

Program Assessment Report

Program: General Education
Year: 16/17
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

Demonstrate an understanding of wellness principles to promote physical and personal health

Outcome(s)

Cultivate Wellness

Standard / Objective

70% of scored assignment meeting a level 2-3

Method of assessment

Course Embedded Paper(s)/Projects

Comment/Details about the method of assessment

The following instructions were sent to faculty on the method of the assessment:

The Delta College General Education Curriculum and Assessment Committee (GECAC), along with General Education Resource Groups are conducting our annual assessment of General Education Outcomes. You are being asked to assess Cultivate Wellness.

Faculty members teaching a section that has indicated an M for one of the selected outcomes will score the selected students' work using the general education rubric (see below). The students who have been selected in a specific class section will be listed in a spreadsheet and faculty will enter the rubric score and qualitative comments about each student's work. The resource group will also collect a smaller subset of student work. Student work for those whose names are highlighted in the spreadsheet should be copied and delivered to Kayleen VanWert. Kayleen will code the student work for anonymity before delivering it to the resource groups. The resource group will analyze the spreadsheet data and norm and score the smaller subset of copies of student work so that they can facilitate collegial discussion and professional development concerning the outcome. Please select an assignment that can be submitted if requested.

For this assessment project, please follow the following process:

- Select one assignment, test, or portion of a test, etc. that requires students to individually demonstrate their general-education mastery of the Cultivate Wellness outcome.
- Complete the "General Education Assessment Faculty Spreadsheet" for the requested students. In this spreadsheet you will enter a score using the General Education Rubric and you will have the opportunity to write qualitative comments about the student work that describes why the score was given. The comments may explain errors or omissions in the student work. The Resource Group will analyze these comments for common threads to improve student learning and to prepare faculty professional development.
- If any of your students have been chosen to have their work collected, those names are highlighted in the

spreadsheet. Copy that student work and deliver it to Kayleen VanWert (B134). All student names and student numbers should be left on the student work. To preserve student and instructor anonymity, Kayleen will code all student and instructor information before she forwards the work to the Resource Group.

Send a copy of your assignment or test instructions, copies of requested student work, and completed spreadsheet for the requested student samples to Kayleen VanWert, B134 (kayleenvanwert@delta.edu) by May 3, 2017. You may send electronic copies or paper copies of the above materials.

If you have any questions about this project, please contact any of the people listed below.

Your participation will influence the future of general education assessment and student learning at Delta College! Thank you!

At the completion of Winter 2017 A stack of assignments were given to the resource group. The assignments were randomly selected out of all the assignments submitted. Assignments were coded and a spreadsheet given to the resource group committee included the coded assignments and the score given by the instructors. The resource group was then asked to grade the student work as a level 0-3.

Courses Affected

Time Frame

17/18

Submitted By

Renee Hoppe

Result

Result

Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

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

Many of the assignments did not meet the outcome so it was difficult to assess the assignment knowing that it was not supporting the objective of the assessment. The GECAC Chair met with the resource committee to provide clarification on how to grade the assignments. The resource group was informed to grade the assignments based on the student work/writing/analysis and not on if the assignment met the outcome being assessed. This concept was hard for our group to digest as we felt it made the data invalid. If the student work is not related to the outcome it didn't make sense for us to assess the assignment with the given levels. The Resource committee also felt that the wellness outcome was written to vague and therefore classes that indicated mastery of wellness may very well have zero dimensions of wellness represented. In their course. Another thing to take into consideration was that though the course masters all of the dimensions. Since all of the assignments are coded we will not know what courses are assessed, what instructors need assistance to create assignments to meet the GECAC requirement, and what faculty may need professional development opportunities to help them in creating a mastery level course. Therefore, the resource group would like to see an increase in communication of the type of assignment to be submitted via email that is sent out to the selected instructors for the assessment.

Use of Data to Improve Student Success

The resource committee was asked to assess if the student work submitted showed developing or proficiency in answering the questions on a particular assignment. Although many of the questions were unrelated to wellness we followed the directive to grade the student work on proficiency with minor errors, omissions, or inappropriate expression and not if the work met the outcome being assessed. If a student submitted an assignment unrelated to the outcome, but was proficient on the assignment with writing skills or correct answers i.e. 100% on a multiple choice exam) they were assessed at the level 3 mastery level. *See additional analysis under "data collected."

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

Goal / Project

Outcome(s)

Think Civically

Standard / Objective

70% of students will score at a 2 or 3

Method of assessment

Capstone Demonstrations(s)

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. A random sample of those students, then, was selected to submit student work. 70 student work samples were requested; 60 were returned. The attrition rate can be attributed to students dropping the class or not completing the assignment.

