General Education Competencies Assessment Report
(2012-2013 Evaluation)

TOPICS COVERED:

Background:

Amarillo College adopted and piloted the Institutional Portfolio Model in the 2006-2007 academic year. The Institutional Portfolio Model involves a transparent and dynamic process that utilizes subcommittees in the examination of student work.

Since 2006, Amarillo College has continued to modify and improve assessment methods. As a result, in 2010, Amarillo College began the transition toward aligning the existing AC general education competencies with the competencies and curriculum mapping outlined in the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's "Revising the State Core Curriculum: A focus on 21st Century Competencies" report.

In efforts to align AC general education competencies with THECB recommendations, the AC competencies have continually evolved.

For more information, on the general education competency assessment process, please view the Amarillo College General Education Competency Methodology.

2012-2013 General Education Competencies Assessed:

- Communication Skills
- Critical Thinking Skills
- Empirical and Quantitative Skills
- Personal Responsibility (Pilot)
- Social Responsibility (Pilot)
- Teamwork

Amarillo College

Participation:
(Return to "Topics Covered")

Fall 2007-2008 marked the first assessment period that general education data was tracked. The artifacts assessed each year represent the artifacts collected in the previous year (e.g. the artifacts assessed in the 2012-2013 year, were the artifacts that were collected in the 2011-2012 year).

The following table shows an initial trend line for 6 years of data that demonstrates how many faculty* from each area submitted coursework for one or more competencies.

Division**	Collected for 2007-2008 Assessment	Collected for 2008-2009 Assessment	Collected for 2009-2010 Assessment	Collected for 2010-2011 Assessment	Collected for 2011-2012 Assessment	Collected for 2012-2013 Assessment
Allied Health	6	5	11	5	3	4
Behavioral Studies	13	4	6	10	3	8
Business	14	3	5	4	5	5
ITT	9	3	4	1	0	4
LCFA	19	0	5	11	2	15
Nursing	18	0	0	11	8	4
Sciences and Engineering	22	10	14	16	11	14
Work Force Development	0	1	2	0	0	4
Total	**101**	**26**	**47**	**58**	**32**	**58**

*These numbers from 2010-2013 do not reflect duplicate faculty submissions. For 2010-2013, several faculty members submitted artifacts for more than one class, but each faculty member is only counted once regardless of classes/sections taught. For 2007-2010, it is not clear whether or not duplicate faculty submissions were counted.

**The division titles have evolved over time, but in an effort to use trendline data, the original division titles were kept for assessment purposes.

2011-2012 Participation Increase Plan a Success:
There was less faculty participation for the 2011-2012 assessment year (2010-2011 collection period) so the course-selection criterion was expanded in 2011-2012 in order to give more instructors the opportunity to submit student work in courses that met the new, expanded course selection criteria. The "Course Selection Process" section of the General Education Competency Methodology explains the new selection criteria that was implemented in the 2011-2012 academic year.

Amarillo College

Overall Findings:

Goal Benchmark: On a scale of 1-5, 70% of students will score a 3 or higher (average) as evaluated by committee members using an institutionally-approved rubric.

Communication Skills Results: Met – 71%

Critical Thinking Skills Results: Not Met – 69%

Empirical and Quantitative Skills Results: Met – 82%

*Personal Responsibility Results: N/A – Pilot (60% with <u>small</u> sample size)

*Social Responsibility Results: N/A – Pilot (80% with <u>small</u> sample size)

*Teamwork Results: Met – 100%

*The Personal Responsibility and Social Responsibility competencies did not fall under the typical general education methodology because 2012-2013 was just a pilot/test year for these rubrics.

The Teamwork competency was fully rolled out in the 2012-2013 year, but fell short of the needed number of baseline (100 minimum) teamwork artifacts. For 2012-2013, Teamwork evaluated 81 artifacts rather than the recommended 100 minimum.

