



**Eastern Florida**  
**STATE COLLEGE**  
*Explore. Achieve. Succeed.*

**Assessment Cycle Review**  
**Spring 2014**

**Prepared by the**  
**Office of Institutional Effectiveness**  
**September 30, 2014**

Executive Summary.....	3
English/EAP Cluster.....	5
Communications Cluster.....	7
Mathematics Cluster.....	8
Science and Engineering Cluster.....	10
Humanities and World Religions Cluster.....	12
Social and Behavioral Sciences Cluster.....	14
Performing and Visual Arts Cluster.....	16
Education Cluster.....	18
Library Science Cluster.....	19

## Executive Summary

This report contains results for both the Spring 2014 AA Program Assessment and the survey of the assessment tool and rubric from May 9<sup>th</sup> Assessment Retreat.

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle 2,219 students were assessed in 47 different courses and 150 different sections. The assessment process designed over the past two years was implemented in classrooms on all campuses with 125 faculty providing data. The purpose of this report is to provide summary statistics of the courses assessed during spring 2014. The data are reported in aggregate by course.

During data collection, there were some inconsistencies in reporting if a student was given the assessment, the benchmark scores for courses, the correct number criteria according to the rubrics, and the overall score. These inconsistencies may have been due in part to the reporting system not having default benchmarks and criteria for each course. The limitations of the reporting tool need to be considered more closely during future assessment reporting cycles.

This report provides an overview of data for the courses in each cluster. For each of the courses assessed the analyses includes a review of the average scores for each criteria included on the rubrics for the assignment, the average overall score for the assignments, the reported benchmark score, the number of students that were assessed, and the number and percent of students that met the benchmark for the assignment.

To be included in this analysis, students must have been assessed using the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubric and must have been given overall score. Limiting the analysis to students with the correct number criteria and an overall score reduced the total number of assessments to 1,460. In all, assessment data for this analysis included students in 34 courses and 93 sections. The table below is a summary of all the data collected and the data used for the analysis in subsequent sections.

### Spring 2014 Review of Assessment Data and Core Abilities

Core Ability	<u>Data Collected</u>			<u>Data Used in Analysis</u>		
	Courses	Section	Students	Courses	Sections	Students
Communicate Effectively	7	20	278	2	10	149
Model Ethical & Civic Responsibility	1	4	77	0	0	0
Process Information	3	8	86	2	6	62
Think Critically & Solve Problems	38	112	1,955	29	72	1,201
Work Cooperatively	2	6	56	1	5	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>47*</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>2,219*</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1,460</b>

Note: \*Total courses and students are less than sum of columns because two courses assessed multiple core abilities and some students were assessed in multiple courses

### **Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review**

While there were some inconsistencies in reporting of the assessment data during the spring 2014 cycle, feedback from survey given after the May 2014 Assessment Retreat indicate that the rubrics developed are suitable for assessment of Core Abilities addressed. The survey indicates very few discrepancies (5 of 39) in scoring of the student assignments during the meeting. Of the five cases in which discrepancies were found, three indicated that interpretation of the criteria on the rubric caused the difference in scores. One cause was linked to determining whether to round up or down, and the last difference was reported to be linked to faculty comparing student assignments to other students' assignments and not adhering strictly to the rubric.

Although discrepancies among scores were noted very infrequently, there were seven responses to the question "What needs to be done to minimize the occurrence of discrepancies in the future?" These responses noted a need for better understanding of the assessment tools and called for simplification and revisions to the rubrics. There were a number of changes planned prior to fall implementation that related to clarification of rubric, a desire to create more clear instructions on the assessment tool, and to consider revising the benchmark that was initially set. Finally, there were a number of recommendations to provide support and training to adjunct instructors as they take on these assessment activities in future semesters.

