

Fall 2017
Core Curriculum Assessment Report

of

Skills 1 – Communication

from the

Social Science

Core Curricular Area



submitted by

Robert Sanderson

on behalf of the

Social Science
Core Area Assessment Committee

Methods

How was student work (artifacts) collected for assessment?

Course sections in each of the core areas were randomly selected for assessment using a random number generator. The same method was used for face-to-face, online, or concurrent courses. Individual instructors were responsible for designing assessment instruments following the guideline established by the Core Council on Assessment and the Core Area Assessment Committee for the Social Sciences.

What type of artifacts were collected?

Multiple-choice, short answer questionnaire or essays were used for collecting data directly from students.

How were the artifacts sampled for assessment?

Depending on class size: if 20 or less students, all were sampled; if more than twenty students, 10 student artifacts were randomly selected for assessment.

How were the artifacts scored?

Artifacts were scored using the common rubric scoring form developed by the CAAC members.

How was reliability in scoring determined and ensured?

The same type rubric and scoring technique was previously used in the pilot study and the assessment for Knowledge 1. In short, we relied on inter-rater reliability which proved successful in previous assessments with the same assessors.

Reflection

What was learned from the assessment results?

We learned to fine tune the assessment process, especially with regard to data collection and interpretation of data collected. We need to refine our communication and organization skills as a committee. For example, there were several areas and courses that did not participate in the Skills 1 assessment and this may be the result of poor communication if nothing else. The committee works well together in organizing and designing rubrics and guidelines for assessment, but the latest process had mixed submission and evaluating problems. The problems were, perhaps, due in part to the lengthy summer break between collecting and submitting student artifacts and the interpreting and scoring of those artifacts within the month or so after returning to campus. I have also learned that although assessment is mandatory, submission of artifacts and compliance at the departmental level seems to be voluntary. In other words, as chair of the CAAC I can ensure that we develop a scoring rubric, guidelines for data collection, and assign assessors sections to score/assess, I cannot but encourage course instructors or even CAAC member to comply.

Continuous Improvement

What changes will be made based upon the assessment results?

CAAC will work to streamline and better organize the data collection and scoring process to help ensure greater compliance and to assessment requirements, and I will work to improve communication between the chair, CAAC members, and individual instructors so that we have greater compliance and useful data from the assessment process in the future.

Feedback

What changes are recommended for Core assessment?

1. Establish greater communication and cooperative ventures between different college areas, i.e., the cooperative effort between CAAC and Art on developing a rubric for Values, or sharing "best practices" between college core assessment committees
2. Perhaps devote a designated period to developing all scoring rubrics prior to administering future assessments, since we know what it is we wish to measure for each assessment area.
3. Provide periodic training seminars or refresher sessions so that assessors and instructors have an opportunity to learn about and have input in the assessment process.

Comments

Other comments?

My mother always told me, "If you don't have anything nice to say..."

END OF REPORT