Amarillo College

Communication Skills Competency

Goal:
- 70% of students will score a 3 or higher (average) on a scale of 1-5

Results:
- 2007-2008 (N=95)
  - 72% of students scored a 3 or higher
- 2008-2009 (N=98)
  - 67% of students scored a 3 or higher
- 2009-2010 (N=97)
  - 74% of students scored a 3 or higher
- 2010-2011 (N=100)
  - 58% of students scored a 3 or higher
- 2011-2012 (N=100)
  - 74% of students scored a 3 or higher
- **2012-2013 (N=100)**
  - **71% of students score a 3 or higher (Average: 3.075)**

Table A: Communication Skills Competency Committee Artifact Evaluation						
Year	**Excellent** **5**	**Good** **4**	**Competent** **3**	**Marginal** **2**	**Poor** **1**	**# of Students** **Assessed**
2007-2008 Number and Percentage	7 7%	26 27%	35 37%	26 27%	1 1%	95
2008-2009 Number and Percentage	1 1%	25 26%	40 41%	30 31%	2 2%	98
2009-2010 Number and Percentage	6 6%	19 20%	47 49%	22 23%	3 3%	97
2010-2011 Number and Percentage	2 2%	15 15%	41 41%	33 33%	9 9%	100
2011-2012 Number and Percentage	2 2%	18 18%	54 54%	19 19%	7 7%	100
2012-2013 Number and Percentage	7 7%	24 24%	40 40%	23 23%	6 6%	100

Amarillo College

Communication Skills Competency Analysis:

- o Additional Communication Artifact Data/Information:
    - ○ Scoring Method
        - ✕ Each committee member individually evaluated the artifacts.
        - ✕ The averages included in Table A were not rounded. For instance, if the committee's average for an artifact was a score of 4.75, the score was counted as a "4" and not a "5."

- o Comparison to Previous Years' Results:

  The evaluation ratings were fairly consistent with the previous year. Though more students were rated as having "Marginal" communication skills, more students were also rated as having "Excellent" and "Good" communication skills.

- o Strengths and Areas that Need Improvement:

  Members of this committee made individual comments on each assessed artifact. Based on the individual tabulation of strengths and weaknesses the top 3 strengths and weaknesses were identified for written and oral communication.

  An artifact that was just deemed adequate did not typically have a strength or weakness associated with it. For instance, for spelling to be deemed as a strength or weakness, the spelling would need to be exceptionally good or exceptionally bad.

  Written
    - ○ **Strengths:**
        - ✕ 1. **Good Transitions/Flow**
        - ✕ 2. **Ability to Follow Directions** – Effectively Addresses Assignment Criteria
        - ✕ 3. **Good Thesis Statements**
    - ○ **Needs Improvement**:
        - ✕ 1. **Incomplete/Missing Citations** – MLA or APA Citations
        - ✕ 2. **Formatting within Style Guidelines** – Issues Formatting MLA or APA Papers
        - ✕ 3. **Structure Problems** – Issues with extremely short paragraphs or missing paragraphs, formatting issues, etc.

  Oral
    - ○ **Strengths:**
        - ✕ 1. **Good Organization**
        - ✕ 2. **Ability to Follow Directions** – Speech Covers Assigned Topics
        - ✕ 3. **Good Introduction**
    - ○ **Needs Improvement**:
        - ✕ 1. **More Practice Needed** – Too Much Reliance on Notes
        - ✕ 2. **Eye Contact** – Too Little Eye Contact
        - ✕ 3. **Timing Issues** – Speech was too short or too long, too much weight given to one supporting idea over another supporting idea, etc.

Amarillo College

Critical Thinking Skills Competency

- Goal:
  - 60% of students will score a 3 or higher (competent) on a scale of 1-5
- Results:
  - 2007-2008 (N=91)
    - 96% of students scored a 3 or higher*
      (Scoring system was changed mid-year)
  - 2008-2009 (N=97)
    - 95% of students scored a 3 or higher
  - 2009-2010 (N=108)
    - 96% of students scored a 3 or higher
  - 2010-2011 (N = 99)
    - 93% of students scored a 3 or higher
  - 2011-2012 (N=100)
    - 95% of students scored a 3 or higher
  - **2012-2013 (N=100)**
    - **69% of students score a 3 or higher (Average: 3.315)**

Table B: Critical Thinking Skills Competency Committee Artifact Evaluation						
Year	**Excellent** **5**	**Good** **4**	**Competent** **3**	**Marginal** **2**	**Poor** **1**	**# of Students** **Assessed**
2007-2008 Number and Percentage	5 5%	57 63%	25 27%	4 4%	0 0%	91
2008-2009 Number and Percentage	18 19%	57 59%	17 18%	4 4%	1 1%	97
2009-2010 Number and Percentage	1 <1%	61 56%	42 39%	4 4%	0 0%	108
2010-2011 Number and Percentage	0 0%	36 36%	56 57%	7 7%	0 0%	99
2011-2012 Number and Percentage	0 0%	53 53%	42 42%	4 4%	1 1%	100
2012-2013 Number and Percentage	0 0%	26 26%	43 43%	27 27%	4 4%	100

