

THREE RIVERS COLLEGE

Office of Institutional Effectiveness



College-wide Outcomes Assessment Report

2022-23

Fall 2022 Collections

Communication Fluency and Critical Thinking

Introduction

All members of the Three Rivers College faculty who teach General Education Courses are responsible for the assessment of their courses depending on the selection in a given semester. The faculty researched, created, and adopted four college-wide outcomes. General Education Courses are assessed through the College-wide Outcomes in an effort to improve student learning across all programs at the institution.

The findings from these assessments are collected and aggregated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The data are then shared for further analysis with the Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC), the Faculty Executive Committee and the faculty-at-large. This College-wide Outcomes Assessment Report includes the findings and executive summaries.

General Education Course outcomes data provides a basis that may help to improve student learning at the institution. The following collection methodology provides an overall portrait of student learning at the institution.

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.

As a result of participating in the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Assessment Academy, members of the Three Rivers College HLC Assessment Academy Team developed an assessment cycle with a timeline for college-wide assessment and identified the party responsible for each step of the process. This process was approved and adopted by the faculty-at-large.

Assessment Design & Methodology

For the purpose of College-wide Outcomes assessment, the courses used in the collection are from the general education curriculum. Those courses are listed below:

ARTS 123 – History and Appreciation of Art	HIST 112 – American History since 1877
BIOL 100 – Survey of Biology	HIST 121 – World Civilization to the Renaissance
BIOL 101 – General Biology	HIST 122 – World Civilization since the Renaissance
BIOL 102 – Environmental Science	MATH 161 – Mathematical Reasoning and Modeling
BIOL 110 – Human Biology	MATH 163 – College Algebra for Calculus
BIOL 190 – Biology for Majors	MUSC 123 – History and Appreciation of Music
BIOL 231 – Anatomy and Physiology I	MUSC 141 – Theory I, Harmony
CHEM 111 – Introductory Chemistry	MUSC 221 – Music Literature I
CHEM 121 – General Chemistry I	MUSC 222 – Music Literature II
ECON 211 – Principles of Macroeconomics	PHIL 200 – Introduction to Philosophy
ECON 212 – Principles of Microeconomics	PHIL 233 – Ethics
ENGL 111 – College Writing	PHIL 243 – Religions of the World
ENGL 112 – Advanced College Writing	PHYS 100 – Survey of Physics
ENGL 210 – Introduction to Literature	PHYS 101 – Physical Science
ENGL 221 – World Literature to 1600	PHYS 211 – General Physics I
ENGL 222 – World Literature since 1600	PSYC 111 – General Psychology
ENGL 231 – English Literature to 1798	PSYC 243 – Human Development Across the Life Span
ENGL 232 – English Literature since 1798	SCOM 110 – Public Speaking
ENGL 241 – American Literature to 1870	SOCI 111 – General Sociology
ENGL 242 – American Literature since 1870	SPAN 101 – Elementary Spanish I
GOVT 121 – National and State Government	SPAN 102 – Elementary Spanish II
GOVT 233 – International Relations	THEA 120 – History and Appreciation of Theatre
HIST 111 – American History to 1877	THEA 122 – History and Appreciation of Film

NOTE: Students may have been assessed in multiple courses because a student's performance in one course may be different than the same student's performance in another course and that data has value to this evaluation. Thus, the total number of students could be a duplicated headcount.

College-wide Outcomes Assessment Cycle

The assessment cycle allows the institution to take a focused approach to the College-wide Outcomes and for the faculty to be intentional in their efforts to improve student learning across the institution.

The diagrams that follow provide more specific details of what occurs in each phase of the cycle.