## English/EAP Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the English EAP Cluster provided assessment data for three different core abilities and two different courses. The data used for the analysis below includes 161 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
ENC 1101*	2.39	2.78	2.94	3.02	3.02	2.89	2	35	35	100%
ENC 1101*	2.62	2.72	2.90	3.07	2.86	2.76	3 <sup>#</sup>	29	17	59%
ENC 1101 <sup>^</sup>	2.52	2.70	2.61	2.68	2.45	2.59	3 <sup>#</sup>	44	25	57%
ENC 1101+	3.12	3.28	3.07	3.02	2.37	2.91	2	43	41	95%
ENC 1102	2.90	3.20	3.25	3.20	-	3.20	3	20	19	95%

ENC 1101 measured three Core Abilities; \* = Communicate Effectively; <sup>^</sup> = Process Information; + = Think Critically and Solve Problems; # indicates benchmark different than recorded in AA Program Assessment Course Benchmarks document

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the English/EAP Cluster reviewed assignments for ENC 1101 that were designed to assess three core abilities: 1) communicate effectively; 2) Process Information; 3) Think critically and solve problems. The assignment for ENC 1102 were designed to assess the Think Critically and Solve Problems Core Ability. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **ENC 1101 Feedback from assessment survey.**

The three faculty teams for ENC 1101 reported no discrepancies from the May 9 scoring session. The benchmark of 3 was met by 60-66% of the assignments that were scored.

Regarding the spring term assessment of students in ENC 1101, the faculty teams noted that students were mainly assessed during weeks 7-9, 10-12, or 13-14. Two out of three teams indicated that students were given sufficient time to “practice” the core ability. To allow for more practice, one team indicated that they would change the order of instruction. The course materials were found suitable, but one team indicated that they would like to create supplemental material and collaborate with the

libraries to support course content. All three teams reporting for ENC 1101 noted that the course competencies and objectives support student's growth in the linked Core Ability. However, one of the three core abilities will no longer be assessed for future cycles.

For the upcoming fall assessment, one team indicated that they would like to incorporate discussion on problem solving techniques within the class activities and reiteration of appropriate academic writing resources. A suggestion was given to provide academic writing resources in a LibGuide and to have that LibGuide be linked to all ENC 1101 course shells.

The ENC 1101 teams suggested that the Assessment Committee provide appropriate data for comparison, clearer instructions, and for future assessment meetings to have breakfast snacks and coffee.

### **ENC 1102 Feedback from assessment survey.**

The faculty team reported no discrepancies from the May 9 scoring session for ENC 1102. Although no scoring discrepancies were reported, the team recommended to clarify instructions on the assessment tool in order to minimize discrepancies in the future. The benchmark of 3 was met by 70% of the assignments that were scored.

Regarding the spring term assessment of students in ENC 1102, the faculty teams noted that students were mainly assessed during weeks 10-12. The team indicated that students were not given sufficient time to "practice" the core ability. To allow for more practice, the team indicated that they would create an in class activity. The course materials were found suitable to address the core ability and the team reported that the course competencies and objectives support student's growth in the linked Core Ability.

For the upcoming fall assessment, the team indicated that they would clarify instruction on the assessment tool and create an in class activity. The team for ENC 1102 indicated that no resources or other support was needed from the assessment committee for the fall assessment cycle.

## Communications Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the Communications Cluster provided assessment data for two courses. The data used for the analysis below includes 85 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course	C1	C2	C3	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
SPC 2608	3.75	3.38	3.35	3.46	3	85	68	80%

---

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Communications Cluster reviewed assignments for SPC 2608. Fundamentals of Speech addressed the core ability, Communicate Effectively. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Communications Faculty Feedback.**

The Faculty team that assessed SPC 2608 reported no discrepancies in the scoring of assignments in the morning scoring session. The benchmark for the course was 3 and 80% of assignments graded in the morning session met or exceeded this mark.

During the spring semester assessment cycle, the assessment was given in weeks 13-14 and 15-16. The faculty team felt that the students were given sufficient time to practice the core ability. The team indicated that they feel the course materials adequately address the core ability and the competencies and objectives support the students' growth in the linked core ability.

The assessment committee may be able to help the communications cluster for future implementation by providing a liaison with IT to ensure that there is consistent suitable equipment for recording speeches.

