



GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT RESULTS AND ANALYSIS AY 2013-2014

PURPOSE AND CHARGE

The General Education Outcomes Forum II (GEO Forum II) adopted the following purpose statement.

“Through the general education core curriculum, students will gain a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world; develop principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse global world; and cultivate advanced intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning”~Adopted by the Texas Undergraduate Education Advisory Committee

The THECB approved the following core competencies for all Texas institutions of higher education: Critical Thinking, Communication Skills, Teamwork, Empirical & Quantitative Skills, Social Responsibility and Personal Responsibility. These core competencies, although not each required in every course in the core, must be present and taught throughout the core curriculum in such a way that a student receiving an Associate’s Degree or completing the Core Curriculum will have demonstrated competencies in these six areas.

To ensure teaching and learning of the general education core competencies, assessment of core competencies, although course-embedded, will occur at the institutional level. This faculty-driven process will be overseen by the Core Objective Assessment Team (COAT). COAT, a district-wide faculty committee, is charged with making recommendations for measures, including the development and maintenance of rubrics, serving as a sounding board for assessment logistics, consulting with faculty on assessment issues, conducting core assessments of student artifacts outside of courses as well as making recommendations for improvements needed based on assessment results.

PROCESS OF ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION CORE CURRICULUM

- Assessment has continued on a cycle of three per year. Social Responsibility, Critical Thinking and Teamwork were assessed during the 2013-2014 Academic Year. Communication, Personal Responsibility and Empirical and Quantitative Skills are scheduled to be assessed during the 2014-2015 academic year.
- The assessment sample will rotate through Core courses that will be identified at the beginning of each assessment cycle. A total of 150-200 artifacts will be generated for each of the three core objectives intended for assessment in the given long semester.

Each semester, the sample will include a variety of modalities and campuses to ensure a quality sample across the curriculum.

- Faculty whose courses have been chosen to participate in the assessment process will be notified and given the appropriate Collin College Core Objectives Rubrics. All Collin College Core Objective Rubrics are available online.
- Faculty/Departments may choose any type of measure for the assessment, as long as it meets the criteria for the Core Objective being assessed. The assignment should be one that also will be used by the instructor as part of the student's grade in the course.
- Artifacts will be assessed by faculty members on the Core Objectives Assessment Team.
- Assessments will be based on rubrics developed by Collin faculty members for the purpose of assessing student attainment of the state's core objectives.
- COAT will be responsible to oversee implementation of the assessment process, to train assessors, and to maintain the rubrics.
- Prior to each assessment cycle, COAT faculty members who conduct the assessment will be trained in the use of the rubrics by someone with extensive experience with the use of rubrics and holistic grading for assessment purposes.
- Faculty members who rate student artifacts related to the empirical and quantitative skills core objective should be specialized in disciplines related to the core objective and must complete the requisite training referred to in the previous bulleted item. For the other five core objectives, faculty members who rate student artifacts should be faculty members who complete the requisite training.
- Members of COAT will serve three-year terms with 1/3 of the committee rolling over each year.
- New members will be recommended by COAT to the Vice President of Academic and Workforce Development. The Vice President of Academic and Workforce Development will forward these recommendations to the Deans. After Dean approval, new members will begin their appointments each fall semester.



SUMMARY

Assessment Cycle: Fall 2013 and Spring 2014

Collin College continued assessment during fall 2013 through spring 2014. The competencies assessed for fall 2013 and spring 2014 were Social Responsibility, Critical Thinking and Teamwork.

Table 1: COAT Assessment Summary Fall 2013 and Spring 2014

Core Objective	Measures	Modalities	# Sections Assessed	# (Expected) Students Assessed	# (Expected) Assessed Students with 30+ core hours
Social Responsibility	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	255	7300	243
Critical Thinking	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	217	5900	260
Teamwork	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	92	2650	562

*Measures are determined by faculty within their departments. Departments decide whether to choose a single measure or to allow multiple measures for the assessment. All assessments are course imbedded.

The following high-enrollment core courses were chosen for fall 2013 & spring 2014:

Core Objective	Courses Chosen
Social Responsibility	HUMA 1301 DRAMA 2361 GOVT 2305 SOCI 1301
Critical Thinking	PSYC 2301 MATH 2413 ENGL 1301 PHYS 1401 HIST 1301
Teamwork	ENVR 1401 SPCH 1315 CHEM 1411 MUSI 1306

At the end of the fall 2013 and spring 2014 semesters, faculty sent copies of student artifacts to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Artifact submissions were to be assessed on the following General Education competencies: Social Responsibilities, Critical Thinking and Teamwork.

