

**Arts & Sciences Division  
2016 Assessment of Student Learning Report**

Prepared by Liz Medendorp, Ann Oreskovich, & Brad Bowers

**Assessment Activities**

Department: <u>Mathematics</u>					Assessment Types					
SLOs Assessed		Participation		Sample Size	Assessment Measures				Scoring Methods	
Prefix	Count	PT	FT		Direct Type	Count	Indirect Type	Count	Type	Count
MAT	7	2	5	353	Quiz/Test/Exam	3	Survey	1	Rubric	8
					Essay/Research Paper		Reflection	1	Test Score	3
					Oral Presentation		Self-Assessment		Checklist	
					Team-based Project	3	Peer Assessment		Holistic	
					Portfolio		Interview		Other (specify):	
					Simulation/Demonstration		Completion/Pass Rates			

Department: <u>English &amp; Communication</u>					Assessment Types					
SLOs Assessed		Participation		Sample Size	Assessment Measures				Scoring Methods	
Prefix	Count	PT	FT		Direct Type	Count	Indirect Type	Count	Type	Count
AAA	0				Quiz/Test/Exam	1	Survey	1	Rubric	10
CCR	1		2	21	Essay/Research Paper	9	Reflection		Test Score	1
COM	3	1	1	245	Oral Presentation		Self-Assessment		Checklist	1
ENG	6		6	209	Team-based Project		Peer Assessment		Holistic	
LIT	1		1	26	Portfolio		Interview		Other (specify):	
					Simulation/Demonstration	1	Completion/Pass Rates			

Department: <u>Criminal Justice</u>					Assessment Types					
SLOs Assessed		Participation		Sample Size	Assessment Measures				Scoring Methods	
Prefix	Count	PT	FT		Direct Type	Count	Indirect Type	Count	Type	Count
CRJ	3		1	54	Quiz/Test/Exam	2	Survey		Rubric	3
					Essay/Research Paper	1	Reflection		Test Score	
					Oral Presentation		Self-Assessment		Checklist	
					Team-based Project		Peer Assessment		Holistic	
					Portfolio		Interview		Other (specify):	
					Simulation/Demonstration		Completion/Pass Rates			

Department: <u>Early Childhood Education</u>					Assessment Types					
SLOs Assessed		Participation		Sample Size	Assessment Measures				Scoring Methods	
Prefix	Count	PT	FT		Direct Type	Count	Indirect Type	Count	Type	Count
ECE	3		2	52	Quiz/Test/Exam	3	Survey		Rubric	3
LTN	N/A				Essay/Research Paper	3	Reflection		Test Score	3
EDU	N/A				Oral Presentation		Self-Assessment		Checklist	
					Team-based Project		Peer Assessment		Holistic	
					Portfolio		Interview		Other (specify):	
					Simulation/Demonstration		Completion/Pass Rates			

Department: <u>Social Sciences</u>					Assessment Types					
SLOs Assessed		Participation		Sample Size	Assessment Measures				Scoring Methods	
Prefix	Count	PT	FT		Direct Type	Count	Indirect Type	Count	Type	Count
ANT	N/A				Quiz/Test/Exam		Survey		Rubric	9
GEO	1	1		52	Essay/Research Paper	9	Reflection		Test Score	
HIS	5	2	2	408	Oral Presentation		Self-Assessment		Checklist	
POS	1	1		74	Team-based Project		Peer Assessment		Holistic	
ETH	N/A				Portfolio		Interview		Other (specify):	
PSY	2	2	5	564	Simulation/Demonstration		Completion/Pass Rates			
SOC	N/A									
SWK	N/A									
WST	N/A									

Department: <u>Fine Arts &amp; Humanities</u>					Assessment Types					
SLOs Assessed		Participation		Sample Size	Assessment Measures				Scoring Methods	
Prefix	Count	PT	FT		Direct Type	Count	Indirect Type	Count	Type	Count
ART	2	3	2	127	Quiz/Test/Exam		Survey		Rubric	10
DAN	N/A				Essay/Research Paper	8	Reflection		Test Score	
HUM	4	1	1	45	Oral Presentation	4	Self-Assessment		Checklist	
MUS	N/A				Team-based Project		Peer Assessment		Holistic	
PHI	2		1	42	Portfolio		Interview		Other (specify):	
SPA	2		1	64	Simulation/Demonstration		Completion/Pass Rates			
THE	N/A									