Amarillo College

- o Additional Critical Thinking Artifact Data/Information:
    - ○ Revised Rubrics
      The revised critical thinking rubrics were used during the 2011-2013 year so the 2011-2012 year and the 2012-2013 year are the best years to use for apples-to-apples comparison purposes. The new rubric meets the criteria proposed by UEAC and outlined by the THECB.
    - ○ Scoring Method
      - ✠ Each committee member individually evaluated the artifacts.
      - ✠ The averages included in Table B were not rounded. For instance, if the committee's average for an artifact was a score of 4.64, the score was counted as a "4" and not a "5."
    - ○ Committee Member Artifact Averages (rounded to 1 decimal place):
      - ✠ Committee Member A: **3.3**
      - ✠ Committee Member B: **3.4**
      - ✠ Committee Member C: **3.3**
      - ✠ Committee Member D: **3.5**
      - ✠ **Committee Artifact Average: 3.3**

  Comparison to Previous Years' Results:
  Compared to the previous year, the number of "Competent" and "Good" artifacts has dropped. For the third year in a row, no artifacts were rated as exemplary by every committee member.

  If you change the rounding methods by rounding anything with a ".5" up to the next number, the drop is not quite as significant (9 "2" ratings as opposed to 27 "2" ratings), but since the same rounding methods were used in the previous year as with this year, you can still see that overall the number of "marginal" and "poor" showings of competence in critical thinking has risen. Other factors that could affect this drop are of course the "luck" factor that sometimes comes with random sampling methods. However, this drop in critical thinking scores from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012 is still worthy of examination.

- o Strengths and Areas that Need Improvement:
    - ○ **Strengths:**
      - ✠ **Good Thesis/Conclusions and Supporting Arguments** – Well-developed thesis statements and conclusions. Several artifacts also presented well-defined arguments to defend thesis.
      - ✠ **College-Level Writing** – Several examples of college-level prose
      - ✠ **Good Analysis** – Several examples of accurate and thorough examination of data or subject matter
    - ○ **Needs Improvement**:
      - ✠ **Disconnected Ideas** – Some writing seemed disjointed
      - ✠ **Spelling/Grammar Issues** – Not college-level spelling/grammar usage
      - ✠ **Ability to Follow Instructions**
      - ✠ **Needs More Elaboration** – Some examples of incomplete examination of data or subject matter

Empirical and Quantitative Skills Competency

In 2011-2012, the general education competency committee switched from evaluating the number of achieved outcomes for mathematics problems to using the rubric to evaluate empirical and quantitative skills problems. As a result, data prior to 2011-2012 is not included in this report because the type of artifacts has been greatly expanded and the evaluation method has been changed.

Goal:
- 70% of students will score a 3 or higher (competent) on a scale of 1-5

Results:
- 2011-2012 (N=105)
  - 79% of students scored a 3 or higher
- **2012-2013 (N=102)**
  - **82% of students scored a 3 or higher (Average: 3.8)**

Table C: Empirical and Quantitative Skills (EQS) Competency Committee Artifact Evaluation						
Year	**Excellent** **5**	**Good** **4**	**Competent** **3**	**Marginal** **2**	**Poor** **1**	**# of Students** **Assessed**
2011-2012 Number and Percentage	19 18%	28 27%	36 34%	7 7%	15 14%	105
2012-2013 Number and Percentage	41 40%	27 26%	16 16%	11 11%	7 7%	102

Empirical and Quantitative Skills Competency Analysis:
- Additional Critical Thinking Artifact Data/Information:
  - Scoring Method
    The committee met together and unanimously agreed on the artifact score ratings.
  - Value of Artifacts
    Each committee is asked to go through and assure that an assignment has at least the possibility of achieving a score of "3" or higher so that students are not unfairly penalized. The EQS Committee checked the artifacts and assigned a value to each artifact set so that more information could be gained from the data analysis.

