more reliable baseline for future collection than the Spring 2024 pilot collection. Committee discussion considered the advantages of more disciplinary diversity being included in future Critical Thinking efforts regarding assignment development and typical collection composition.

Critical Thinking: Instructor Feedback

As part of the collection process, instructors are afforded the opportunity to comment on the results and process. Fourteen of the eighteen sections in this collection were represented by faculty comments. Six comments can be characterized as observations on student performance. Three comments mentioned the importance of specific foundational skills, and there were also three comments expressing concern over the possible use of artificial intelligence. Limited discussion of instructional strategies and details of the assessment assignments were also discussed.

No comments were submitted that might be interpreted as an indicating concern about the process or confusion about the purpose of College-wide Outcome assessment.

Cultural Awareness

The student will identify and analyze one's own culture, the culture of others, and examine the relationship and interactions among different cultures.

	I	II	III	IV
Cultural Self-awareness (Understanding one's own cultural values)	<p>Does not demonstrate an understanding of one's own cultural values and biases.</p> <p>(A minimal explanation of facts is not provided.)</p>	<p>Identifies one's own basic cultural values.</p> <p>(A simple fact-based recognition/summ arization is provided without further elaboration.)</p>	<p>Analyze perspectives about one's own cultural values.</p> <p>(Examines the origin and rationale of one's own values without making further implications.)</p>	<p>Assesses impact of one's own cultural values in terms of cultural integration and change.</p> <p>(Makes inferences about how one's own values integrate within the culture's dominant beliefs.)</p>
Multicultural awareness (Understanding other's cultural values)	<p>Does not demonstrate an understanding of the values of other cultures.</p> <p>(A minimal explanation of facts is not provided.)</p>	<p>Identifies the values of other cultures.</p> <p>(A simple fact-based recognition/ summarization is provided without further elaboration.)</p>	<p>Analyzes perspectives of values of other cultures.</p> <p>(Examines the origin and rationale of other cultural values without making further implications.)</p>	<p>Assesses impact of other cultural values within the context of other cultures.</p> <p>(Makes inferences about how the other cultures' values affect the dynamics within those other cultures.)</p>
Intercultural awareness (Understanding cultural similarities and differences)	<p>Does not demonstrate an understanding of the similarities/ differences among cultural values.</p> <p>(A minimal explanation of facts is not provided.)</p>	<p>Identifies the primary similarities/ differences among cultural values.</p> <p>(A simple fact-based recognition/ summarization is provided without further elaboration.)</p>	<p>Compares/ contrasts the relationship and interactions among cultural values.</p> <p>(Similarities and differences are clearly identified and discussed.)</p>	<p>Evaluates the relationship among cultural values and assesses the possible outcomes of cultural interactions.</p> <p>(Make inferences and formulate rational conclusions.)</p>

*The Roman numeral classification is used to show ordinal differentiation of student performance with IV indicating performance of fully accomplishing the competency described.

Cultural Awareness Collection Overview

The 2024-2025 academic year collection of Cultural Awareness represents the first opportunity to broadly test the consistency of rubric application between individual sections of a single course and across disciplines, following the norming activities and rubric application workshops of the 2023-2024 academic year. Artifacts were scored from fourteen sections collected from spring 2025 courses in the Humanities, Fine Arts, and Social Science. There was a balance of 100 and 200 level courses, however the 100 level courses were dominated by the Fine Arts. The spring 2025 collection, like the spring pilot collection of 2024, was drawn from sections taught by full time faculty, teaching in a variety of locations and included both face-to-face and online modalities. There were only two dual credit sections included in this collection. In analysis, the dual credit sections are removed from the data summaries by modality but included in the overall numbers and in the comparison of 100 to 200 level courses.

The total of artifacts produced in face-to-face sections is very low for this collection but is indicative of enrollment patterns for courses with developed assessment assignments in Cultural Awareness. In the spring of 2025, less than eight percent of all enrollments in courses with confirmed or developing assessment assignments in Cultural Awareness were in the face-to-face modality. Although the average section enrollment for online courses was greater than the average enrollment of face-to-face sections, all included sections' enrollments were thirty students or less at the end of the spring 2025 term.