Collection Phase		
Task	Timeline	Organizer(s)
Course Selection	May/December of Previous Semester	Department Chairs & Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Inform Faculty	May/December of Previous Semester	Department Chairs
Rubric Norming	FT- Faculty: Convocation Week PT – Faculty: 2 nd – 3 rd Week of Semester	Faculty & Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Data Collection Link Email	Immediately after Norming Session	Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Data Collection	Due last day of Finals	Faculty
Faculty Debrief	Embedded in Assessment Link	Faculty, Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Department Chairs, Student Learning Improvement Committee
Analysis Phase		
Task	Timeline	Organizer(s)
Data given to Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC)	September/February	Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC) (Results Discussion)	September/February	Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC)
Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC) Meeting (Use of Results Recommendations)	October/March	Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC)
Summary Report of Findings for Faculty Executive Committee	October/March	Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC)
Report out Findings/ Recommendations to Faculty-at- Large	October/March Faculty Meeting(s)	Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC) & Faculty Executive Committee
Identify Areas of Improvement/provide Recommendation to Department Chairs	May/December	Departments
Data given to Student Learning Improvement Committee (SLIC)	September/February	Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Implementation Phase		
Task	Timeline	Organizer(s)
Department Meeting with Results and Discussion	September/February	Departmental
Action Plan Implementation Review (From Previous Semester)	Convocation	Departmental
Go Forth and Conquer (contact affected adjuncts, training, SPOL, Curriculum, etc.)	Throughout Semester	Departmental
Executive Summary of Action Plans (Final Progress Report)	November/April	Department Chair
Faculty Executive Committee presents a synthesis of previous semester's implementation to faculty at large.	December/May Faculty Meetings	Faculty Executive Committee
Department Meeting with Results and Discussion	September/February	Departmental
Action Plan Implementation Review (From Previous Semester)	Convocation	Departmental

Course Selection by College-wide Outcomes for 2022-23

	Fall 2022		Spring 2023	
	Communication Fluency	Critical Thinking	Cultural Awareness	Information Literacy
ARTS 123 – History and Appreciation of Art		X		
BIOL 101 – General Biology		X		
BIOL 231– Anatomy and Physiology I		X		
CHEM 111 – Introductory Chemistry				
CHEM 121 – General Chemistry I				
ECON 211 – Principles of Macroeconomics				
ECON 212 – Principles of Microeconomics				
ENGL 111 – College Writing	X			
ENGL 221 – World Literature to 1600				
ENGL 231 – English Literature to 1798	X			
GOVT 121 – National and State Government				
GOVT 233 – International Relations				
HIST 111 – American History to 1877				
MATH 161 - Mathematical Reasoning and Modeling		X		
MATH 163 - College Algebra for Calculus	X			
PHIL 233 – Ethics	X			
PHIL 243 – Religions of the World				
PHYS 100 – Survey of Physics	X			
PHYS 101 – Physical Science				
PHYS 211 – General Physics I	X			
PSYC 111 – General Psychology				
PSYC 243 – Human Development Across the Life Span				
SCOM 110 – Public Speaking				
SOCI 111 – General Sociology				
SPAN 101 – Elementary Spanish I				
SPAN 102 – Elementary Spanish II				
THEA 120 – History and Appreciation of Theatre				
THEA 122 – History and Appreciation of Film				

Explanation of Data

To make action-oriented decisions on the data for improving student learning, the focus is on the percentage totals of students who fell within a particular performance level for each competency area of the associated rubric. Viewing this data and using the rubric to review each particular criteria allows faculty to focus on the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes of students that can be improved.

This view of the data should not be the sole focus for the purpose of improving student learning but provides a basis for conversation when exploring the data longitudinally. All college outcomes data found in this report uses a four-point rubric model, developed by instructional faculty.

The nomenclature of the performance levels is designated as I, II, III, and IV. The Roman numeral classification is used to show ordinal differentiation of student performance, with IV indicating performance of fully accomplishing the competency described.

Key Terms and Definitions

Course Types

Hybrid

Hybrid Course is a type of course design that combines traditional face-to-face classroom time with online components for accessing or uploading coursework. A course with 1-79% of the face-to-face component replaced with an online component is considered a “hybrid” course.

Interactive Television (ITV)

Interactive Television (ITV) Course is a type of course design whereby content is delivered through television transmission. The broadcast occurs in real-time from one location and is synchronized with multiple classrooms across the service region to provide instruction at a specifically scheduled course time.

Online

Online Course is a type of course design with 80% or more of the content delivered online. An online course may have limited or no face-to-face classroom meetings; however, testing and other required meetings may occur in a traditional face-to-face setting.

Traditional/Web-Enhanced

Web-Enhanced Course is a type of course design where content is delivered in a “traditional” face-to-face classroom setting. This course type has a web component for accessing course materials such as syllabi, notes, PowerPoints, videos, etc. No replacement for face-to-face course time occurs.

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.

Analysis and Feedback for Improvement of Communication Fluency

To assess Communication Fluency during the fall semester of 2022, 17 sections of 6 courses were selected in face-to-face and online modalities. Courses assessed were 16 weeks in length. Of these courses, 284 student assessments were collected.

