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**EFSC Core Abilities**

- Communicate Effectively
- Model Ethical & Civic Responsibility
- Process Information
- Think Critically & Solve Problems
- Work Cooperatively
Calendar Year 2011

- Spring 2011
  - Formed committee
  - Conducted situational analysis
- Summer 2011
  - Literature review
  - Designed 2 course pilot
- Fall 2011
  - Recruited faculty
  - Hosted faculty work sessions
  - Collected data

Phase One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 20</td>
<td>BSCC 1010, PSY 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>AMH 2020, HUM 2230, OCE 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=41</td>
<td>ENC 1102, STA 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Process

- Collect data
- Identify Measures & Assessments
- Analyze findings
- Develop action plans
- Implement changes

Calendar Year 2012

- **Spring 2012**
  - Customized rubric
  - Developed assessment instrument
  - Attended holistic scoring training

- **Fall 2012**
  - Phase One: Deployed assessment (14 sections), Analyzed results
  - Phase Two: Developed and piloted rubrics and instruments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Novice - 1</th>
<th>Apprentice - 2</th>
<th>Practitioner - 3</th>
<th>Professional - 4</th>
<th>Exemplar - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define the problem/question</td>
<td>No understanding of the problem/question posed.</td>
<td>Simplistic understanding of the problem/question, with little clarification.</td>
<td>Basic articulation of the problem/question, with little understanding of its complexity.</td>
<td>Effectively articulates the problem/question and acknowledges some of the complexities in the problem/question.</td>
<td>Fully articulates and addresses the complexity and, nuances of the problem/question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the text/evidence</td>
<td>No evidence of having read the text/evidence</td>
<td>Provides irrelevant examples with little discussion of text/evidence</td>
<td>Includes some relevant examples, with basic discussion of the text/evidence.</td>
<td>Incorporates multiple relevant examples with sound discussion of the text/evidence</td>
<td>Integrates meaningful discussion of the text/evidence while evaluating possible bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualize</td>
<td>No recognition of historical or cultural significance or context</td>
<td>Recognises, but does not expand upon, the historical or cultural context</td>
<td>Explains the basic historical or cultural context</td>
<td>Establishes accurate connections to other perspectives and contexts</td>
<td>Demonstrates connections between the problem and its contemporary implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate a conclusion</td>
<td>No conclusion is given</td>
<td>Conclusion is unclear or underdeveloped; lacks connection to evidence</td>
<td>Conclusion is developed and tied to some relevant evidence.</td>
<td>Conclusion is fully developed and logically tied to evidence.</td>
<td>Takes a strong, committed, supported position which incorporates a sound historical perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-scoring Questionnaire

1. Does the activity align with all of the criteria on your rubric? If not, what changes do you need to make – either to the rubric or the activity?

2. What were the 3 most common mistakes made on the papers you scored?

3. Reviewing the 3 most common mistakes made on the papers you scored, are any changes needed to the rubric, activity, or directions to address the mistakes? If so, what changes are needed?

4. Do you need a definitions page for the rubric or the assignment? If so, who is going to write it?

5. Did you include directions for the faculty? If not, who is going to write them? Is the activity an in-class or out-of-class assignment? If the activity is an out-of-class writing assignment, did you require students use Turnitin? Will you in the future?
Post-scoring Questionnaire

6. Is the activity an in-class or out-of-class assignment? If the activity is an out-of-class writing assignment, did you require students use Turnitin? Will you in the future?

7. Do you feel the assessment you used is appropriate for measuring the Core Ability to which it is linked? Why or why not? If not, what changes should be made?

8. Do you feel that the Core Ability measured with this assessment is appropriate for the course? Why or why not? If not, what changes should be made?

9. Do you feel that the students were given sufficient time in the course to “practice” the Core Ability before the implementation of this assessment? Why or why not? If not, what changes should be made?

10. What changes to curriculum should be considered to help improve student performance with respect to the Core Ability?

11. What changes to instruction should be considered to help improve student performance with respect to the Core Ability?

12. How did you expect each of the student’s to score on individual criteria and overall?
   - Criterion 1 _____  Criterion 2 _____  Criterion 3 _____
   - Criterion 4 _____  Criterion 5 _____  Overall score _____

13. Record the result of today’s scoring session below.
   - Criterion 1 _____  Criterion 2 _____  Criterion 3 _____
   - Criterion 4 _____  Criterion 5 _____  Overall score _____

14. Did today’s results (#13) meet your expectations (#12)?

15. Currently the benchmark for the overall score is ___. Do you agree with this? If not, please explain.
Calendar Year 2013

• Spring 2013 (Phase Two - 130 sections)
  ✓ Deployed assessment in classroom
  ✓ Conducted blind holistic scoring

• Fall 2013
  ✓ Analyzed findings
  ✓ Made changes

AMH 2010 – U.S. History to 1877. Using the analytic rubric developed by the AMH
2020 course team in Phase One, the course team measured Think Critically. To demonstrate
their competence, students were required to complete an out-of-class response paper two to four pages
in length using at least two original sources, in addition to the textbook. The assessment
benchmark, established at an overall median score of 3 out of 5 on the analytic rubric, was
achieved (mean = 2.867, median = 3.000, mode = 3.000, st. dev = 0.730).