## Mathematics Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the Mathematics Cluster provided data for eight different courses. The data used for the analysis below included 419 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course	C1	C2	C3	C4	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
MAC 1105	4.64	3.95	3.84	3.16	3.73	4	44	25	57%
MAC 1114	5.00	4.45	3.65	3.30	3.95	3 <sup>#</sup>	20	17	85%
MAC 1114	4.86	4.19	3.80	3.62	4.02	4	65	45	69%
MAC 1140	3.45	3.20	3.05	3.10	3.15	3 <sup>#</sup>	20	15	75%
MAC 1140	4.72	4.60	4.40	4.08	3.69	4	25	21	84%
MAC 1311	4.22	3.56	3.33	3.11	3.44	4	9	5	56%
MAT 1033	3.77	3.06	2.49	2.06	2.66	3	47	19	40%
MAT 1033	5.00	4.56	3.89	4.11	4.22	4 <sup>#</sup>	9	6	67%
MGF 1106	3.92	3.45	3.19	3.66	3.28	3	64	43	67%
MGF 1107	4.89	4.44	4.69	3.92	4.31	3	62	60	97%
STA 2023	4.19	3.30	3.30	3.70	3.54	4	54	29	54%

# indicates benchmark different than recorded in AA Program Assessment Course Benchmarks document

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Mathematics Cluster reviewed assignments for a number of math courses. All courses assessed the Core Ability, Think Critically and Solve Problems. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Mathematics Faculty Feedback.**

One of the eight faculty course teams reported a discrepancy in the scoring of the May 9 scoring session against the scoring key provided. The discrepancy was attributed to differing interpretations of the criteria on the rubric. The teams indicated that in order to minimize discrepancies in the future, rubrics

need to be corrected, faculty need a good understanding of the criteria, and a key highlighting each criterion would be helpful. Another suggestion was to provide more specific information about the objectives that must be covered in each course and to develop a college wide exit exam for each course. The benchmarks and percentage that met the benchmarks from each course team are highlighted in Table 1 below.

During the spring term assessment of the courses reviewed here, the timing of the assessment occurred at various times. Table 2 below shows when the assessments were given in each course. All faculty teams indicated that students were given sufficient time to “practice” the core ability and all course materials were found suitable to address the core ability. All teams reported that the course competencies and objectives support student’s growth in the linked Core Ability.

Changes that were planned for the upcoming fall assessment included: two teams indicated that no changes were necessary; one team would change the benchmark from 4 to 3; two teams noted that the rubric needed clarification and example assignments would be provided to faculty; one team indicated a need to change the assessment all together; and one team indicated that proper notation needed to be emphasized further in the course. Finally, a suggestion was made to create an agreed upon pre-assessment tool that may be utilized within each course section.

The course assessment teams asked that the Assessment committee help by providing access to benchmarks in the repository, example assignments for each course, and to ensure that all assessment tools and rubrics are up to date to ensure consistency. There was also a call for alternative strategy for implementing with online students and more reminders to complete assessments throughout the semester.

Table 1. Mathematics Benchmarks and Percent That Met Benchmark During May 9 Scoring Session

Course	Benchmark	% Meeting Benchmark
MAC 1105	4	25%
MAC 1114	4	60%
MAC 1140	4	60%
MAC 1311	4	40%
MAT 1033	3	60%
MGF 1106	3	80%
MGF 1107	3	100%
STA 2023	4	11.1%

Table 2. Weeks When Assessment Was Given in Math Classes During Spring 2014 Term

Course	Weeks Assessed					
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-14	15-16
MAC 1105	X					
MAC 1114		X				
MAC 1140		X				
MAC 1311				X		
MAT 1033			X			
MGF 1106		X				
MGF 1107				X		
STA 2023					X	
Total	1	3	1	2	1	0

## Science and Engineering Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the Science and Engineering Cluster provided data for nine different classes. The assessment data for 391 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics were used for the analysis below.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
BSCC 1005	3.31	2.77	2.54	2.85	3.08	3.00	2	13	13	100%
BSCC 1005	2.31	2.38	2.31	2.46	2.62	2.46	3 <sup>#</sup>	13	6	46%
BSCC 1010	4.16	4.30	4.47	3.91	3.65	4.35	2	43	41	95%
BSCC 1011	2.83	3.60	3.24	3.29	3.29	3.29	3	42	36	86%
BSCC 2093	2.51	3.17	2.17	2.60	2.32	2.55	3	47	25	53%
BSCC 2094	3.70	3.30	3.25	3.25	3.57	3.75	4	44	30	68%
CHM 1045	4.43	3.56	3.20	2.73	2.78	3.36	2	80	77	96%
OCE 1001	3.49	3.58	3.11	2.81	3.85	3.37	3 <sup>#</sup>	84	81	96%
PHY 2048	4.08	3.75	3.75	3.67	3.42	3.58	3	12	9	75%
PHYL 2048	3.54	3.62	3.85	3.69	3.15	3.85	3	13	11	85%