Department: <u>Biological &amp; Physical Sciences</u>					Assessment Types					
SLOs Assessed		Participation		Sample Size	Assessment Measures				Scoring Methods	
Prefix	Count	PT	FT		Direct Type	Count	Indirect Type	Count	Type	Count
AST	N/A				Quiz/Test/Exam	3	Survey		Rubric	6
BIO	3		4	106	Essay/Research Paper	4	Reflection		Test Score	1
CHE	2		1	17	Oral Presentation	1	Self-Assessment		Checklist	
ENV	N/A				Team-based Project		Peer Assessment		Holistic	
GEY	1		1	18	Portfolio		Interview		Other (specify):	
PHY	1		1	16	Simulation/Demonstration		Completion/Pass Rates			
SCI	N/A									

## Assessment Results

### Overview & Key Findings

MAT: Nearly all performance targets were met, students performed exceptionally well on communication skills, and the majority were beyond the “developing” level on all SLOs. Additionally, 2016 results suggest adjustments from past assessment cycles have brought improved student performance, and planned improvements are appropriate and evidence-based. Areas that could benefit from further attention include graphing, evaluating evidence and implications, and developing content.

ENG: Performance targets were met with moderate success, with students demonstrating effectiveness in the areas of organization (including unity and coherence) and professionalism (growth, commitment, attitude, and initiative), but trends of underperformance were noted across prefixes in the areas of source integration, critical thinking (statement of position/thesis), and time management (timeliness, meeting deadlines). Additionally, experimenting with multiple rubrics revealed that external tools may not be the most accurate effective measurements for our students.

CRJ: While performance targets (90% of students achieving 70% on all 3 SLOs) were not met, the majority of students demonstrated an accomplished grasp of the core concepts being assessed, but the inclusion of other under-performing skills (especially depth of analysis and writing ability) in the assessment rubrics as well as the small sample sizes potentially negatively skewed the results

ECE: Performance targets for all SLOs were met or exceeded by a substantial majority of students, The department feels that increased focus on instruction for Developmental Domains and Cultural Diversity have been mostly successful, with students showing increased abilities in the assessed areas, and will therefore target different SLOs with different assessment assignments for Developmental Domains, while continuing to concentrate on increased assignment instruction and awareness.

SOC: For the PSY prefix, students in Spring 2016 performed below the target value by 7 to 10 percentage points, but adjustments were made in instruction and the assessment assignment for Fall 2016 that brought student performance results up over the two SLOs to 20% and 7%, respectively. The adjustments resulted in consequential improvements, at least in one SLO, but both were improved. For HIS, GEO, and POS, students performed exceptionally well overall on the SLO, but one issue is that the performance target was low, at 60%. Nevertheless, taking this into account, students still scored in the 80<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles. The same SLO was applied across all three prefixes. One exception was a Spring 2016 POS course, which scored below the target at 52%, but not enough data was provided by the adjunct instructor, and is no longer available, to evaluate the possible reasons for this disparity.

FAH: In the Fine Arts & Humanities Department, there is a concerted effort to improve assessment measures and scoring methods. As a result, there is some difficulty in achieving longitudinal data, but progress towards a more sustainable plan and some immediate successes. In ART, due to changes in the signature assignment and rubric, there was a

marked change in written communication from spring, where only 44% of students achieved the goal to fall, where 72% of the students met the goal. The department would benefit from continuing to develop discipline-specific rubrics in alignment with institution-level learning outcomes.

SCI: The Science Department made a unified effort at evaluating institutional-level assessment goals, specifically Critical Thinking & Problem Solving and Communication, using the institution rubrics to evaluate those skills. Overall, 100-level BIO students met or nearly met the performance targets for critical thinking. In GEY, students met most of the performance goals in communication, and CHE students performed exceptionally well at reporting calculations. The Department noted some difficulty in applying the institution-level rubrics and would benefit from developing more meaningful, discipline-specific rubrics that are aligned with college outcomes.