Amarillo College

- ○ Findings Breakdown
  - ✠ Of the 14 sets submitted for assessment, the values of the artifacts were distributed as follows:
    - 12 artifacts sets were worth 5 points (85.7%)
    - 2 artifact sets were worth 4 points (14.3%)
  - ✠ Of the 102 individual items that were assessed, the values of the individual items were distributed as follows:
    - 87 items worth 5 points (85.3%)
    - 15 items were worth 4 points (14.7%)
  - ✠ 5 Point Questions (87 Artifacts)
    - 41 artifacts scored 5 points (47.13%)
    - 19 artifacts scored 4 points (21.84%)
    - 11 artifacts scored 3 points (12.64%)
    - 9 artifacts scored 2 points (10.34%)
    - 7 artifacts scored 1 point (8.05%)
    - **81.61% scored 3 points or above**
  - ✠ 4 Point Questions (15 Artifacts)
    - 8 artifacts scored 4 points (53.33%)
    - 5 artifacts scored 3 points (33.33%)
    - 2 artifacts scored 2 points (13.33%)
    - 0 artifacts scored 1 point (0%)
    - **86.66% scored 3 points or above**

- ○ Comparison to Previous Year's Results:
  Compared to the previous year's results, this group of students performed at a much higher level in the "Excellent" category which seems to imply that either students are better grasping empirical and quantitative skills, that empirical and quantitative skills are being taught at a higher level (i.e. more assignments worth a "5" on the rubric were given thus enabling more students to obtain a "5" on the rubric), or a combination of the two variables.

Strengths and Areas that Need Improvement:

- ○ **Strengths:**
  - ✠ **Improved Assignment Quality:** Last year 63 items worth 5 points were submitted. This year 87 items worth 5 points were submitted, a 38.1% increase. This seems to indicate that faculty members have continued to ask more questions involving critical thinking, analysis, estimating, and drawing qualitative conclusions.
  - ✠ **Increased Assignment Difficulty:** Committee members noted the increase in level 5 questions and feel that faculty members are embracing the assessment process while raising their expectations of student performance.
  - ✠ **Needs Improvement**: **Faculty Roadblocks**: It is the hope of this committee that faculty members will have access to all assessment results and will use them to incorporate higher level thinking skills into their own assessments.

Personal Responsibility Competency

In 2012-2013 the Personal Responsibility rubric was piloted. Due to the small number of artifacts submitted by faculty that cover personal responsibility topics, the committee elected to select 5 different assignments associated with personal responsibility. After the assignments were selected by the committee, one artifact associated with each assignment was randomly selected so that the committee members could use the rubric to evaluate each artifact and ensure that the rubric could be easily used with a variety of assignment/artifact types.

Goal:
Test the rubric and make any needed edits based on the assessment experience and findings.

Scoring Method: The committee met as a group and evaluated/discussed the artifacts, assignments, and rubric.

Results:
2012-2013 (N=5)
- **60% of students scored a 3 or higher (Average: 3.2)**

Artifacts	Evaluation Score
A1	4
B1	5
C1	2
D1	2
E1	3

The rubric was evaluated as being acceptable for use in evaluating personal responsibility topics.

The results for 2012-2013 are not displayed in a year-by-year comparison chart format because this is a pilot year (i.e. test the rubric year) and the purpose of this year is to make any needed rubric edits.

Outcome:
The rubric was deemed to adequately cover the topic of personal responsibility. However, a few tweaks were made to the rubric (word changes) that made sense to the evaluators. It is expected that many more content areas will implement personal responsibility topics/assignments into their classes once the new THECB core curriculum requirements go into effect in fall 2014.

Amarillo College

Social Responsibility Competency

In 2012-2013 the Social Responsibility rubric was piloted. Due to the small number of artifacts submitted by faculty that cover social responsibility topics, the committee elected to select 5 different assignments associated with social responsibility. After the assignments were selected by the committee, one artifact associated with each assignment was randomly selected so that the committee members could use the rubric to evaluate each artifact and ensure that the rubric could be easily used with a variety of assignment/artifact types.

Goal:
Test the rubric and make any needed edits based on the assessment experience and findings.

Scoring Method: The committee met as a group and evaluated/discussed the artifacts, assignments, and rubric.

Results:
2012-2013 (N=5)
- � **80% of students scored a 3 or higher (Average: 3.4) – Note: these evaluations were made <u>after</u> the rubric changes (referenced above) were made.**

Artifacts	Evaluation Score
A1	4
B1	4
C1	3
D1	2
E1	4

The rubric was evaluated as lacking in its ability to evaluate social responsibility topics from a historical perspective. As a result, the verbiage in the rubric was expanded to prepare it for use in History classes and/or any other class that looks at social responsibility from a historical perspective.

The results for 2012-2013 are not displayed in a in a year-by-year comparison chart format because this is a pilot year (i.e. test the rubric year) and the purpose of this year is to make any needed rubric edits.