# indicates benchmark different than recorded in AA Program Assessment Course Benchmarks document

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Science and Engineering Cluster reviewed assignments for a number of life and physical science courses. All courses assessed the Core Ability, Think Critically and Solve Problems. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Science and Engineering Faculty Feedback**

The faculty teams reported on Biology, Microbiology, Anatomy and Physiology, Chemistry, Oceanography, and Physics. No discrepancies from the May 9 scoring session were found on the assignments reviewed. Although no scoring discrepancies were reported, the team reported that there were some answer sheets that were based on previous assessment and not the one that was in use at the time of the scoring session. In addition, one faculty team did not have the score key to compare the scores with. Ensuring most current assessment tool and that scoring key are provided would help

minimize discrepancies in the future. In addition, the faculty teams felt that there needed some clarification to the rubric and that all faculty involved with assessment are familiar with the rubric and grading policies. The benchmark scores for Science and Engineering cluster courses and the percent of assignments that met or exceeded the benchmark in the May 9<sup>th</sup> scoring session are found in Table 1 below.

During the spring term, the timing of the assessment occurred at various points. Table 2 below shows when the assessments were given in each course. All faculty teams indicated that students were given sufficient time to “practice” the core ability and all course materials were found suitable to address the core ability. All teams reported that the course competencies and objectives support student’s growth in the linked Core Ability.

Course	Benchmark	% Meeting Benchmark
BSCC 1005	3	80%
BSCC 1010	2	96%
BSCC 1011	3	100%
BSCC 2093	3	67%
BSCC 2094	3	90-95% in class
CHM 1045	2	80%
MCBC 2010	3	81%
OCE 1001	3	60%
PHY 2048	3	75-80%

For the upcoming fall assessment, the faculty teams indicated that they would clarify directions on the assessment tool to ensure faculty and students understand what is needed. One team mentioned that plan to make a small correction to the grading guidelines and re-evaluate the benchmark. The team indicated that they would like the assessment committee’s help to ensure that the faculty have to correct assessment tool and rubric. Additionally, multiple teams requested that more faculty be involved in the process and for timely announcements regarding which sections will need to submit assessment data.

Course	Weeks Assessed					
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-14	15-16
BSCC1005					X	
BSCC 1010					X	
BSCC 2093						X
BSCC 2094			X			
BSCC 1011		X				
BSCC 1011		X				
CHM 1045			X			
OCE 1001	X	X				
PHY 2048		X				
Total	1	4	2		2	1

## Humanities and World Religions Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the Humanities and World Religions Cluster provided assessment data for 74 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
HUM 2211	3.41	3.18	3.15	3.00	2.74	3.09	3	34	24	71%
HUM 2249	2.14	2.68	3.00	2.77	2.41	2.45	2	22	22	100%
REL 2300	2.33	2.67	2.78	2.78	-	2.78	3	18	14	78%

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Humanities and World Religions Cluster reviewed assignments for three courses. These courses addressed the Core Abilities, Process Information and Think Critically and Solve Problems. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Humanities and World Religion faculty feedback.**

Two of the three courses that the faculty teams reported on during the May 9 scoring session were found to have discrepancies in the scoring. The cause of these discrepancies were indicated to be the rubric and a comparison of student assignments to other student assignments. In one case it was recommended that the rubric be modified in order to minimize discrepancies in the future. The other recommendation was to be sure that faculty are consistent in scoring assignments to the rubric and not comparing to other assignments. The benchmark scores for Humanities and World Religions cluster courses and the percent of assignments that met or exceeded the benchmark in the May 9<sup>th</sup> scoring session is found in Table 1. The World Religions team did not report the percent that met or exceeded the benchmark.