2024-2025 Data Results

Cultural Awareness

Cultural Awareness 2024-2025
5 Courses
14 Sections
238 Artifacts Assessed

Total	I	II	III	IV	Total
Cultural Self-awareness	11	40	82	105	238
	4.6%	16.8%	34.5%	44.1%	100.0%
Multicultural awareness	16	58	106	58	238
	6.7%	24.4%	44.5%	24.4%	100.0%
Intercultural awareness	22	60	82	74	238
	9.2%	25.2%	34.5%	31.1%	100.0%

2024-2025 Data Results by Modality

Cultural Awareness

Face to Face Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Cultural Self-awareness	0	2	4	7	13
	0.0%	15.4%	30.8%	53.8%	100%
Multicultural awareness	0	2	8	3	13
	0.0%	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%	100%
Intercultural awareness	0	2	8	3	13
	0.0%	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

Online Courses*	I	II	III	IV	Total
Cultural Self-awareness	10	32	62	77	181
	5.5%	17.7%	34.3%	42.5%	100%
Multicultural awareness	14	48	76	43	181
	7.7%	26.5%	42.0%	23.8%	100%
Intercultural awareness	19	51	59	52	181
	10.5%	28.2%	32.6%	28.7%	100%

*Dual Credit sections excluded.

2024-2025 Data Results by Course Level

Cultural Awareness

100-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Cultural Self-awareness	3	21	38	34	96
	3.1%	21.9%	39.6%	35.4%	100%
Multicultural awareness	5	33	43	15	96
	5.2%	34.4%	44.8%	15.6%	100%
Intercultural awareness	5	32	32	27	96
	5.2%	33.3%	33.3%	28.1%	100%
200-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Cultural Self-awareness	8	19	44	71	142
	5.6%	13.4%	31.0%	50.0%	100%
Multicultural awareness	11	25	63	43	142
	7.7%	17.6%	44.4%	30.3%	100%
Intercultural awareness	17	28	50	47	142
	12.0%	19.7%	35.2%	33.1%	100%

Cultural Awareness Trend Data

Cultural Self-awareness	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Spring 2021	4%	23%	37%	35%	99
Spring 2022	14%	32%	33%	21%	91
Spring 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	2.7%	14.0%	22.7%	60.7%	150
2024-2025	4.6%	16.8%	34.5%	44.1%	238

Multicultural awareness	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Spring 2021	7%	18%	33%	42%	100
Spring 2022	25%	30%	26%	19%	91
Spring 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	5.3%	18.7%	29.3%	46.7%	150
2024-2025	6.7%	24.4%	44.5%	24.4%	238

Intercultural awareness	I	II	III	IV	Total Artifacts
Spring 2021	7%	22%	34%	37%	91
Spring 2022	34%	29%	20%	18%	91
Spring 2023	Process improvement; No Collection				
Spring 2024	8.1%	25.5%	25.5%	40.9%	149
2024-2025	9.2%	25.2%	34.5%	31.1%	238

Cultural Awareness: Analysis Summary

Relative to other CWO areas, there are fewer courses with developed assignments available to be included in the artifact collections, especially when restricted to full-time faculty. The course representation in the collection set for Spring 25 is very similar to the Spring 24 pilot. The score distribution varies more than might be expected, given the similarities in the courses and sections included. Scores varied considerably within disciplines and even between sections of a single course in the same modality.

There are also some potential surprises in findings when comparing SLO achievement between 100 and 200 level courses, with a higher frequency of scoring in both the lowest and the highest achievement levels. The committee acknowledged that the scaffolding in Cultural Awareness classes is not embedded across multiple courses in the curriculum in the same way that exists for Information Literacy and Communication Fluency aligned courses where higher expectations are cultivated in courses with relevant prerequisites. It is also interesting to note that the scores in the dual credit sections are below those of the traditional admit student sections overall and when comparing sections of the same course.

In committee conversation, additional course titles were suggested for cultural awareness inclusion and/or development. It was also acknowledged by SLIC members that the key terms and concepts central to Cultural Awareness assessment are more open to interpretation than those central to other CWO areas and may naturally require more frequent norming to maintain a common application of the rubric.

