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**Background**

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A[[1]](#footnote-1), 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 784 students, 726 papers were collected (92%). A random sample of 60 was selected from CORE 210 sections delivered in fall 2013 and spring 2014.

The assessment team consisted of the same 5 faculty members from the previous year – Dr. Brenda Bender (Communication Disorders), Dr. Joshua Brokaw, (Biology), Dr. Jason Holland (Mathematics), Mr. J. Scott Self (Alpha Academic Services), Dr. Jeanine Varner (Language and Literature).

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.

Inter-rater reliability was evaluated using an Intraclass Correlation which yielded an ICC = 0.393 for single measures and an ICC= 0.921 for average measures. These measures indicate an acceptable level of agreement among raters. Paired t-tests were utilized to investigate differences between raters on specific SLOs. The results indicated a significant difference between raters for SLO ONE, FOUR, SIX and SEVEN. These differences will be discussed later in the report.

SLOs assessed in 2013-2014:

 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 2013-14, 75% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; meeting the acceptable target for this SLO and approaching the ideal target of 80%. This is an absolute increase of 11% from the previous year.

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

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 2013-14, 61.7% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; approaching the acceptable target of 70%. This SLO was not assessed in the previous year so a comparison could not be made.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TWO** | **Obj. 1.1.B** | **CORE 210** | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Access and Use Information | Score > 2.5 | No assessment | 61.7% |
| Acceptable Target (70%) | No assessment | Approaching |
|
| Ideal Target (80%) | No assessment | Not met |
| Average of all samples | No assessment |  2.45 |

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 2013-14, 61.7% of sampled papers received a rubric rating of 2.5 or higher; approaching the acceptable target of 70%. An absolute decrease of 9% was noted from the previous year.

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

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 2013-14, 60% of sampled papers received a composite score of 7.5 or higher. This is a 4% absolute decrease when compared to the previous year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **COMPOSITE** | **Obj. 1.1** | **CORE 210** | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|   | Total > 7.5 | 63.6%(total > 5.0) | 60.0% |
| Acceptable Target (70%) | Approaching | Not met |
|
| Ideal Target (80%) | Not met | Not met |
| Average of all samples | 5.29(total > 5.0) | 7.59 |

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 2013-14, 41.7% of sampled papers received a rubric score of 2.5 or higher. This is an absolute decrease of 22% from the previous year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOUR** | **Obj. 1.2.A** | **CORE 210** | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Describe Relevant Theories | Score > 2.5 | 63.6% | 41.7% |
| Acceptable Target (70%) | Approaching | Not met |
| Ideal Target (80%) | Not met | Not met |
| Average of all samples | 2.5 | 2.16 |

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 2013-14, 48.3% of sampled papers received a rubric score of 2.5 or higher. This is an absolute decrease of 16% from the previous year.

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

SLO 1.2 Composite

The QEP report calls for a composite score for 7.5 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 2013-14, 36.7% of sampled papers received a composite score of 5.0 or higher. This is a 23% absolute decrease when compared to the previous year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **COMPOSITE** | **Obj. 1.2** | **CORE 210** | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|   | Total > 5.0 | 59.1% | 36.7% |
| Acceptable Target (70%) | Not Met | Not met |
|
| Ideal Target (80%) | Not met | Not met |
| Average of all samples | 5.03 | 4.44 |

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 2013-14, 40% of sampled papers received a rubric score of 2.5 or higher. This is an absolute decrease of 10% from the previous year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SIX** | **Obj. 1.3.A** | **CORE 210** | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Evaluate Information | Score > 2.5 | 50% | 40% |
| Acceptable Target (70%) | Not met | Not met |
|
| Ideal Target (80%) | Not met | Not met |
| Average of all samples | 2.27 | 2.15 |

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 2013-14, 55% of sampled papers received a rubric score of 2.5 or higher. This is an absolute decrease of 11% from the previous year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SEVEN** | **Obj. 1.3B** | **CORE 210** | Year 2 | Year 3 |
| Use Information for a Purpose | Score > 2.5 | 65.9% | 55.0% |
| Acceptable Target (70%) | Minimally Met | Not met |
|
| Ideal Target (80%) | Not met | Not met |
| Average of all samples | 2.67 | 2.4 |

SLO 1.3 Composite

The QEP report calls for a composite score for 7.5 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 2013-14, 43% of sampled papers received a composite score of 5.0 or higher. This is a 7% absolute decrease when compared to the previous year.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **COMPOSITE** | **Obj. 1.3** | **CORE 210** | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|   | Total > 5.0 | 50% | 43% |
| Acceptable Target (70%) | Not met | Not met |
|
| Ideal Target (80%) | Not met | Not met |
| Average of all samples | 4.94 | 4.55 |

**Factors impacting the 2013-14 assessment:**

**Significant Changes to Assessment Rubric.** The CORE 210 rubric was significantly revised for the YEAR 3 assessment. The first major revision occurred in SLO 1.1.A and 1.1.C following the changes made by the CORE 110 assessment team. Each of these rubric items assessed more than one skill; therefore, the two skills/outcomes were rated separately and the two ratings were averaged to determine the rubric score for each item. This change allowed for a more specific rating of each skill for SLO 1.1. In addition, the term “theories” in SLO 1.2.A and 1.2.B was very difficult to apply to the assignments generated from CORE 210. This year the language of these SLOs was revised to “…theories or perspectives” to allow for a broader application of the SLO especially as the BCOR 310 assessment team launched this year.

While the InterClass Correlation measures indicate moderate to strong agreement among the ratings; a paired T-test indicated significant differences between raters on items ONE, FOUR, SIX and SEVEN. Further evaluation of the difference scores between raters indicated a one point difference between most paired ratings on these items. Therefore, the ratings on these items are valid and no further assessment is needed. It is felt that the changes to the rubric called for the raters to assess each rubric item more individually, thereby decoupling the rubric items from an overall/general assessment of Excellent, Competent, Emerging or Unacceptable.

**Delay in Papers being Available for Assessment.** This year the assessment team experienced an 8 day lag between the completion of the norming process and when the sample of papers were available for assessment. While the time lag was minimized as much as possible, the effect on the assessment results is unknown.

**Inconsistencies in Writing Assignment across Sections.** The assessment team commented this year again on the variability among the papers. During the 2013-14 year, the results of the 2012-13 assessment was presented to the CORE 210 director and instructors. Feedback was provided based on the assessment team’s observations and assessment results. These recommendations were intended to assist instructors in revising the writing assignment to be more consistent across sections to facilitate a more reliable sample of papers for assessment this year. The writing prompts were not made available for the assessment team and our assumption is that some changes were made to the writing prompts across sections but the recommendation for a common citation style was not implemented across sections.

**Recommendations**

* Finalize adjustments to the assessment rubric in early 2015 and have a team meeting to discuss the rubric prior to norming process.
* Collect writing prompts from all sections of CORE 210 and provide access to team prior to assessment process.
* Submit papers to the Pursuit office on the last day of classes OR on the first day of Finals Week to facilitate a timely assessment process.
* Invite a faculty member from the Department of Language and Literature to make a presentation to CORE 210 faculty in the Adams Center or during faculty meetings to discuss helpful strategies for writing position papers.
* Focus on the big ideas of citing sources, of evaluating and analyzing theories or perspectives, and of writing conclusions.
* Compare specific signature assignments from each of the CORE 210 classes to make revisions and provide consistency in the descriptions of the assignment.
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