Courses Affected

Time Frame

Submitted By

Result

Result

Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

Here are the results of the entire sample of 217 students, as scored by instructors: Level 0 = 28 (13%); Level 1 = 8 (4%); Level 2 = 37 (17%); Level 3 = 144 (66%). Therefore, 83% of the entire sample was evaluated by instructors as a level 2 or 3. Here are the results of the work scored by the Think Civically Resource Group: Level 0 = 1 (1.7%); Level 1 = 5 (8.3%); Level 2 = 15 (25%); Level 3 = 38 (63%). Therefore, 88% of the student's work was scored as "mastery" or "developing" per the scoring rubric. In comparing instructor scores with that of the resource group, there was a tendency for instructors to score the work slightly higher than the resource group members. Compared with the resource group scores (above), instructor scores were as follows: Level 0 = 1 (1.7%); Level 1 = 3 (6.7%); Level 2 = 11 (18.3%); Level 3 = 45 (75%). Part of this discrepancy can be explained by professors scoring student work based on the assignment criteria, rather than the Think Civically outcome.

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

In reviewing the assignments submitted by instructors, we found a great diversity in the ways that the think civically outcome is measured across the disciplines represented in the sample. In reviewing the assignments, the resource group found an inconsistency in the way these measurements captured the "engage effectively in civic life" part of the Think Civically outcome. The assignments consistently measured the "understanding of diverse societies, ranging from local to global" part of the outcome, but did not prompt the student to explain how this understanding prepared he/she to be a more active citizen and better contribute to the community. Further, the resource group did not have a consistent rubric for how to score samples that lacked this piece. In evaluating the assignments, some may assume that the student is prepared to engage in civic life, by demonstrating the understanding of diverse societies, while not requiring that the student specifically articulate that part of the Think Civically outcome. Next time we assess this outcome, we would like to make clear to both instructors and those scoring the student work samples that the engagement component must be present and that the assessment should prompt this. We might reiterate to the professors collecting and scoring the work samples that the rubric for the Think Civically Outcome is different from the assignment rubric. Many of the comments by professors indicated that they were evaluating the work according to the assignment rubric, rather than the Think Civically outcome rubric. As a result, the professors scored the work slightly higher than

the resource group. Lastly, as a resource group, we would also like to score the work samples together to improve the reliability of the measures and to ensure we are all using the same standard. The scoring rubric was too general to provide consistency in scoring methods.

Use of Data to Improve Student Success

The results of the assessment well surpassed the expectations of the Think Civically Resource Group. We were more than satisfied with the 88 percent of students that scored at the 2 or 3 level. In the future, we would suggest that instructors adjust their measurements to capture the students understanding of how the knowledge they gained prepares them to "engage effectively in civic life."

<p>Institutional Student Learning Outcome</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Apply Knowledge and Skills</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Think Critically</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Communicate Effectively</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Act Responsibly</p>	<p>Action plan items of what is planned based on the data and results</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change assignments/activities <input type="checkbox"/> Update course content</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change materials provided <input type="checkbox"/> Update course outcomes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adjust grading rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Update prior courses</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continue to Monitor <input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>
--	---

Comments and Action Plan

Discipline/Program Comments

Advisory Board Comments

Assessment Committee Comments

As far as the Cultivate Wellness action plan, this may be a bit of an older action plan. Cultivate Wellness was to work with GECAC this past year (2018-2019) in developing a better explanation for the "clarifying sheet" to explain what would qualify and what would not for cultivate wellness so as to expand where the outcome can be assessed. The outcome of the meeting was for expanding where the outcome is assessed rather than restricting it. The single assessment of all 6 dimensions for wellness being used as a universal GECAC assignment is not a viable solution. This was discussed and the discussion indicated that such an assignment could be used within some LW courses, but is not to be the only possible assessment for the outcome as this would limit its use to only a few courses. Meeting one "dimension" of CW is all that is needed to be considered for an M in this outcome. Before any professional development opportunities are provided, discussion with the CW group needs to be done through the guidance of GECAC.

As for the Think Civically outcome, discussion also mentioned that the idea of having an additional assessment of the engagement is not appropriate as the outcome is simply written to demonstrate the knowledge to be able to engage appropriately. This would effectively add another outcome and again greatly limit the opportunities for assessment in an outcome already found in few places.

Curriculum Council Comments

Action Plan

Multiple tasks need to be addressed for the next round of General Ed. Assessment of the Wellness Outcome. The Wellness Outcome Mastery examples need to better match the expectation of the outcome, so that instructors can determine the type of assignment they need to create and submit mastery. Professional development opportunities need to be created to educate faculty on the cultivate wellness outcome and definition. Assistance should be made available for faculty who want to offer courses mastering wellness so that their course are in alignment with the outcome and wellness definition. The LW faculty have already been proactive and have started development a summative assessment for mastery level LW courses. The assignment will assess student mastery of all 6 dimensions of the Wellness Outcome and be used as the universal assignment collected for the GECAC cultivating wellness outcome. *One paraphrased opinion that was shared with the resource committee is that the Wellness Outcome's home is in the LW discipline, and is where most of the mastery courses will be designated. Since this is a learning cycle, for the next Gen Ed Assessment, the instructor of courses that can demonstrate mastery for the Wellness

Outcome, may want to develop a summative assessment that addressess all 6 dimensions. Courses outside of the LW discipline should also be coached to develop and assignment to meet the GECAC cultivating wellness outcome that can be used for assessment.

Actions Taken in Response to Older Reports