Students were assessed in the three competency areas of Clarity of Ideas, Coherent Organization, and Effective Communication. The Level IV performance criteria for Clarity of Ideas explains that the student will be able to provide *ideas that are fully supported with accurate and credible details relevant to the topic*. 47% (n=134) of students scored in the Level IV performance range for Clarity of Ideas with 35% (n=100) in Level III, 16% (n=44) in the Level II performance range, and 2% (n=6) scoring in the lowest performance range; Level I.

The highest performance level criteria for coherent organization describes the IV criteria as students being able to *use a pattern of reasoning that is fully consistent and relevant to the ideas presented*. 51% (n=144) of students scored in the Level IV performance range for this competency area while 35% (n=98) scored in the III range. Additionally, 13% (n=37) of students scored in the II performance level while 1% (n=5) scored in Level I for performance.

The competency area of effective communication requires students to demonstrate *the purpose or effect of the idea is easily understood and clearly conveyed* as the highest performance level criteria; noted as performance Level IV. 54% (n=152) of students assessed demonstrated this ability at Level IV while 30% (n=84) did so at Level III performance. Also, 15% (n=43) of students scored in the II performance level while 1% (n=5) scored at Level I. Subsequent analysis and breakdowns by modality are also included within the data presented in the following section.

Fall 2022 Data Results Communication Fluency

Communication Fluency Fall 2022 Data

6 Courses

17 Sections

284 Students Assessed

Total	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	6	44	100	134	284
	2%	16%	35%	47%	100%
Coherent Organization	5	37	98	144	284
	1%	13%	35%	51%	100%
Effective Communication	5	43	84	152	284
	1%	15%	30%	54%	100%

Fall 2022 Data Results by Modality Communication Fluency

Face-to-Face Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	5	19	35	51	110
	5%	17%	32%	46%	100%
Coherent Organization	5	17	34	54	110
	5%	15%	31%	49%	100%
Effective Communication	5	17	32	56	110
	5%	15%	29%	51%	100%

Online Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	1	25	65	83	174
	1%	14%	37%	48%	100%
Coherent Organization	0	20	64	90	174
	0%	11%	37%	52%	100%
Effective Communication	0	26	52	96	174
	0%	15%	30%	55%	100%

Fall 2022 Data Results by Course Level

Communication Fluency

100-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	5	36	69	112	222
	2%	16%	31%	51%	100%
Coherent Organization	5	30	70	117	222
	2%	14%	32%	52%	100%
Effective Communication	5	34	59	124	222
	2%	15%	27%	56%	100%

200-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	1	8	31	22	62
	2%	13%	50%	35%	100%
Coherent Organization	0	7	28	27	62
	0%	11%	45%	44%	100%
Effective Communication	0	9	25	28	62
	0%	15%	40%	45%	100%

Communication Fluency Trend Data

Clarity of Ideas	I	II	III	IV	# of Artifacts
Fall 2015	0%	15%	39%	46%	92
Fall 2016	0%	10%	42%	48%	178
Fall 2017	1%	16%	54%	29%	198
Fall 2018	3%	18%	56%	23%	189
Fall 2019	4%	17%	37%	42%	632
Fall 2020	2%	27%	36%	34%	362
Fall 2021	6%	17%	32%	45%	212
Fall 2022	2%	16%	35%	47%	284

Coherent Organization	I	II	III	IV	# of Artifacts
Fall 2015	0%	23%	33%	45%	92
Fall 2016	1%	12%	50%	37%	178
Fall 2017	4%	9%	39%	48%	198
Fall 2018	5%	16%	42%	37%	189
Fall 2019	5%	15%	44%	36%	632
Fall 2020	2%	24%	39%	35%	362
Fall 2021	5%	11%	36%	48%	212
Fall 2022	1%	13%	35%	51%	284

Effective Communication	I	II	III	IV	# of Artifacts
Fall 2015	0%	18%	47%	35%	92
Fall 2016	1%	16%	35%	49%	178
Fall 2017	1%	18%	49%	32%	198
Fall 2018	2%	14%	56%	28%	189
Fall 2019	4%	14%	42%	40%	632
Fall 2020	2%	24%	40%	33%	362
Fall 2021	6%	16%	39%	39%	212
Fall 2022	1%	15%	30%	54%	284

Communication Fluency: Instructor Feedback

Several anomalies were noted. For all competencies, artifacts collected from 100-level courses showed a higher percentage of scores at the level IV achievement than the 200-level courses. For all competencies, score distribution was uneven across courses, modalities and even section to section of the same modality and course. In each case a single section accounted for 50% or more of all scores assigned Level I. The lack of correlation between sections was noticed in the CWO collection for the Spring semester of 2022 to a lesser extent but together fueled conversation supporting additional training for rubric application. Patterns in some scores also indicated that the opportunity to reach Level IV on the rubric may not be fully supported in some of the assignments used.

