



# CORE 210 Assessment – 2012-13 Report

*Dr. Phyllis Bolin*

*Dr. Brenda Bender*

## Background

In order to assess outcomes 1.1A<sup>1</sup>, 1.1C<sup>3</sup>, 1.2A<sup>4</sup>, 1.2B<sup>5</sup>, 1.3A<sup>6</sup>, and 1.3B<sup>7</sup> from the QEP document, the CORE 210 research artifact was collected. From a set of 383 students, 366 papers were collected (95%). Dr. Mark Riggs created a random sample of 60 papers randomly selected from CORE 210 sections delivered in fall 2012 and spring 2013. Two sections taught in the spring semester submitted annotated bibliography assignments and were excluded from the sample along with one paper identified as being plagiarized. Therefore the total number of papers in the sample was 44.

The assessment team consisted of 5 faculty members from across the university – 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) – who have agreed to serve for 5 years.

Prior to assessing rubric scores, inter-rater reliability was evaluated. A paired t-test yielded no significant differences between raters for paired rubric measures. An Intraclass Correlation was calculated and yielded an ICC = 0.567 for single measures and 0.940 for average measures.

These measures indicated acceptable inter-rater agreement therefore 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 following measures. A total average score was calculated for each SLO. A count of the papers in the sample meeting the acceptable target was calculated for each SLO. The count was divided by the N of the sample to calculate the percentage of the sample meeting the target. Composite scores were calculated by adding the rubric scores for each SLO (e.g., 1.1.A + 1.1.C). A count of papers meeting the target and a percentage of the sample meeting the target were also calculated for the composite scores.

SLOs assessed in 2012-2013:

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

## Results

### SLO 1.1

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher on rubric items ONE, TWO, and THREE and a target composite score of 5.0 or higher. The **ideal target** calls for 85% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and a composite score of 5.0.

<b>ONE</b>	<b>Obj. 1.1.A</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.67
<b>TWO</b>	<b>Obj. 1.1.B</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 2.5	No assessment
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	No assessment
	Average of all samples	No assessment
<b>THREE</b>	<b>Obj. 1.1.C</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 2.5	70.45%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	MET
	Average of all samples	2.63
<b>COMPOSITE</b>		<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 5.0	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	5.29

Appendix D

SLO 1.2

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher on rubric items FOUR and FIVE and a target composite score of 5.0 or higher. The **ideal target** calls for 85% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and a composite score of 5.0.

<b>FOUR</b>	<b>Obj. 1.2.A</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.5
<b>FIVE</b>	<b>Obj. 1.2.B</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 2.5	63.64%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.53
<b>COMPOSITE</b>		<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 2.5	59.10%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	5.03

Appendix D

SLO 1.3

The QEP report calls for an **acceptable target** of 70% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher on rubric items SIX and SEVEN and a target composite score of 5.0 or higher. The **ideal target** calls for 85% of samples scoring 2.5 or higher and a composite score of 5.0.

<b>SIX</b>	<b>Obj. 1.3.A</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 2.5	50%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.27
<b>SEVEN</b>	<b>Obj. 1.3.B</b>	<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 5.0	65.91%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	2.67
<b>COMPOSITE</b>		<b>Year 2</b>
	Percent > 5.0	50%
	Met Acceptable Target (70%)	Not met
	Average of all samples	4.94

## Recommendations –

1. Adjust the rubric language to be more general to better fit the variety of topics selected in the writing assignment:
  - a. Specifically refine the language “in the field” and “major theories”. The readers found these terms were too prescriptive for assessing the common assignment.
  - b. Provide a scaffold for readers on SLO 1.1.C – Students will use information ethically and legally. The 4 aspects assessed in this SLO are inter-related and a scaffold will assist readers in assessing this SLO more consistently.
2. Select additional samples if not all submitted papers follow the common writing assignment. Two sections submitted annotated bibliographies instead of the writing assignment.
3. Clarify the common writing assignment requirements across all sections of CORE 210.
  - a. Provide specific expectations for
    - i. Formatting (e.g., page numbers, font type and size, margins)
    - ii. Citation style – MLA was the most frequently used
    - iii. Writing style – some students employed a creative writing style that was difficult to assess
  - b. Complete the assignment earlier in the semester to allow time to provide feedback to the students
  - c. Provide feedback to students on topic choice; narrowing the topic to facilitate a more focused paper
  - d. Provide EXPLORE rubric to teachers and students for an understanding of skills being assessed by the assignment.
4. Ensure students meet the course pre-requisites for CORE 210; specifically ENGL 112.