Course	Benchmark	% Meeting Benchmark
HUM 2211	3	80%
HUM 2249	2	100%
REL 2300	3	-

During the spring term, the timing of the assessment occurred at various points. Table 2 below shows when the assessments were given in each course. One faculty team indicated that students were not

given sufficient time to “practice” the core ability. In order to provide more time for students to practice the core ability, the teams suggested to create an in class activity, incorporate a study case, and launch a pre-test.

All course materials were found suitable to address the core ability. However, one team recommended greater collaboration with libraries to support course content. All teams reported that the course competencies and objectives support student’s growth in the linked Core Ability.

In regard to anticipated changes to be made for the fall term, one faculty team indicated that adjunct faculty will need to become more involved and they hope that the Center for Teaching Excellence can provide assessment skills workshops.

The final recommendation was that the Assessment committee can help by providing strong support for adjunct faculty.

Table 2. Weeks When Assessment Was Given in Humanities and World Religion Classes During Spring 2014 Term						
Course	Weeks Assessed					
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-14	15-16
HUM 2211			X			
HUM 2249					X	
REL 2300			X			
<b>Total</b>			<b>2</b>		<b>1</b>	

## Social and Behavioral Sciences Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the Social and Behavioral Science Cluster provided assessment data for 243 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
AMH 2010	3.00	2.67	2.67	2.78	-	3.00	2 <sup>#</sup>	9	9	100%
AMH 2010	3.69	3.31	3.41	3.56	-	3.54	3	39	38	97%
AMH 2020	3.38	3.06	2.98	3.02	-	3.08	3	53	43	81%
AMH 2948	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	-	4.00	3	1	1	100%
EUH 1001	2.90	3.00	2.80	2.90	-	2.80	3	10	6	60%
PSY 2012	3.47	3.40	3.05	3.09	3.14	3.25	3	57	47	82%
DEP 2004	3.80	3.59	3.57	3.68	3.45	3.59	3	74	66	89%

# indicates benchmark different than recorded in AA Program Assessment Course Benchmarks document

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Social and Behavioral Science Cluster reviewed assignments for a number of courses. These courses addressed the Core Abilities, Think Critically and Solve Problems and Model Ethic and Civic Responsibilities. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Social and Behavioral Science faculty feedback.**

Two of the seven courses that the faculty teams reported on during the May 9<sup>th</sup> scoring session were found to have discrepancies in the scoring. Interpretation of the rubric and how to calculate scores that may need to be rounded were the causes of the two discrepancies. In order to minimize future discrepancies, there needs to be agreed upon definitions of the performance criteria and clear guidance on how to deal with rounding numbers. The benchmark scores for courses in the Social and Behavioral Science cluster and the percent of assignments that met or exceeded the benchmark in the May 9<sup>th</sup>

scoring session are found in Table 1. Percent meeting benchmark was not provided by PSY 2012 Faculty team.

During the spring term assessment, the timing of the assessment occurred at various points. Table 2 below shows when the assessments were given in each course. One on the seven faculty teams indicated that students were not given sufficient time to “practice” the core ability. In order to provide more time for students to practice the core ability, the team noted plans to implement a practice assignment.

All course materials were found suitable to address the core ability and all teams reported that the course competencies and objectives support students’ growth in the linked Core Ability.

Four of the seven teams indicated that additional instruction support would be required to satisfactorily implement the assessment in the future. In particular, learning labs, writing centers, and tutors were noted as important to the assessment process. In order to incorporate these services in class, one faculty team noted that they plan on scheduling class time with the Writing Center.

Changes that are planned before the fall term assessment cycle include reformatting the assessment tool so that questions are presented more clearly to the students, instructional clarification will be added for adjunct professors, and a practice assignment will be implemented by one team.

The only request that the faculty teams made of the assessment committee were to provide clear and concise expectations regarding outcomes.