Teamwork Skills

Table 2: Teamwork Summary Fall 2013 and Spring 2014

Categories:	Rating				Met Standard
	1	2	3	4	
Meeting Contributions	3%	2%	13%	82%	95%
Assignment Completion	2%	4%	13%	81%	94%
Individual Management	2%	3%	13%	82%	95%
Fosters Team Climate	2%	2%	10%	86%	96%
Conflict Resolution	2%	3%	11%	84%	95%

209 papers in 110 teams from 92 course sections rated fellow team members. A given individual had from 3-6 ratings, depending on the size of the group, with an average of 3.34 ratings. The COAT developed Teamwork Protocol was used.

Goal: 70% of students assessed will rate a 3 (On a scale of 1-4) or higher for each criterion

Result: Goal per criterion met

Continuous Improvement

- Inter-Rater Reliability Issues

- A protocol was used which removed much of the reliability issues. However, it was noted that there was a lack of organization in the submission process. This resulted in the inability to assess some teams.
- Rubric Clean-Up/Peer Review Form
 - It was noted that the shading impeded the reading of comments on the submitted peer reviews. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness asked that the shading be lightened to improve readability of comments.
- Committee Actions and Suggestions
 - Additional wording will be added to the protocol to organize the submission process. Instructors will be asked to keep a record of the team members for each group and submit the papers organized by group.
 - The shading of the peer review will be lightened.

Critical Thinking

Table 3: Critical Thinking Summary Fall 2013 and Spring 2014

Categories:	N= 201 Papers		Rating				Met Standard
	Inter-Rater Reliability, N=21	1	2	3	4		
Innovation/Creativity	76%	18%	41%	37%	4%	41%	
Exploration	94%	12%	39%	42%	7%	49%	
Identification	83%	11%	34%	44%	11%	55%	
Presentation	83%	18%	45%	32%	5%	37%	
Conclusion	83%	19%	39%	33%	8%	41%	

Goal: 70% of students assessed will rate a 3 (On a scale of 1-4) or higher for each criterion

Result: Goal per criterion not met

Continuous Improvement

- Inter-Rater Reliability Issues
 - Committee members had difficulty assessing innovation and creativity. The committee discussed the interpretation of innovation and creativity. A consensus could not be reached.
 - Committee members found the rubric to be cumbersome when assessing presentation. The requirement of “uses multiple approaches” was problematic in that artifacts submitted did not allow for multiple solutions. It

was argued that multiple approaches/solutions were not necessary to demonstrate critical thinking.

- Committee members had difficulty assessing conclusion between ranks 2, 3 and 4. Committee members argued that the requirements from 2-3 make a logical leap, however there is a large leap from the ‘production of a generalized conclusion’ to “produces a thorough and logical conclusion well supported by evidence”.
- Committee members also discussed that some of the assignments being assessed did not meet the criteria and could not be assessed.
- Suggestions were made with respect to rubric wording but the committee felt that the wording should stay as it was when the assessments were submitted. It was not clear what to do in the instances where the assignment did not meet criterion. Throughout the assessment session faculty continued to ask about artifacts that did not align with the measure.
- Rubric Clean-Up/Peer Review Form
 - The use of the rubric proved to be cumbersome due to the wording of part of the definition “to include creative thinking, innovation.” COAT members were indecisive whether innovation and creativity should be compared to what is known or whether the students showed innovation and creativity at their level.
 - There was additional discussion regarding how the rubric would be applied to disciplines, such as Math, where it was argued that there is only one solution to a problem and thus innovation and creativity would not play a role.
 - The wording for conclusion and presentation criteria proved difficult to assess. Suggestions were made to minimize the gap between rankings 3 and 4. Suggestions were made to change the wording in ranking 4 for presentation.
- Committee Actions and Suggestions
 - The COAT has a subcommittee working on the findings from this summer’s assessment to make recommendations regarding wording changes within the rubrics
 - COAT informed the Discipline Leads of the results of the assessments. COAT will have “Interpretation of Rubrics” and “Assignment Alignment” workshops

during the January 2015 Faculty Development Conference. These presentations will clarify how assessment team members interpret the vocabulary of the rubrics as well as how to develop assignments which better align with rubrics. COAT continues to encourage assignment review by the committee to see how assignments align with the COAT rubrics. COAT will make suggestions for improvements only if needed. COAT continues to point out the need for students to be aware of the rubrics.

- The Leadership Team worked with COAT and Faculty Council to offer scholarships to faculty to develop closing the loop action plans for teaching core curriculum objectives and program outcomes in non-core courses. These action plans will be presented at the Faculty Development Conference in January 2015 and at the Lunch-n-Learn sessions at Faculty Council.
- COAT will give the “Interpretation of Rubrics” presentation and “Assignment Alignment” workshops at the 2015 Spring Associate Faculty “Collaborations” Conference.
- Students must be given clear instructions and assignments developed to address the rubric
 - Faculty will be given opportunities through faculty development programs to learn new ways to think about teaching critical thinking. These opportunities will focus within as well as apart from their disciplines.

