General Education Competencies Report on Assessment
2009-2010

Background:

Amarillo College adopted a model for assessment in the year 2006. The Institutional Portfolio Model was piloted in the 2006-2007 academic year. This model utilizes subcommittees to examine student work for each competency. The Office of Outcomes Assessments uses a Course Master Data File (CMDF) that includes all courses offered at Amarillo College during the fall semester. Courses that are developmental, dual-credit, have less than 10 students with 30 hours from AC, and classes that are clinical, practicum or labs are removed from the CMDF. Remaining courses are then paired with a competency that appears to be a good fit with the course curriculum. A mail merge email is then sent out to approximately 150 faculty asking for participation in the Assessment of General Education. The goal is to receive 100 usable student artifacts. In order to reach the targeted goal, a large amount of oversampling is required. Of the 150 faculty targeted, only approximately 60% will respond and submit work (based on previous years).

Student work identifying information is removed and then submitted to the appropriate Competency Committee where each committee has a rubric that they will use to assess student work. These rubrics are reliable and valid, since reliability is established by each committee through a standardization process.

Each committee member is trained to use the rubric and all members of the group work through a sample of student work to ensure they are coming up with similar scores. In cases of large discrepancies, the committee discusses these issues as they arise. Furthermore, the rubrics were validated at face value by each committee working for one year or more to determine the appropriate statements that are measured. The statements were determined by faculty representing appropriate areas of the institution and who had a knowledge base for the competency that he or she was assigned to. For example, the Communication Committee consists of 5 faculty members from across the institution including English, Speech, Business Administration, and Nutrition.

Fall 2007-2008 was the first year of tracking assessment data. The following report shows an initial trend line for 3 years of data.

Participation:

The following is the number of faculty members by division who submitted actual usable student work:

2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008
Allied Health – 5	Allied Health – 11	Allied Health-6
Behavioral Studies - 10	Behavioral Studies - 6	Behavioral Studies- 13
Business - 4	Business - 5	Business- 14

ITT - 1	ITT - 4	ITT-9
LCFA-11	LCFA-5	LCFA-19
Nursing-11	Sciences and Engineering – 14	Nursing-18
Sciences and Engineering – 16	Work Force Development – 2	Sciences and Engineering-22

These numbers do not reflect duplicate faculty submissions. Several faculty members submitted more than one class. 55 classes submitted student work that was assessed in 2009-2010.

Analysis by Competency:

Communication -

- 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
            - Goal was not met
    - ○ 2009-2010 (N=97)
        - ✖ 74% of students scored a 3 or higher
    - ○ Actual Scores as follows:

Committee Evaluation						
	Excellent 5	Good 4	Average 3	Marginal 2	Poor 1	# Students Assessed
Yr: 2007-2008	7 7%	26 27%	35 37%	26 27%	1 1%	95
Yr: 2008-2009	1 1%	25 26%	40 41%	30 31%	2 2%	98
Yr: 2009-2010	6 6%	19 20%	47 49%	22 23%	3 3%	97

- *Recommendations and Challenges:*
    - Committee Notes
        - ○ Compared to last year, this year's artifacts displayed better organization and sentence clarity.
        - ○ For the most part, instructors also provided more thorough instructions
        - ○ Student engagement in the assignment seemed high, especially if the assignment seemed to be related to a presumed major. (Assignments related

to career-related topics evoked a higher quality of work than in other instances).

- Challenges noted
  - ○ Students continue to struggle with introductions and conclusions, thesis placement, and thesis support.
  - ○ Students do not follow instructions about length or number of required sources.
  - ○ Although the overall quality of the writing samples improved this year over last, many students have difficulty using Standard English. They seem to drop words into sentences without regard for the context of the sentence or the meaning of multisyllabic words.
  - ○ Students have difficulty incorporating citations from outside sources into their essays in a coherent manner. Many of them indiscriminately drop in quotes and then fail to tie the quote to anything they have written.
  - ○ Students do not possess good proofreading skills.
  - ○ Very few speech artifacts are being submitted.
- Suggestions for Improvement:
  - ○ Develop a packet for instructors. The packet would contain the scoring rubric, examples of instructions that are explicit and thorough and annotated sample essays that highlight strengths and weaknesses.
  - ○ Publicize the Writers' Corner as a help for students.
  - ○ Find out why more speech communication artifacts are not coming in. If the problem lies with the videotaping requirement, then think of ways to make this requirement less burdensome. Would the Assessment Division have a staff member or student assistant who could do the videotaping?
  - ○ Students need to be required to submit some sort of formal, college level written assignment in <u>every</u> college class.
  - ○ Since many AC "graduates" are not required to take Freshman Comp. for their certificate program, it would be helpful if Amarillo College (the English Department or Library, perhaps) would come up with a "generic" guide for writing a 5 paragraph essay that students could access on-line to help them.
  - ○ It's just like everything else – the way to become better at math is to practice working math problems, getting feedback on problems missed, and practicing learning how to do the math problems correctly. The way to become a better writer is to practice writing, getting feedback on incorrect punctuation, grammar, and faulty thinking, and then practicing revising.

