

Assessment Results for Cycle for Processes Associated with Common Program Learning Outcomes

Schedule Adherence

For the last 3-years we have successfully maintained our assessment schedule. This provides us with a set of assessment data for each learning outcome we look forward to continuing this schedule and mapping trends to review the effectiveness of our changes.

Assessed Winter 2017, with next assessment cycle Winter 2020.

1. ISLO: Act responsibly.

Assessed Winter Semester 2017. Next Assessment Cycle 2020.

- a. GELO: Think Civically: Demonstrate an understanding of diverse societies, ranging from local to global, in order to engage effectively in civic life.
- b. GELO: Cultivate Wellness: Demonstrate an understanding of wellness principles to promote physical and personal health.

Assessed Winter 2018, with next assessment cycle Winter 2021.

2. ISLO: Apply knowledge and skills.

- a. GELO: Utilize Technology Effectively: Solve a problem or accomplish a task using technology.
- b. GELO: Reason Quantitatively: Use quantitative information or analyze data within context to arrive at meaningful results.

Assess Winter 2019, with next assessment cycle Winter 2022.

3. ISLO: Communicate effectively. (Assessed Winter Semester 2019)

- a. GELO: Communicate Effectively: Communicate effectively in oral, written, or symbolic expression.

4. ISLO: Think critically. (Assessed Winter Semester 2019)

- a. GELO: Think Critically: Produce a defensible conclusion or solution using critical or creative thinking.

Completion of the first three-year assessment cycle has demonstrated that we have successfully developed a sustainable assessment process which can be repeated in future years. The first assessment cycle gave us a baseline for our data analysis and insight into the skills and knowledge of our graduates. The focus of this first assessment cycle has been to establish our methods of sampling students and educate faculty about the assessment process. We expect the ongoing work of the General Education Curriculum and Assessment Committee, as well the General Education Resource Groups, to improve student learning and student performance in future assessment cycles. The initial baseline of 70% of students achieving a rubric level 2 or 3 has been increased to a long-term goal of 80% of students achieving a rubric level 2 during the next assessment cycle.

Table 1.1.A: Student Performance by Outcome

Caption Table 1.1.A:

Our assessment process relies on faculty to design their own assessment tool and submit the results for specific students who have earned 45 credit hours or more. This credit hour designation selects for students who are nearing the end of their course work on a 2-year program. The instructor-assigned scores are reviewed for rigor by a General Education Resource Group, a committee of faculty who offer support to other faculty in assessing a specific general education outcome. Comparisons between the instructor assigned scores and the resource group scores are showed in Table 1.1.B.

Key:

Faculty and resources groups used the same 4-point rubric listed below to assess student work according to the appropriate General Education Outcome:

Level 0 – No Evidence. No student work was submitted or the student dropped the course before submission.
 Level 1 – Emerging. Does not meet expectations: has major errors, omissions, or inappropriate expressions.
 Level 2 – Developing. Meets minimal expectations: has minor errors, omissions, or inappropriate expression.
 Level 3 – Mastery. Shows proficiency in demonstrating the outcome.

ISLO	Act Responsibly				Apply Knowledge and Skills				Communicate Effectively	Think Critically		
	Think Civically		Cultivate Wellness		Utilize Technology		Reason Quantitatively					
Assessment Schedule	2017, 2020, 2023				2018, 2021, 2024				2019, 2022, 2025			
	N		N		N		N		N		N	
Level 0	13%	28	6%	15	11%	43	12%	115	8%	48	9%	96
Level 1	4%	8	6%	14	12%	46	12%	115	5%	30	9%	91
Level 2	17%	37	18%	44	17%	66	23%	216	28%	160	23%	228
Level 3	66%	144	70%	173	61%	243	53%	495	59%	342	59%	599
Total N	217		246		398		941		580		1014	
Average Level	2.4		2.5		2.3		2.2		2.4		2.3	
% Acceptable	83%	181	88%	217	78%	309	76%	711	87%	504	82%	827

- Interpretation: In the large samples the percent of scores at the 2 and 3 levels surpassed the target of 70% in all general education outcome categories. The target was met for all outcomes.
- To improve performance, we are offering help to students and faculty in the following ways:
 - Professional development opportunities to design activities/assignments that develop critical thinking skills (workshops, access to examples, discipline TC guide)
 - Promoting current student resources: TLC and WRIT
 - Creating discipline specific student guidelines
 - GECAC eLearning site available to all faculty with sample assessments

Table 1.1.B: Rater Reliability

Caption Table 1.2:

A subset of the assignments used to develop Table 1 were screened for appropriate rigor. This table compares the rankings of individual faculty against the members of the general education resource group.