### Use of Results

Department	Number of SLOs assessed	Performance targets achieved	Number to be reassessed	If not achieved, % below target
Mathematics	7	6	7	2%-8% range
English & Communication	11	6	5	1%-29% range
Criminal Justice	3	0	3	15%-24%
Early Childhood Education	3	3	0	N/A
Social Sciences	9	9 <sup>1</sup>	0 <sup>2</sup>	N/A
Fine Arts & Humanities	10	1	9	2%-50% range
Biological/Physical Sciences	7	2	5	2%-98% range
<b>Totals</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	

### Closing the Loop

MAT: More scaffolding activities for practice as well as more collaborative work to offer more opportunities to ask questions and prepare for individual performance measures.

ENG: While several assessment projects will have to be revisited after revisions to the core competencies have been finalized state-wide, in general, assessment procedures will be expanded to include greater involvement from PT instructors and branch campuses, and more effort will be put into developing/refining internal measurement tools/rubrics. Additional scaffolding/hands-on practice, emphasis on time management skills, and attention to the processes of reading and writing will be implemented in various courses across the department.

CRJ: More formative assessments/scaffolding assignments, in-class demonstrations of practical applications, increased time allowances, and referrals to support services and writing resources.

<sup>1</sup> In both POS and PSY, the Spring 2016 numbers did not meet the target, but in all cases, POS and PSY hit their targets in Fall 2016.

<sup>2</sup> All Social Sciences CSLOs are being rewritten for 2017 to use standard competencies, so while there may be some similarities between the 2016 and 2017 CSLOs, they are not exactly the same and, thus, the 2016 CSLOs are not being reassessed.

ECE: The department will not be reassessing these SLOs for 2017, but will derive new ones, but still based on Developmental Domains.

SOC: For the PSY, SOC, and HIS prefixes, the 2016 CSLOs are no longer being assessed in 2017. Instead, the CSLOs are being taken directly from the Standard Competencies from each course, with Program- and Course-Level rubrics being created to assess these new CSLOs.

FAH: Most SLOs will continue to be assessed, including some that met their targets, in order to make improvements and ensure reliable results. Assignments will be created and revised to better target deficiencies. A weekly writing workshop was added for HUM. Scaffolding activities will be added, and new resources, such as Pearson's REVEL for ART.

SCI: Assessment assignments will be included as part of the grade or more heavily weighted to ensure participation. Discussions, collaborative and active learning assignments will be increased to promote critical thinking skills. Assignments will also be created to specifically target identifying implicit information/data to drive students to higher levels of critical thinking. In addition, discipline-specific rubrics will be identified or developed.