<u>Critical Thinking and Problem Solving</u>-
- 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
- ○ Actual Scores as follows:

Committee Evaluation						
	Exemplary 5	**Excellent 4**	**Competent 3**	**Needs Wk 2**	**Unacceptable 1**	**# Students Assessed**
Yr: 2007-2008	5 5%	57 63%	25 27%	4 4%	0 0%	91
Yr: 2008-2009	18 19%	57 59%	17 18%	4 4%	1 1%	97
Yr: 2009-2010	1 <1%	61 56%	42 39%	4 4%	0 0%	108

- *Recommendations and Challenges:*
  - ○ Committee Notes
    - ✖ Good representations of assignments were submitted, which allowed for a more varied look at how students are performing across different disciplines.

  - ○ Room for Improvement
    - ✖ Assignments needed clearer instructions
    - ✖ Difficulty assessing some of the work due to lack of understanding the intentions of the assignments
    - ✖ Many spelling and syntax errors noted

Mathematics-
- Goal:
  - ○ 75% of students will demonstrate at least 3 outcomes AND
  - ○ 60% will demonstrate at least 4 outcomes
- Results:
  - ○ 2007-2008 (N=99)
    - ✖ 84% of students scored a 3 or higher
    - ✖ 0% scored a 4 or higher *
      - *Few assignments allowed students to score above 3 points*
  - ○ 2008-2009 (N=102)
    - ✖ 86% of students scored a 3 or higher
    - ✖ 47% of students scored a 4 or higher
  - ○ 2009-2010
    - ✖ 93% of students scored a 3 or higher
    - ✖ 50% of students scored a 4 or higher
      - Did not meet minimum standard
    - ✖ Actual Scores:

Committee Evaluation						
	All 5 major outcomes are **demonstrated/**	**All 4 major outcomes are** **demonstrated/**	**3 major outcomes are** **demonstrated/**	**2 major outcomes are** **demonstrated/**	**Only 1 major outcome is** **demonstrated/**	

	met 5	met 4	met 3	met 2	met 1	# Students Assessed
Yr: 2007-2008	0 0%	0 0%	83 84%	12 12%	4 4%	99
Yr: 2008-2009	31 30%	16 16%	41 40%	9 9%	5 5%	102
Yr: 2009-2010	7 8%	40 43%	40 43%	4 4%	1 1%	94

✠ No additional information submitted to Office of Outcomes Assessments as of September 21, 2010

Technology -
- Goal:
  - ○ 75% of students will score a 3 or higher (adequate)
- Results:
  - ○ 2007-2008 (N=96)
    - ✠ 95% of students scored a 3 or higher
  - ○ 2008-2009 (N=87)
    - ✠ 30% of students scored a 3 or higher*
      - Goal was not met
    - ✠ Actual Scores:
      - See Chart below
  - ○ 2009-2010 (N=85)
    - ✠ 94% of students scored a 3 or higher
      - Met Goal
    - ✠ 22% of students scored 4 or 5
  - ○ Actual Scores:

Committee Evaluation						
		Proficient 4	Adequate 3	Marginal 2	Unsatis. 1	# Students Assessed
Yr: 2007-2008		2 2%	89 93%	5 5%	0 0%	96
Yr: 2008-2009		0 0%	26 30%	61 70%	0 0%	87
Rubric Changed	Exceptional 5	Proficient 4	Adequate 3	Marginal 2	Unsatis. 1	
Yr: 2009-2010	14 17%	4 5%	62 73%	5 6%	0	85

- *Recommendations and Challenges:*
  - ○ Committee Notes
    - ✠ Current rubric is working well
    - ✠ The 5th component of rubric was valuable

  - ○ Room for Improvement
    - ✠ Assignments need clearer instructions
    - ✠ Students did not always follow the instructions

Summary of Assessment

<u>General Education Competencies</u>

- Our students appear to meet our minimum standards in all competencies, with the exception of the Mathematics Competency second requirement.
- Send results/reports to Academic Affairs Committee, Dean's Council, and Faculty Development Committee.
- Recommendations from this report
    - Instructional Assessment Subcommittee
    - Faculty Development on Writing Clear Instructions
    - Publicize availability of Writer's Corner