

CORE 210 Assessment – 2015-16 Report



Dr. Phyllis Bolin
Dr. Brenda Bender

Background

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A¹, 1.1B², 1.1C³, 1.2A⁴, 1.2B⁵, 1.3A⁶, and 1.3B⁷ from the QEP document, the CORE 210 research artifact was collected. From a set of 733 enrolled students, 692 papers were collected (94.4%). A random sample of 60 papers was selected from CORE 210 sections delivered in fall 2015 and spring 2016.

The assessment team consisted of 4 of the same faculty members from the previous year – Dr. Brenda Bender (Communication Disorders), Dr. Joshua Brokaw, (Biology), Mr. J. Scott Self (Alpha Academic Services), Dr. Jeanine Varner (Language and Literature). Dr. Jason Holland (Mathematics) left the university at the end of the 2015 academic year. No replacement was made for his place on the assessment team.

Each paper was rated by 2 members of the assessment team. The scores from rater 1 and rater 2 were averaged for each SLO for each paper in the sample. These averages scores were used to calculate the total average score for each SLO, the number of papers meeting the acceptable target and the composite scores. Composite scores were calculated by adding the rubric scores for each SLO (e.g., 1.1.A + 1.1.B + 1.1.C). Percentages of papers meeting acceptable target scores were calculated by dividing by the number of papers in the sample.

SLOs assessed in 2015-2016:

- ¹ Students will determine the nature and extent of the information needed.
 - ² Students will access the needed information effectively and efficiently.
 - ³ Students will use information ethically and legally.
 - ⁴ Student will describe theories or perspectives relevant to a particular case or problem.
 - ⁵ Students will describe findings and interpretations relevant to a particular case or problem.
 - ⁶ Students will evaluate information and its sources critically.
 - ⁷ Students will use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
-

Results

SLO 1.1.A

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher for this rubric item. In 2015-16, 85% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; meeting both the acceptable target and the ideal target for this SLO. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates a substantive increase in this SLO for this year.

ONE	Obj. 1.1.A	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Determine Information Needed	Score > 2.5	63.6%	75.0%	74.67%	85%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Approaching	Met	Met	Met
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Approaching	Approaching	Met
		Average of all samples	2.67	2.63	2.71	2.85

SLO 1.1.B

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher for this rubric item. In 2015-16, 78.33% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; meeting the acceptable target score and approaching the ideal target score for this SLO. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates a modest but significant increase for this year.

TWO	Obj. 1.1.B	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Access and Use Information	Score > 2.5	No assessment	61.7%	72%	78.33%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	No assessment	Approaching	Met	Met
		Ideal Target (80%)	No assessment	Not met	Not met	Approaching
		Average of all samples	No assessment	2.45	2.59	2.76

SLO 1.1.C

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher for this rubric item. In 2015-16, 66.67% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; thus approaching the acceptable target score and not meeting the ideal target for this SLO. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates no increase in this SLO score for this year.

THREE	Obj. 1.1.C	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Information Use Strategies	Score > 2.5	70.5%	61.7%	66.67%	66.67%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	MET	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not met
		Average of all samples	2.63	2.5	2.66	2.65

SLO 1.1 Composite

The QEP report calls for a composite score for 7.5 for SLOs ONE, TWO and THREE. An **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 7.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 7.5 or higher. In 2015-16, 65% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 7.5 or higher approaching the acceptable target score for this SLO. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates a slight increase for this year.

COMPOSITE	Obj. 1.1	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
		Total > 7.5	63.6% (total >5.0)	60.0%	62.67%	65%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Approaching	Not met	Approaching	Approaching
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not met
		Average of all samples	5.29 (total >5.0)	7.59	7.96	8.27

SLO 1.2.A

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2015-16, 76.67% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher. The acceptable target score was met; approaching the ideal target score. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates a substantive increase for this year.

FOUR	Obj. 1.2.A	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Describe Relevant Theories	Score > 2.5	63.6%	41.7%	62.67%	76.67%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Approaching	Not met	Approaching	Met
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Approaching
		Average of all samples	2.5	2.16	2.54	2.67

SLO 1.2.B

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2015-16, 58.33% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher. Neither the acceptable target score nor the ideal target score were met for this SLO. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates no significant increase in this SLO for this year.

FIVE	Obj. 1.2.B	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Analysis Applied to Situation	Score > 2.5	63.6%	48.3%	57.33%	58.33%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Approaching	Not met	Not met	Not met
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not met
		Average of all samples	2.53	2.27	2.41	2.39

SLO 1.2 Composite

The QEP report calls for a composite score for 5.0 for SLOs FOUR and FIVE. An **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 5.0 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 5.0 or higher. In 2015-16, 58.33% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 5.0 or higher. Neither the acceptable target score nor the ideal target score were met for this SLO. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates no significant increase in this SLO for this year.

