Program Assessment Report

Program: General Education
Year: 17/18
Division: General Education
Contact: Maureen Donegan

Delta College

Actions Taken in Response to Last Year's Report

Rationale for Current Assessments

Assessment 1 of 2

Goal / Project

Outcome(s)

Utilize Technology Effectively

Standard / Objective

At least 70% of students will score at the 2 or 3 level on a standard rubric.

Method of assessment

Course Embedded Paper(s)/Projects

Comment/Details about the method of assessment

GECAC identified students close to graduation by selecting classes that students were most likely to take the semester before graduation. Within those classes, they identified the students that had 45 or more credits. Instructors then chose a single assignment to assess using the standard GECAC rubric.

Courses Affected

Courses across the college with a M for the Gen Ed outcome Utilize Technology Effectively on the Gen Ed audit.

Time Frame

Winter 2018

Submitted By

Maureen Donegan - GECAC Chair

Result

Result

(3) Results exceeded expectation/standard

Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

640 students were selected for assessment and 398 students were scored by their instructor. This resulted in a 62% return rate. The type of technology use that was assessed includes software, equipment and calculators. The instructor scores for the 398 students are as follows: Level 0 No Evidence – 43 (11%), Level 1 Emerging - 46 (12%), Level 2 Developing – 66 (17%), Level 3 Mastery – 243 (61%). Therefore, 77.6% of students scored at a level 2 or 3.
150 assignments were requested to be submitted to the resource group for and 74 assignments were

submitted. Out of the subsample of 74 assignments 89% were scored at a level 2 or 3 by the instructor, whereas the resource group scored 94% at the 2 or 3 level.

What We Learned (areas for improvements, strengths, etc.)

Professional development recommendations include defining “utilize technology”, giving faculty guidelines on how to choose a good assignment and performing norming sessions for assessing the outcome based on an assignment. The resource group recommends reviewing the qualitative comments for additional information about the assessment, offering professional development on how to define Utilize Technology, and rotating the assessment to occur during the fall semester, because some OAT capstone classes are only offered in fall semester. Those students would not be included in any assessments during the winter semester. SLAC Recommendations include looking at score that don’t match to get other data and standardizing GenEd assessment reports. A data template for all resource groups to use for reporting should be developed.

Use of Data to Improve Student Success

The next Utilize Technology Effectively outcome assessment will occur during the Fall, instead of winter, 2021 semester to capture more students who are taking capstone classes in computer science and related fields.

Institutional Student Learning Outcome	Action plan items of what is planned based on the data and results	
☑ Apply Knowledge and Skills	☐ Change assignments/activities	☐ Update course content
☐ Think Critically	☐ Change materials provided	☐ Update course outcomes
☐ Communicate Effectively	☐ Adjust grading rubric	☐ Update prior courses
☐ Act Responsibly	☑ Continue to Monitor	☑ Other

Assessment 2 of 2

Goal / Project

Outcome(s)

Reason Quantitatively

Standard / Objective

At least 70% of students will score at the 2 or 3 level on a standard rubric.

Method of assessment

Course Embedded Paper(s)/Projects

Comment/Details about the method of assessment

GECAC identified students close to graduation by selecting classes that students were most likely to take the semester before graduation. Within those classes, they identified the students that had 45 or more credits. Instructors submitted 941 scores for student work using the GECAC rubric. A random sample of 132 samples were requested for the resource group. 122 were collected, and 107 were scored by the resource group. The difference between those samples requested and those collected can be attributed to students who dropped the class before the assignment was collected. The difference between the assignments collected and those scores can be attributed to assignments that were not understood by the resource group, or appeared to not fit the conditions of a valid assessment tool for quantitative reasoning. It is also important to note that several members from GECAC participated with the resource group scoring of student work.

Courses Affected

Courses across the college with a M for the Gen Ed outcome Reason Quantitatively on the Gen Ed audit.