Social Responsibility

Table 4: Social Responsibility Summary Fall 2013 and Spring 2014

Categories:	N= 211 Papers		Rating				Met Standard
	Inter-Rater Reliability, N=16		1	2	3	4	
Intercultural Competence	76%		18%	31%	22%	29%	51%
Civic Responsibility	94%		16%	31%	31%	22%	53%
Global Engagement	83%		23%	25%	25%	27%	52%

Goal: 70% of students assessed will rate a 3 (on a scale of 1-4) or higher for each criterion

Result: Goal per criterion not met

Continuous Improvement

- Inter-Rater Reliability Issues
 - Rubrics were not changed from the pilot to test whether the reliability issues were due to the interpretation of the rubrics or the submitted assignments.

- Committee members found the rubrics to be cumbersome with respect to global engagement. Committee members discussed the interpretation of engagement in regional, national, and global communities.
- Suggestions were made with respect to rubric wording but the committee felt that the wording should stay as it was when the assessments were submitted. It was not clear what to do in the instances where the assignment did not meet criterion. Throughout the assessment session faculty continued to ask about artifacts that did not align with the measure.
- Committee members argued whether it is possible to effectively teach engagement in regional, national, and global communities.
- Rubric Clean-Up/Peer Review Form
 - The rubric continues to be cumbersome due to wording of the definition “engage effectively in regional, national and global communities.” COAT members argued that this, too, lead to inter-rater reliability issues. Members acknowledged that some assignments did not meet the rubric criteria. The COAT has a subcommittee working on the findings from this summer’s assessment to make recommendations regarding revisions to the rubric. COAT members continue to find that the rubric is based too heavily in course/discipline specifics: Political Science/Government.
- Committee Actions and Suggestions
 - COAT informed the Discipline Leads of the results of the assessments. COAT will have “Interpretation of Rubrics” and “Assignment Alignment” workshops during the January 2015 Faculty Development Conference. These presentations will clarify how assessment team members interpret the vocabulary of the rubrics as well as how to develop assignments which better fit the rubrics. COAT continues to encourage assignment review by the committee to see how they line-up with the COAT rubrics. COAT will make suggestions for improvements only if needed. COAT continues to point out the need for students to be aware of the rubrics.
 - The Leadership Team worked with COAT and Faculty Council to offer scholarships to faculty to develop and present closing the loop action plans for teaching core curriculum objectives and program outcomes in non-core courses. These action plans will be presented at the Faculty Development Conference in January 2015.

- COAT will give the “Interpretation of Rubrics” presentation and “Assignment Alignment” workshops at the 2015 Spring Associate Faculty “Collaborations” Conference.
- COAT, through the discipline leads, the Faculty Council Teaching and Learning Committee, Chairs and the Deans, will share the message that since we met none of our goals for Social Responsibility, any aspect of Social Responsibility may be targeted for improvement. Improvements will occur as follows:
 - Faculty feedback regarding the Social Responsibility rubric will be solicited
 - Faculty whose disciplines include Social Responsibility as a core objective were asked to submit closing the loop action plans and to identify areas of the rubric which prove problematic to teaching social responsibility. Submissions are to be sent to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness by October 31, 2014 in order to be incorporated into the 2015 Faculty Conference workshops.
 - The “Interpretation of Rubrics” and “Assignment Alignment” workshops, based on the aforementioned continuous improvement plans, along with the scholarship presentations, will provide faculty an opportunity to learn new ways to think about teaching Social Responsibility. These opportunities will focus within as well as apart from their disciplines.
 - Students must be given clear instructions and assignments developed to address the rubric
 - Faculty will be given opportunities through faculty development programs to learn new ways to think about teaching social responsibility. These opportunities will focus within as well as apart from their disciplines.

Table 5: COAT Assessment Plan Year 2 for AY 2014-2015

Core Objective	Measures	Modalities	# (Expected) Sections Assessed	# (Expected) Students Assessed	# (Expected) Assessed Students with 30+ core
Communication Skills	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	233	6205	200
Personal Responsibility	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	108	2740	200
Empirical and Quantitative	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	30	750	200

Table 6: Objectives by Section for AY-2014-2015

Core Objective	# (Expected) Sections Assessed
Communication Skills	Math 1342 (39 sections) Drama 1310 (19 sections) Dance 2303 (16 sections) BIOL 2402 (30 sections) GOVT 2306 (73 sections) ECON 2301 (56 sections)
Personal Responsibility	ENGL 2332 (15 sections) ENGL 1302 (85 sections) HIST 2301 (8 sections)
Empirical and Quantitative	MATH 2312 (12 sections) ANTH 2351(5 sections) PHYS 2425 (13 sections)

Table 7: COAT Assessment Plan Year 3 for AY 2015-2016

Core Objective	Measures	Modalities	# Sections Assessed	# (Expected) Students Assessed
Social Responsibility	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	TBD	TBD
Critical Thinking	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	TBD	TBD
Teamwork	Multiple*	Hybrid, Online, Night, Day, Express, Variety of Campuses	TBD	TBD