Instructors who participated in the collection of this data were provided with an opportunity to answer three questions regarding their assessment experience. The questions are:

1. What did you learn from this assessment?
2. Will you make any changes to this course because of this assessment?
3. Additional feedback:

This information is collected to gain insight into aspects of the process that we can improve in future collections and to note any trends from the faculty that may prompt additional training or discussion. The information provided by the faculty who participated in this specific collection can be found in the subsequent section.

A total of 39 comments were received for the three questions presented. The majority of comments could be fairly described as observations regarding student performance. Although the total number of comments was up modestly from the previous fall, fewer comments were submitted compared to collections through fall of 2020. Several comments addressed differences in student experience and achievement by modality. Very few comments were formative in nature and comments indicating uncertainty or confusion surrounding the assessment process were up from previous years. Some representative examples of faculty comments are included below.

Communication Fluency

Instructor Responses: What did you learn from this assessment?

“I would say that most of the students this semester were proficient at communication. Interestingly enough, I think that if some of the students that were dropped for attendance were included in this assessment, the numbers would be lower.”

“Students are still struggling to articulate principles of ethical norms.”

“The students can communicate, but have difficulty organizing their ideas as easily.”

“The students have trouble putting thoughts in their own words and copy more often than not.”

“The Online students seemed to have moved out of the lowest competency level. That is possibly due to being forced to communicate with the instructor in writing as opposed to talking in class. The flip side seems to be that the face-to-face students were more likely to get higher scores for communicating the ideas in writing due to being able to overhear the instructor telling peers how to format things or fix grammar issues.”

“Students in this group seem to do better at organizing and communicating their ideas than they have clear support for their ideas or coming up with ideas in the first place.”

“This assessment showed me that students understand credible sources, and how to research them. They understood the importance of using these credible sources in their APA essay.”

“By looking at this assessment, I was able to see if students were able to decipher credible sources. These sources would be used for the APA essay assignment. I was also able to see that students were able to answer questions in complete sentences, along with finding the research.”

Instructor Responses: Will you make any changes to this course because of this assessment?

“If I were allowed to make changes to the master shell, I might include more resources that explain clear and concise language.”

“continue to expand student access to ENGL 08 supplemental course”

“I offered this assignment the week before finals week. I think I will offer it earlier next time.”

“Not at this time.”

“Will continue to stress basic concepts in early lessons.”

“I will endeavor to email students earlier in the semester, when they first get behind.”

“No, but I will email the students who seem to be behind at the beginning of the course - instead of waiting until they get too behind.”

“I will concentrate on making sure the students understand how important communicating their ideas can be.”

“I’ll try to explain the purpose of the assignment better early in the semester.”

“Yes. I will try to add more face-to-face (with Zoom or phone calls) to interactions with online students in order to give them more help with the details of effective communication.”

“I will not make any changes to this assessment due to the fact that over 90% of the class understood. Students will need to understand credible sources.”

“I will not make any changes to the course as students fared well on this assessment.”

Instructor Responses: Additional Feedback

“I have no additional feedback.”

“I don’t have any other comments.”

“It is hard to generalize over such a small group.”

“It is difficult to make generalities based on such a small set of students.”

“I have used this assessment before, and the students still struggle with how to complete it.”

Critical Thinking

The student will analyze evidence and assumptions to formulate informed judgments and solutions.

	I	II	III	IV
Analyze Evidence	Relevance and credibility of evidence are not established.	Recognizes relevant evidence but fails to establish credibility.	Analyzes relevant evidence and its credibility.	Evaluates relevant evidence and its credibility.
Analyze Assumptions	Assumptions are not identified.	Recognizes relevant assumptions.	Analyzes relevant assumptions.	Evaluates relevant assumptions.
Formulate Judgments & Solutions	Judgments and solutions are not formulated.	Formulates judgments and solutions.	Formulates and articulates reasons for judgments and solutions.	Formulates, articulates reasons for, and recognizes potential consequences of judgments and solutions.

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

Analysis and Feedback for Improvement of Critical Thinking

To assess Critical Thinking during the fall semester of 2022, 15 sections of 4 courses were selected in all modalities: face-to-face, online, and interactive television (ITV). Courses assessed were both 8 and 16 weeks in length. Of these courses, 258 student assessments were collected.