## Challenges & Successes

Dept.	Challenges	SLOs to Target	Successes to Celebrate	Recommendations/Comments
<b>MAT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaningfully applying general institution-level rubrics to student work within the discipline</li> <li>• Establishing baseline data with new rubrics and assessment tools (increase performance targets in 2017)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graphing</li> <li>• Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving: Evaluating Evidence and Evaluating Implications &amp; Consequences (Perspectives &amp; Possible Solutions)</li> <li>• Communication: Developing Content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All performance targets were met or nearly met, and the majority of students were beyond the “developing” level</li> <li>• Students performed exceptionally well on communication skills</li> <li>• Results suggest adjustments from the past have brought improved student performance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Align and implement discipline-specific rubrics</li> <li>• Develop assessment tools that more directly isolate the skills of analysis, evaluation, and synthesis within signature assignments for more meaningful results</li> </ul>
<b>ENG</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adapting to changing “core competencies” and placement/attendance policies.</li> <li>• Effectively scaffolding instruction while teaching to students with a wide range of backgrounds, experiences, and skill levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source Integration</li> <li>• Communicating Purposefully (thesis statements)</li> <li>• Time Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students performed exceptionally well on organization skills, including unity and coherence.</li> <li>• Students displayed remarkable growth, attitude, and initiative with regard to their learning processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Align and implement discipline-specific rubrics</li> <li>• Establish ongoing assessment projects to gather more longitudinal data</li> <li>• Increase sample sizes and promote further collaboration/ participation in designing future assessment projects.</li> </ul>
<b>CRJ</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small sample sizes (only one semester of data – SP16)</li> <li>• Time constraints of final exam essay assignment</li> <li>• Initial testing of rubrics assessing multiple skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies and procedures in the administration of law enforcement</li> <li>• Critical Thinking/Analysis</li> <li>• Communication: Mechanics &amp; Genre Conventions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of students did demonstrate an accomplished grasp of the core concepts being assessed (comprehension)</li> <li>• Improvements are mostly needed for procedures, not for learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revise rubrics so that the individual SLOs can be more directly isolated</li> <li>• Lower performance targets</li> <li>• Increase sample sizes, if possible, especially by actively encouraging PT instructor participation</li> </ul>
<b>ECE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating a new activity that more accurately assesses Developmental Domains.</li> <li>• Obtaining greater participation by other instructors and campuses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical Thinking</li> <li>• Informational Literacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students performed above the performance target, even though it was set at a high 85%.</li> <li>• Improving instruction focus has seemed to make the difference in improving student performance over the Fall 2015 numbers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make sure CSLOs align with standard competencies and develop discipline-specific rubrics.</li> <li>• Make sure that the new activity more accurately assesses Developmental Domains.</li> <li>• Continue to seek greater participation by other instructors and campuses.</li> </ul>
<b>SOC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In PSY, students performed below the target in Spring 2016, so adjustments were made for Fall 2016. These included</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective Communication</li> <li>• Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For PSY, adjustments made to the SLO assignment and instruction resulted in significant improvement from Spring to Fall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Align CSLOs with standard competencies and develop discipline-specific rubrics.</li> </ul>

Dept.	Challenges	SLOs to Target	Successes to Celebrate	Recommendations/Comments
	<p>increasing instruction on the assignment, and crafting a variation on the assignment that focused more on concepts, rather than learning and memory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In HIS, GEO, and POS, students generally scored well above the target, but struggled in identifying credible and reliable sources to support their argument. This will need to be addressed in the 2017 plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information and Communication Technology Literacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All performance targets were met, with the majority of students scoring a 3 out of 4 or higher.</li> <li>The majority of HIS, GEO, and POS Students did well expressing arguments and supporting them with evidence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For HIS, GEO, and POS, students' weakness in finding and applying credible and reliable sources to an argument needs to be addressed through instruction or assignments geared toward that SLO.</li> </ul>
<b>FAH</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying/Developing meaningful, discipline-specific rubrics</li> <li>Longitudinal data due to changes in scoring methods</li> <li>Obtaining greater participation by part-time instructors and branch campuses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication: using sources and evidence, developing content</li> <li>Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving: interpreting oral texts, analysis and evaluation of an argument, evaluating evidence, considering other perspectives, evaluating implications and consequences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In ART, students performed above the target in one SLO, and in a second SLO students have been steadily improving from years past, and after revisions to the signature assignment and rubric, the target was met in fall 2016.</li> <li>In SPA, students exceeded the target for one SLO.</li> <li>There is a concerted effort to improve assessment measures and scoring methods.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and implement discipline-specific rubrics that align with institutional rubrics.</li> <li>Once rubrics are established and aligned, longitudinal data will be more achievable.</li> <li>Continue to seek greater participation by part-time instructors and branch campuses.</li> </ul>
<b>SCI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficulty applying the institution-level Communication rubric to student work within the discipline.</li> <li>Obtaining greater participation by part-time instructors and branch campuses.</li> <li>Getting reliable data when participation was not required for a grade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving: considering other perspectives &amp; solutions, identifying implicit information</li> <li>Communication: employing rhetorical knowledge and developing content</li> <li>Stoichiometry and concentration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, students met or nearly met performance goals in Critical Thinking &amp; Problem Solving at the 100-level in BIO courses.</li> <li>In GEY, students met most of the performance goals in Communication.</li> <li>In CHE, students performed exceptionally well in reporting calculations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Align and implement discipline-specific rubrics.</li> <li>Continue to seek greater participation by part-time instructors and branch campuses.</li> <li>As noted, include assessment assignments as part of the grade.</li> <li>Develop assignments to target critical thinking and communication weaknesses that are meaningful to the discipline.</li> </ul>