Course	Benchmark	% Meeting Benchmark
AMH 2010	3	80%
AMH 2020	3	80%
DEP 2004	3	80%
EUH 1000	3	67%
POS 2041	3	90%
PSY 2012	3	-
SYG 2000	3	100%

Course	Weeks Assessed					
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-14	15-16
AMH 2010				X		
AMH 2020				X		
DEP 2004			X			
EUH 1000			X			
POS 2041					X	
PSY 2012		X	X	X		
SYG 2000			X			
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	

## Performing and Visual Arts Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the Performing and Visual Arts Cluster provided assessment data for 29 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course	C1	C2	C3	C4	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
ARTC 1300	3.81	3.78	3.81	3.44	3.70	4	27	15	56%
MUL 2010	3.50	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.50	3	2	1	50%

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Performing and Visual Arts Cluster reviewed assignments for ARTC 1300, MUL 2010, and THE 1100. All of these courses addressed the Core Ability, Think Critically and Solve Problems. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Performing and Visual Arts faculty feedback.**

There were no discrepancies reported by the faculty teams during the May 9<sup>th</sup> scoring session. The benchmark scores for courses in the Performing and Visual Arts Cluster courses and the percent of assignments that met or exceeded the benchmark in the May 9<sup>th</sup> scoring session are found in Table 1.

All the spring term assessments for the Performing and Visual Arts courses were given to students in the last two weeks of the semester.

Course	Benchmark	% Meeting Benchmark
ARTC 1300	4	40%
MUL 2010	3	50%
THE 1100	3	90%

The faculty teams reported that the students were given sufficient time to “practice” the core ability, the course material adequately addressed the core ability, and the course competencies and objectives support students’ growth in the linked core ability. The teams indicated that they planned on creating supplemental material and collaborating with libraries to support the course more fully.

Two changes were noted before the fall term assessment cycle, one team indicated that they planned on adding library and Writing Center activities into the course calendar; another team noted that the

benchmark was likely set too high and they plan on changing it. The assessment committee could help by giving clear directions to adjunct faculty and by reviewing the benchmarks set for the course.

## Education Cluster

### Section One: Spring Assessment Results

During the spring 2014 assessment cycle the Education Cluster provided assessment data for 48 students who were given an overall score and had the correct number of criteria according to the submitted rubrics.

### **Spring Assessment Data: Mean Scores and Benchmark Performance**

Course		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Overall	Bench	N Students	N Met Bench	% Met Bench
EDF	1005	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.65	4.31	4.63	3	48	48	100%

### Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Education Cluster reviewed assignments for EDF 1005. This course addressed the Core Ability, Work Cooperatively. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Education faculty feedback.**

There were no scoring discrepancies reported by the faculty teams on during the May 9<sup>th</sup> scoring session. The benchmark score was 3 and 100% of the student assignments reviewed met or exceeded the benchmark.

During the spring 2014, the assessment in EDF 1005 was given to students during the last two weeks of the term. The faculty team indicated that the student were given enough time to “practice” the core ability. The faculty team noted that the course materials adequately addressed the core ability. The course competencies and objectives were found to support the students’ growth in the linked core ability.

Although the faculty team did not indicate they needed additional support from the Assessment committee, they noted that the support of the Writing Centers were important to implement the assessment satisfactorily.

## **Library Science Cluster**

### **Section One: Spring Assessment Results**

These data are being reviewed for formatting and inclusion in the report.

---

### **Section Two: Assessment Retreat Tool and Rubric Review**

During the May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014 college wide assessment meeting, the Library Science Cluster reviewed assignments for ENC 1101 and SPC 2608. These courses addressed the Core Ability, Process Information. The following is a brief review of the answers to the assessment meeting survey regarding the effectiveness of the assessment tools and rubrics used during the spring 2014 term and again during the scoring session at the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Library Science faculty feedback.**

There were no scoring discrepancies reported by the faculty teams on during the May 9<sup>th</sup> scoring session. The benchmark score was 4 and 76% of the student assignments reviewed met or exceeded the benchmark.

During the spring 2014, the assessment in the Library Science cluster was given to students during the weeks 7-9, 10-12, and 13-14. The faculty team indicated that the student were given enough time to “practice” the core ability and that the course materials adequately addressed the core ability. The course competencies and objectives were found to support the students’ growth in the linked core ability.

The faculty team noted that they planned on separating the benchmark and performance standard for each course and revise the overall performance standard for each course. In addition, there were plans to revise certain lower scoring questions. Finally, there were plans to include a non-scored item to get faculty names of the courses students took the assessment for.

The faculty team indicated that the assessment committee could help by incorporating data collected through the Library Science collection tool.