The Critical Thinking rubric involves three competency areas; analyze evidence, analyze assumptions, and formulate judgments and solutions. The Level IV performance criteria for analyze evidence explains that the student will be able to *evaluate relevant evidence and its credibility*. 49% (n=127) of students scored in the level IV performance range for analyze evidence with 25% (n=65) in level III, 16% (n=40) in the Level II performance range, and 10% (n=26) scoring in the lowest performance range, Level I.

The highest performance level criteria for analyze assumptions describes the Level IV criteria as students being able to *evaluate relevant assumptions*. 54% (n=140) of students scored in the Level IV performance range for this competency area while 26% (n=68) scored in the Level III range. Additionally, 12% (n=30) of students scored at Level II performance while 8% (n=20) scored at Level I for performance.

The competency area of formulate judgments and solutions requires students to formulate, articulate reasons for, and recognize potential consequences for judgments and solutions as the highest performance level criteria, noted as performance Level IV. 43% (n=111) of students assessed demonstrated this ability at the IV performance level while 31% (n=79) did so at Level III. Also, 17% (n=44) of students scored in the Level II performance range, while 9% (n=24) did not, and scored in the lowest performance range. Subsequent analysis and breakdowns by modality are also included within the data presented in the next section.

Fall 2022 Data Results Critical Thinking

Critical Thinking Fall 2022 Data

4 Courses

15 Sections

258 Students Assessed

Total	I	II	III	IV	Total
Analyze Evidence	26	40	65	127	258
	10%	16%	25%	49%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	20	30	68	140	258
	8%	12%	26%	54%	100%
Formulate Judgments and Solutions	24	44	79	111	258
	9%	17%	31%	43%	100%

Fall 2022 Data Results by Modality Critical Thinking

Face-to-Face	I	II	III	IV	Total
Analyze Evidence	10	24	37	38	109
	9%	22%	34%	35%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	5	19	31	54	109
	5%	17%	28%	50%	100%
Formulate Judgments and Solutions	6	15	41	47	109
	5%	14%	38%	43%	100%

Online	I	II	III	IV	Total
Analyze Evidence	16	13	24	87	140
	11%	9%	17%	62%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	15	7	32	86	140
	11%	5%	23%	61%	100%
Formulate Judgments and Solutions	18	24	34	64	140
	13%	17%	24%	46%	100%

ITV Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Clarity of Ideas	0	3	4	2	9
	0%	33%	45%	22%	100%
Coherent Organization	0	4	5	0	9
	0%	44%	56%	0%	100%
Effective Communication	0	5	4	0	9
	0%	56%	44%	0%	100%

**Fall 2022 Data Results by Course Level
Critical Thinking**

100-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Analyze Evidence	19	20	19	95	153
	12%	13%	12%	63%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	19	14	27	93	153
	12%	9%	18%	61%	100%
Formulate Judgments and Solutions	24	29	20	80	153
	16%	19%	13%	52%	100%

200-Level Courses	I	II	III	IV	Total
Analyze Evidence	7	20	46	32	105
	7%	19%	44%	30%	100%
Analyze Assumptions	1	16	41	47	105
	1%	15%	39%	45%	100%
Formulate Judgments and Solutions	0	15	59	31	105
	0%	14%	56%	30%	100%

Critical Thinking Trend Data

Analyze Evidence	I	II	III	IV	# of Artifacts
Fall 2015	33%	13%	27%	27%	58
Fall 2016	15%	7%	30%	48%	181
Fall 2017	2%	20%	64%	14%	55
Fall 2018	7%	34%	51%	8%	168
Fall 2019	9%	20%	34%	37%	532
Fall 2020	8%	22%	34%	36%	341
Fall 2021	8%	19%	30%	43%	215
Fall 2022	10%	16%	25%	49%	258
Analyze Assumptions	I	II	III	IV	# of Artifacts
Fall 2015	28%	9%	29%	34%	58
Fall 2016	18%	10%	37%	35%	181
Fall 2017	2%	29%	55%	14%	55
Fall 2018	9%	33%	50%	8%	168
Fall 2019	10%	22%	35%	34%	532
Fall 2020	10%	23%	29%	38%	341
Fall 2021	9%	13%	34%	44%	210
Fall 2022	8%	12%	26%	54%	258
Formulate Judgements and Solutions	I	II	III	IV	# of Artifacts
Fall 2015	31%	7%	31%	31%	58
Fall 2016	20%	15%	41%	23%	181
Fall 2017	2%	47%	40%	11%	55
Fall 2018	11%	33%	42%	15%	168
Fall 2019	12%	22%	35%	30%	532
Fall 2020	14%	23%	33%	30%	341
Fall 2021	9%	25%	31%	35%	212
Fall 2022	9%	17%	31%	43%	258