COMPOSITE	Obj. 1.2	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
		Total > 5.0	59.1%	36.7%	56%	58.33%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Not Met	Not met	Not met	Not Met
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not met
		Average of all samples	5.03	4.44	4.96	5.05

SLO 1.3.A

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2015-16, 65% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; approaching the acceptable target score for this SLO. The ideal target score was not met. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates a substantive increase for this year.

SIX	Obj. 1.3.A	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
		Score > 2.5	50%	40%	57.33%	65%
	Evaluate Information	Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Approaching
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not met
		Average of all samples	2.27	2.15	2.36	2.39

SLO 1.3.B

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher. In 2015-16, 66.67% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; approaching the acceptable target score and not meeting the ideal target score. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates a slight drop in this SLO for this year.

SEVEN	Obj. 1.3B	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
	Use Information for a Purpose	Score > 2.5	65.9%	55.0%	70.67%	66.67%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Minimally Met	Not met	Met	Approaching
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not Met
		Average of all samples	2.67	2.4	2.54	2.52

SLO 1.3 Composite

The QEP report calls for a composite score for 5.0 for SLOs SIX and SEVEN. An **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 5.0 or higher and an **ideal target** of 80% of samples scoring 5.0 or higher. In 2015-16, 58.33% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 5.0 or higher. Neither the acceptable target score nor the ideal target score were met for this SLO. A comparison with 2014-15 data indicates no significant increase in this SLO for this year.

COMPOSITE	Obj. 1.3	CORE 210	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
		Total > 5.0	50%	43%	57.33%	58.33%
		Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not Met
		Ideal Target (80%)	Not met	Not met	Not met	Not met
		Average of all samples	4.94	4.55	4.91	4.99

Observations:

The data indicate:

- Students are approaching the acceptable target criteria for SLO 1.1; determining the nature and extent of the information needed, accessing the needed information effectively and efficiently, and using information ethically and legally.
 - The data demonstrate significant growth in Obj. 1.1.A. student knowledge of determining the need for information and Obj. 1.1.B. accessing and citing sources over the past year with absolute increases of 10% and 6% respectively.
 - The data also demonstrate continued difficulties with Obj. 1.1.C. using information ethically and legally. Papers exhibit lack of citations or missing information when citing sources in the text.
- Students are approaching the acceptable target criteria for SLO 1.2; describing theories or perspectives relevant to a particular case or problem and describing findings and interpretations relevant to a particular case or problem.
 - The data demonstrate students are meeting criteria for Obj. 1.2.A. – describing theories or perspectives relevant to a particular case or problem. In addition, the data is approaching the ideal target of 80% of criteria.
 - The data continues to demonstrate students' struggle with Obj. 1.2.B. describing findings and interpretations relevant to a particular case or problem – a minimal absolute but insignificant increase was noted in this objective.
 - The availability of the writing prompts to the assessment team again this year provided context to the team to determine the expectations of the paper when applying the scoring rubric.
- Students are not meeting the acceptable target criteria for SLO 1.3; evaluating information and its sources critically and using information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
 - The data demonstrate students are approaching the target criteria for Obj. 1.3.A. with an absolute increase of 8% from the previous year.
 - The data demonstrate a small decrease in Obj. 1.3.B. indicating students are not fully achieving the purpose of the writing assignment.

The Assessment Team had access to the writing prompts from the sections of CORE 210 taught in the fall and spring which was extremely helpful in determining how well the paper met the expectations for the assignment.

Commendations:

1. Thesis statements were readily identifiable in most papers. This is noted in the improvements for SLO 1.1; obj. A and B. CORE 210 faculty are clearly assisting students in shaping thesis statements to clearly define the scope of the topic.
2. In addition, several writing prompts were very detailed which assisted the team in understanding the expectations of the paper when applying the rubric.
3. The papers assessed this year made significant improvements in describing the theories or perspectives relevant to the thesis statement and interpreting the findings to support the thesis statement [SLO 1.2, obj. A] with a 14% absolute increase over the previous year. This is another area for commendation to the CORE 210 faculty for using detailed writing prompts, breaking the writing process into steps and using peer review.
4. Continued growth was seen in SLO 1.3 – analyzing and interpreting information and effectively accomplishing a specific purpose. An 8% absolute increase was noted in Obj. 1.3.A. - analyzing and interpreting information. The CORE 210 faculty is to be commended for expanding the writing prompts to specify the student should present at least one counter-argument to their thesis. In many cases, this inclusion provided a richer written product which accomplished the purpose of the writing assignment.

Other comments:

Changes to the scoring rubric enabled the assessment team to better assess the number of sources and use of cited sources in the papers. This, coupled with the availability of the writing prompts allowed the team to more reliably score the selected papers.