Time Frame

Winter 2018

Submitted By

Maureen Donegan - GECAC Chair

Result

Result

(3) Results exceeded expectation/standard

Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

When considering all instructor scores for the 941 students, the counts are: Level 0 Dropped – 53 (5.6%), Level 0 No Evidence – 62 (6.6%), Level 1 – 115 (12.2%), Level 2 – 216 (23.0%), Level 3 – 495 (52.6%). Therefore, 24.4% were scored at the 0 and 1 levels, while 75.6% were scored at the 2 and 3 levels.
Out of the subsample of 107 assignments, the following counts are from instructors: Level 0 – 7 (6.5%), Level 1 – 13 (12.1%), Level 2 – 36 (33.6%), Level 3 – 51 (47.7%). Therefore, 18.7% were scored at the 0 and 1 levels, while 81.5% were scored at the 2 and 3 levels.
Out of the same 107 assignments, the following counts are from the resource group: Level 0 – 8 (7.5%), Level 1 – 18 (16.8%), Level 2 – 24 (22.4%), Level 3 – 57 (53.3%). Therefore, 24.3% were scored at the 0 and 1 levels, while 75.7% were scored at the 2 and 3 levels. It turned out that out of the 107 assignments, 70 (65.4%) were scored the same by the resource group and instructors, 34 (31.8%) differed by 1 level, and 3 (2.7%) differed by more than 1 level. There were also 15 assignments that were unable to be scored by the resource group. This accounted for 12.3% of the 122 actual assignments collected.

What We Learned (areas for improvements, strengths, etc.)

In each of the categories above (instructor scores for large sample, instructor scores for small sample, and resource group scores for small sample) the percent of scores at the 2 and 3 levels surpassed the target of 70%.
When comparing the resource group and instructor scores, the two groups scored the same 65.4% of the time and they differed by one 31.8% of the time. In only 2.7% of the scores were the two groups more than one different. There is a 5.6% difference between the 2 and 3 levels from the resource group and from the instructors. This seems a bit high due to the consistency of the scoring. This discrepancy is likely due to the resources group scoring harder at the 1-2 levels, while the instructors graded harder at the 2-3 levels. This would account for the 2 and 3 level scores for the resource group to be lower while having nearly consistent scoring. This information may be important in determining trends in what each group is looking for when scoring.
When comparing the instructor scores in the large sample and the small sample, the percentages seemed very consistent. This is important because it suggest that a smaller number of scores may be needed for the large sample in order to achieve reliable results. This should probably be explored over several assessment cycles in order to better determine if this is true.

Use of Data to Improve Student Success

Perhaps one of the biggest take-aways involved the 15 assignments that the resource group was unable to score. There were two main reasons for these assignments not being scored: the resource group not understanding the assignment or key, and the assignment not seeming to satisfy the expectations of the outcome. These assignments seemed to occur most often in the business and health professions areas.
There were several online assignments submitted for this project. It was often the case in these assignments that students merely needed to enter a number into a cell, sometimes choosing it from a list given rather than determining it themselves. They also often were not required to demonstrate and understanding of what the numbers mean in the context of the problem. In addition, if technology is doing the majority of the work for these students, the assignment may be meeting the assignment requirements for the course, but not the requirements for the reason quantitatively outcome. Some suggestions for improvement in this area moving forward could include conversations with individual faculty, training at discipline meetings provided by GECAC or resource group leaders, along with learnings and COS sessions.
Recommendations from SLAC include the following:

- Adjust Resource Group Membership based on the disciplines being assessed
- Look for trends based on the Qualitative Comments
- Include information about the comments
- Provide Professional development session about how to write Qualitative Comments

Institutional Student Learning Outcome	Action plan items of what is planned based on the data and results	
☑ Apply Knowledge and Skills	☐ Change assignments/activities	☐ Update course content
☐ Think Critically	☐ Change materials provided	☐ Update course outcomes
☐ Communicate Effectively	☐ Adjust grading rubric	☐ Update prior courses
☐ Act Responsibly	☑ Continue to Monitor	☑ Other

Comments and Action Plan

Discipline/Program Comments

Advisory Board Comments

Assessment Committee Comments

Curriculum Council Comments

Action Plan

Actions Taken in Response to Older Reports