Critical Thinking: Instructor Feedback

Several anomalies were noted in Critical Thinking results. Similar to the results for Communication Fluency, artifacts in all competencies collected from 100-level courses showed a higher percentage of scores at the Level IV achievement than the 200-level courses. The 200-level course also showed fewer Level I scores which was more in line with expectations. In conversation, concern was expressed that there may be flaws in assignment design and may not be providing students with a sufficient opportunity to demonstrate achievement at the highest rubric level. The score distribution was uneven across courses; just two of the 13 sections accounted for 70% of all scores assigned Level I. Very different scoring patterns were observed in sections of the same course and modality, which fueled conversation supporting additional training for rubric application and assignment design.

Instructors who participated in the collection of this data were provided with an opportunity to answer three questions regarding their assessment experience. The questions are:

1. What did you learn from this assessment?
2. Will you make any changes to this course because of this assessment?
3. Additional feedback:

This information is collected to gain insight into aspects of the process that we can improve in future collections and to note any trends from the faculty that may prompt additional training or discussion. The information provided by the faculty who participated in this specific collection can be found in the subsequent section.

A total of 18 comments were received for the three questions presented. The majority of comments could be fairly described as observations regarding student performance. The number of comments received from instructors was the lowest recorded for any given assessment cycle. Several comments indicated uncertainty or confusion surrounding the assessment process. Representative examples of faculty comments are included below.

Critical Thinking

Instructor Responses: What did you learn from this assessment?

“Students had a hard time elaborating on solutions. Most answered with short basic answers. No elaborating.”

“Students were provided with a graph with questions to answer. The assessment used may have been too easy. I would be interested in seeing how students answered the same questions at the beginning of the semester.”

“Students seem to be doing overall better. I may still need to clarify the purpose in a way that is more engaging.”

“The majority of students are able to analyze evidence, and assumptions, and formulate judgments and solutions well enough to write an effective essay.”

Instructor Responses: Will you make any changes to this course because of this assessment?

“Not at this time.”

“The students do create graphs and analyze the data in class. A pre-test could be offered in the future.”

“Data and an explanation for the exercise was put into an earlier week so students could work on it more before submission. Other things were also put into an earlier week for the same purpose.”

“Yes, I think I will change how I introduce this activity to clarify the difference between variables. Also I plan to model how to graph data, and give them more specific graphing requirements. “

“As an adjunct I am unable to make changes in the course.”

Instructor Responses: Additional Feedback

“None.”

“I attempted to create an objective assessment piece and would like to see how future students answer the same questions without the m/c options.”

“I would like to talk with the English department to see if they are having similar problems with student sources in research. It would be helpful if we had similar requirements for source selection and citations.”

“I attempted to create an objective assessment piece and would like to see how future students answer the same questions without the m/c options.”

“It might be helpful to have an assignment that is designed to measure these outcomes or to identify which assignment is to be used for this assessment.”

Actions and Recommendations

In examining the CWO data and submitted instructor comments, the faculty have identified several elements of our practice that should be strengthened to improve the ongoing validity of the College-wide Outcome collection and evaluation process. Through discussion with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and academic leadership the faculty have indicated their support for a one cycle pause in regular CWO collection to engage in further discussion and training related to assessment assignment development, CWO Rubric refinement, and uniform value rubric application.

Goals of the discussion and training will be to:

- Ensure the instructional faculty hold a common understanding of the process and goals related to CWO assessment.
- Ensure a uniform application of the faculty developed CWO value rubrics as well as a common understanding of the underlying key concepts and terms.
- Develop and implement Assessment Assignment Guidelines that can be used to ensure a natural alignment between the associated College-wide Outcomes and course specific activities and outcomes.
- Ensure assessment priorities and practice are consistent across all academic disciplines and all instructional modalities.

Published by:

Office of Institutional Effectiveness
Three Rivers College
2080 Three Rivers Blvd.
Poplar Bluff, MO 63901
573-840-9007
fludwig@trcc.edu