Table 35: Descriptive Statistics for AMH 2010, Overall and by Criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score</th>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
<th>Criterion 2</th>
<th>Criterion 3</th>
<th>Criterion 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.dev</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The course team reported the three most common mistakes made by students were not
accurately citing material, not addressing all parts of the assignment, and providing irrelevant
examples. To reduce the occurrence of these, the course team revised several of the questions the
students were required to answer. In addition, the team decided to increase the length
requirement to two to six pages because the original length of the paper was deemed inadequate
for the assignment. The directions for faculty were revised to include a strong recommendation
that instructors require the use of Turnitin.com by students. The team also stated the assessment
used was appropriate for measuring the Core Ability, the Core Ability was appropriate for the
course, and students were given sufficient time to practice the Core Ability before
implementation. The final recommendation by the course team was for the discipline to consider
establishing Communications 1 (ENC 1101) as either a pre-requisite or co-requisite for this
course.
Calendar Year 2014

- Spring 2014 (185 sections)
  - Deployed assessment in classroom
  - Conducted blind holistic scoring

- Fall 2014
  - Summative evaluation (closing the loop)

Post-scoring Questionnaire

What is the benchmark for this assessment?

What percentage of your students met or exceeded the benchmark?

When in the semester is the current Core Ability assignment completed?
- Weeks 1-3
- Weeks 4-6
- Weeks 7-9
- Weeks 10-12
- Weeks 13-14
- Weeks 15-16
Post-scoring Questionnaire

Were students given sufficient time to “practice” the Core Ability before being evaluated?

If not, which of the following changes could be made?

- Create an in-class activity
- Incorporate a case study
- Create a new collaborative learning activity
- Launch a pre-test
- Implement a new just-in-time (formative) assessment
- Implement a peer review assignment
- Implement a self-assessment assignment
- Change the order of instruction
- Change the time of implementation of the current assessment instrument (assignment)
- Other, please explain.______________________________

Post-scoring Questionnaire

Do the course materials, such as the textbook or online course companion, adequately address the Core Ability?

If not, which of the following should be addressed?

- Create supplemental material
- Collaborate with libraries to support course content
- Use supplemental material available through the publisher
- Other, please explain.______________________________
**Post-scoring Questionnaire**

Which of the following resources and/or support services do you need in order to implement the assessment to your satisfaction?

- Equipment – Request through Department Chair
- Instructional support – Center for Teaching Excellence or Academic Technology
- Print and/or electronic books, videos, etc. - Libraries
- Software – Request through Department Chair
- Supplies – Request through Department Chair
- Other, please explain._______________________

**Post-scoring Questionnaire**

Do the course competencies and objectives support the student’s growth in the linked Core Ability?

If not, which of the following should be addressed?

- Course sequence
- Course prerequisites
- Gaps in the course sequences
- Redundancies
- Other, please explain._______________________
Post-scoring Questionnaire

Based on your above responses, what changes have you decided to make, if any, before re-implementation occurs this Fall?

How do you plan to secure any needed resources?

How can the Assessment Committee help as you make changes for the Fall re-implementation?

Assessment Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Ability</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate Effectively</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Information</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Ethical &amp; Civic Responsibility</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve Problems &amp; Think Critically</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Cooperatively</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I* – implement    
A – assess          
E – evaluate changes
Office of Planning and Assessment

• Provide assistance to the faculty
  – Coordinator of Assessment
  – Academic Technology
  – Center for Teaching Excellence
• Identify systems to support/automate data collection and analysis
• Create reports, disseminate information back out to the faculty
Improvements

• Instructor will not have to select course
• Analyze the “other” selections and those that are frequently used get added to the list
• Instructor will have the ability to upload artifacts
• Include real-time descriptive statistics for individual sections and aggregate
• Survey the faculty about their experience with the process to identify additional gaps

What are your thoughts?

• What do you see as strengths or limitations of this model?
• What are other ways to improve this model?
• How does this model compare to your assessment models?
Resources

Rubric Construction


- AALHE (Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education): [http://course1.winona.edu/shatfield/air/rubrics.htm](http://course1.winona.edu/shatfield/air/rubrics.htm) Provides rubrics for a variety of assignments from colleges and universities across the country.

- UCF’s Faculty Center for Teaching & Learning: [http://www.fctl.ucf.edu/TeachingAndLearningResources/CourseDesign/Assessment/AssessmentToolsResources/rubrics.php](http://www.fctl.ucf.edu/TeachingAndLearningResources/CourseDesign/Assessment/AssessmentToolsResources/rubrics.php)


- Viewpoints (online journal): [http://faculty.ccp.edu/dept/viewpoints/w06v7n2/rubrics1.htm](http://faculty.ccp.edu/dept/viewpoints/w06v7n2/rubrics1.htm) Provides an article that outlines the debate about the use of rubrics, as well as the basic components and scope of a rubric.
Resources

Evaluation Design


Resources

Colleges & Universities

• Valencia: [http://valenciacollege.edu/instassess/](http://valenciacollege.edu/instassess/)

• Palm Beach: [http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/x10269.xml](http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/x10269.xml)

• St. Pete College: [http://www.spcollege.edu/central/ie/](http://www.spcollege.edu/central/ie/)

• Miami Dade College: [http://www.mdc.edu/learningoutcomes/assessment.aspx](http://www.mdc.edu/learningoutcomes/assessment.aspx)
Resources

Colleges & Universities
• UCF: http://oeas.ucf.edu/
• Florida Gulf Coast University: http://www.fgcu.edu/planning/assessment
• Polk State College: http://www.polk.edu/currentstudents/academics/qep/Pages/default.aspx
• Joliet Junior College: http://www.jjc.edu/about/committees/student-learning/Pages/default.aspx

Other Organizations
• American Association of Colleges & Universities www.aacu.org
  AACU has 15 value rubrics: http://www.aacu.org/value/index.cfm
• National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment www.learningoutcomeassessment.org
  ▪ Learning Outcomes Assessment in Community Colleges, July 2011
  ▪ Down and In: Assessment Practices at the Program Level, June 2011
  ▪ Institutions identified as "Good Assessment Practice" case studies