Differences in scoring patterns between modalities seem to be present but are difficult to assess. The total of artifacts produced in face-to-face sections is very low for this collection, but is indicative of enrollment patterns for courses with developed assessment assignments in Cultural Awareness. In the spring of 2025, there were only 703 students who completed a course with a confirmed assessment assignment. Of those 703 students, only 52 were in a face-to-face section.

Cultural Awareness: Instructor Feedback

As part of the collection process, instructors are afforded the opportunity to comment on the results and process. All sections in this CWO area were represented by faculty comments. Four comments made observations about student achievement trends, five comments indicated possible limitations of the assessment assignment or a need for some adjustment, and five comments mentioned teaching strategies or areas of focus related to instruction and student experience.

Eleven of the fourteen sections noted that at least some students choose not to complete the artifact assignment. Although this is higher than normal, the comments did not provide enough detail to determine the degree to which this was particularly problematic. Weather related disruptions to the academic calendar may have contributed to a lower response rate from fall 2024 collections.

No comments were submitted that might be interpreted as an indicating concern about the process or confusion about the purpose of college-wide outcome assessment.

Actions and Recommendations

For academic year 2026-2027, Information Literacy has been identified as an area of focus for improvement in student learning. A complete proposal for an improvement objective will be developed by members of the SLIC committee in collaboration with academic leadership and senior instructional faculty. The proposal will be submitted to the faculty for adoption in the spring of 2026.

The faculty have identified the need for additional norming and discussion for instructors of courses collecting Cultural Awareness artifacts. The committee is also in agreement that additional courses aligned with the Cultural Awareness rubric can and should be identified.

The committee reaffirmed the commitment to including adjunct instructors supported by appropriate training and mentoring. The committee also noted that the difference in student achievement by modality warrants further investigation and has identified this as a potential focus in the analysis and/or actions related to future CWO assessment.

Course Type Definitions*

Dual Credit/Dual Enrollment

Admission may be granted to students attending accredited high schools, who qualify. Students who complete Dual Credit courses are awarded both high school and college credit. Students who complete Dual Enrollment courses receive only College credit.

For the purposes of College-wide Outcome assessment, sections comprised entirely of dual credit students are disaggregated. Dual Enrollment students are not disaggregated.

Hybrid

A hybrid course combines face-to-face class time with online components for accessing or submitting course work. Hybrid courses meet a portion of time in an online classroom setting as outlined in the course syllabus. Students will be expected to attend scheduled class sessions in person and complete course work online. 30-70% of the course is delivered face-to-face in the classroom with the remaining content delivered asynchronously online.

Interactive Television (ITV)

An interactive television (ITV) course replicates a face-to-face classroom by using web conferencing or other technology to provide interactive real-time (synchronous) communication between the instructor and students at the campus and/or external locations. An ITV course can be supplemented with an online component for accessing the syllabus, notes, PowerPoints, videos, etc., but students are expected to attend all class sessions in person. 100% of the course content is delivered face-to-face in the classroom or through video conferencing.

Online

A course in which all content, activities, and instruction are delivered online asynchronously. In most cases, there are no required face-to-face sessions and no requirements of on-campus activity. Some courses may require testing, proctoring, or other in-person activities, which will be communicated in the course syllabus. 100% of the course content is delivered online.

Synchronous Online

A synchronous online course is delivered online; however, students are required to attend virtual class sessions with the instructor via video conferencing technology at a specifically scheduled time outlined in the course syllabus. 30-70% of course content is delivered face-to-face through web-conferencing, with the remaining content delivered asynchronously online.

Traditional/Web-Enhanced

A course is delivered in a traditional face-to-face classroom environment where the instructor and students are in the same place. A face-to-face course can be supplemented with an online component for accessing the syllabus, notes, PowerPoints, videos, etc., but students are expected to attend all class sessions in person. 100% of the course content is delivered face-to-face.

*Course type definitions in this report are presented as they appear in the catalog governing the time period that the data was collected.