Key:

F = Faculty Scores

R = Resource Group Scores

ISLO	Act Responsibly				Apply Knowledge and Skills				Communicate Effectively	Think Critically		
	Think Civically		Cultivate Wellness		Utilize Technology		Reason Quantitatively					
GELO												
Assessment Schedule	2017, 2020, 2023				2018, 2021, 2024				2019, 2022, 2025			
	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R
Level 0	3%	3%	1.5%	2%	0%	0%	12%	14%	0%	18%	0%	9%
Level 1	5%	8%	1.5%	10%	11%	7%	11%	16%	10%	3%	8%	9%
Level 2	19%	27%	21%	45%	15%	5%	32%	21%	37%	31%	33%	29%
Level 3	73%	61%	76%	43%	74%	88%	44%	49%	53%	48%	59%	53%
Total N	59		67		74		115		62		78	
Average Level	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.3
% Acceptable	92%	88%	97%	88%	89%	94%	76%	70%	90%	79%	92%	82%

- Part of the discrepancy between faculty scores and resource groups scores can be explained by professors scoring student work based on the assignment criteria, rather than the outcome.
- Cultivate Wellness Results: Many of the assignments submitted did not meet the general education outcome at a level 3 when scored by the resource group. That is not to say that the course isn't mastering wellness, but the work submitted did not capture the outcome. It is difficult to submit one assignment that indicates "mastery". The resource group is working on ways to assist faculty in choosing an assignment that meets the outcome.
- Reason Quantitatively Results: 16 out of the 115 (14%) assignments collected were unable to be scored by the resource group. Reasons for not scoring: resource group could not understand the assignment or the key, the assignment did not satisfy the expectations of the outcome.
- Communicate Effectively Results: 11 out of 62 (18%) assignments collected were unable to be scored by the resource group. Reasons for not scoring: Instructor submitted their evaluation, outside reviewer evaluation or peer evaluation for scoring.
- Think Critically Results: 7 out of 78 (9%) assignments collected were not scored by the resource group. Reasons for not scoring: No student work submitted: 2, Assignment Mismatch: 1, Assignment not addressing critical thinking: 4

- Bottom Line: Resource group scoring is well-aligned with instructor rankings for the large sample but lower than the small sample mainly because not all the assignments turned in were assessable.
- Suggestions for improvement: Conversations with individual faculty, trainings provided by GECAC and resources groups, workshops during the college learning days and adjunct academy.

Table 1.1.C: Degree Specific Data

Caption for Table 1.1.C

Our common learning outcome assessment process samples a wider pool of students than those who actually receive degrees. These tables present assessment results based on the subset of students who actually received a degree or certificate from Delta College.

Part 1: Any Degree or Certificate

ISLO	Act Responsibly				Apply Knowledge and Skills				Communicate Effectively	Think Critically		
GELO	Think Civically		Cultivate Wellness		Utilize Technology		Reason Quantitatively					
Assessment Schedule	2017, 2020, 2023				2018, 2021, 2024				2019, 2022, 2025			
	N		N		N		N		N		N	
Level 0	4%	4	3%	3	3%	5	6%	7	2%	6	4%	12
Level 1	1%	1	3%	3	8%	16	14%	16	3%	7	7%	20
Level 2	11%	11	13%	15	13%	24	24%	27	24%	61	24%	72
Level 3	84%	80	82%	94	75%	136	56%	65	71%	177	65%	195
Total N	100%	95	100%	115	100%	181	100%	115	100%	251	100%	299
Average Score	2.8		2.7		2.6		2.3		2.6		2.5	
% Acceptable	95%	91	95%	109	95%	160	80%	92	95%	238	89%	267

Part 2: Associates in Arts (AA) or Associates in Science (AS)

ISLO	Act Responsibly				Apply Knowledge and Skills				Communicate Effectively	Think Critically		
GELO	Think Civically		Cultivate Wellness		Utilize Technology		Reason Quantitatively					
Assessment Schedule	2017, 2020, 2023				2018, 2021, 2024				2019, 2022, 2025			
	AA	AS	AA	AS	AA	AS	AA	AS	AA	AS	AA	AS
Total N	14	10	16	15	31	20	38	21	34	53	36	71
% Acceptable	86%	100%	87%	93%	77%	85%	74%	86%	94%	91%	92%	85%
% of Graduating Class Sampled	6.3 %	7.1 %	7.2%	11%	21%	19%	26%	20%	22%	47%	24%	63%

- These results indicate that graduates of Delta College are able to demonstrate proficiency in all the common learning outcomes as seen by the high percentage of students scoring at a 2 or 3.
- Although the percentage of AA and AS graduates sampled in the first year of the assessment cycle was low (below 10%), it remained at or above 20% for the remaining four outcomes assessed. These results give us confidence in our sampling methods.
- Results of the assessment cycle have been shared with faculty at division meetings and faculty forum. A workshop was also offered at adjunct academy to educate part-time faculty about our general education assessment process. As faculty become more familiar with the assessment process we expect our rates of participation to increase.