Outcome:
Although the best assignment options were chosen, it was discovered that the rubric did not adequately cover the historical evaluations of topics that dealt with the topic of "social responsibility". As a result, a few tweaks were made to the rubric to allow for the use of the rubric in History classrooms or in other classrooms that look at social responsibility from a historical perspective. It is expected that <u>many</u> more content areas will implement social responsibility topics/assignments into their classes once the new THECB core curriculum requirements go into effect in fall 2014.

Teamwork Competency

Goal:
- ○ **1A.** 70% of students will score a 3 or higher (average) on a scale of 1-5
- ○ **1B.** At least 10 of the same artifacts evaluated between the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 year, will show a limited variability (no more than 1 point variation) in score evaluations in order to ensure the Teamwork rubric is reliable and to validate the usefulness and validity of the "Team Member Critique Sheet" that is often used by faculty as a primary artifact source.

Results:
- ○ **1A. 2012-2013 (N=81)**
  - ✘ **100% of students scored a 3 or higher (Average: 4.6)**

Table D: Teamwork Competency Committee Artifact Evaluation						
Year	**Excellent** **5**	**Good** **4**	**Competent** **3**	**Marginal** **2**	**Poor** **1**	**# of Students** **Assessed**
2012-2013 Number and Percentage	57 70%	18 22%	6 7%	0 0%	0 0%	81

- ○ **1B. Yes – Reliable Rubric and Team Member Critique Sheet**
  - ✘ 10 of the same artifacts/associated assignments were included in the 2011-2012 pilot evaluation and the 2012-2013 full evaluation to ensure rubric reliability. The artifact numbers were changed so that the committee members were less likely to remember the artifacts/scoring from the previous year. Out of these 10 artifacts assessed, 9 were given the same score by the committee and the one score that varied, varied by only 1 point.
  - ✘ 10 total assorted artifacts were assessed to test the reliability of the rubric and the usefulness of the team member critique sheet.
    - o 2 Artifacts – Team Member Critique Sheet format
    - o 3 Artifacts – Team Charter, Individual Activities Log, and Team Member Critique Sheet format
    - o 4 Artifacts – Member assignment, percent of contribution, letter grade recommendation made by student, and comments format

Table D: Teamwork Competency Committee Artifact Evaluation			
Old Artifact Number 11-12	Old Artifact Rating	New Artifact Number 12-13	New Artifact Rating 12-13
A1	5	A2	5
A5	4	A1	5
C7	4	C8	4
C8	5	C9	5
C9	4	C10	4
E13	4	E3	4
E14	5	E4	5
E15	5	E5	5
E16	4	E6	4
E17	5	E7	5

Amarillo College

Teamwork Analysis:

- o **Scoring Method:** The committee met as a group and evaluated/discussed the artifacts.

- o **Strengths:**
  - ○ **Ability to Follow Instructions –** Ultimately the students get the job done. They overcome whatever individual differences there are and complete the task
  - ○ **More Assignments Given that Assess Teamwork than Previous Year –** Instructors are doing a better job integrating teamwork assignments into their classrooms

- o **Needs Improvement**:
  - ○ **Students Showing up Late to Group Meetings**
  - ○ **Students Loafing and Not Doing their "Fair Share"**
  - ○ **Students Need to Work on Procrastination Issues**

- o **Additional Committee Suggestions**:
  - ○ **Instructors Need to Ensure Students that Peer Ratings are Confidential –** Even though peers would make comments on people not showing up to meetings, not doing their part, etc., the ratings were still very high—there was not one student who rated anyone less than a 2 and there were few ratings of 2. It is possible that students are afraid of how group members will react to poor ratings.
  - ○ **Instructors Need to Discuss What Makes a Good Team with Class** – One instructor discussed personality types, division of work, etc. before putting students together in a team.
  - ○ **Instructors Should Let Students See the Rubric Before the Assignment is Given** – L et students see rubric before they do the assignment to help aid in accountability and to act as a guide. Instructor needs to clarify how to use the form.
  - ○ **Instructors Should Limit Groups to 5 Members or Less** – Social Loafing is More Prevalent in Bigger Groups

Future Assessment Plans:

For the 2013-2014 academic year, the General Education Competency Assessment will be traded in for an Instructional Review process that includes core curriculum artifact assessment.

When applicable, the rubrics that were tested and evaluated throughout the entire general education assessment process will be made available to department chairs and program coordinators for use in their core curriculum assessment efforts.

Amarillo College