

**Fall 2018**  
**Core Curriculum Assessment Report**

of

**Values**

from the

**Science**

Core Curricular Area



submitted by

**Kathryn King**

on behalf of the

**Science**

**Core Area Assessment Committee**

---

## Methods

---

### How was student work (artifacts) collected for assessment?

Student work was collected from the instructors of record for each selected section by each discipline's SCAAC representative.

### What type of artifacts were collected?

A variety of artifacts were selected for analysis. This included lab assignments, quizzes, written papers with citations, reaction papers, and exams.

### How were the artifacts sampled for assessment?

In larger sections, some disciplines chose to randomly sample approximately 25 artifacts for analysis. In smaller sections (less than 25 students), all collected artifacts were analyzed.

### How were the artifacts scored?

All artifacts were scored using a common rubric as follows by the instructors of each selected course section:

Values 1: identifying and evaluating or applying ethical standards

Advanced	4	was successful
Proficient	3	attempted and was usually successful
Novice	2	attempted but was not always successful
Not Met	1	made little attempt
Absent	0	made no attempt

Values 2: students should be able to apply course knowledge to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.

Advanced 4	was successful
------------	----------------

## Science

Values

---

Proficient	3	attempted and was usually successful
Novice	2	attempted but was not always successful
Not Met	1	made little attempt
Absent	0	made no attempt

### **How was reliability in scoring determined and ensured?**

The use of a common rubric developed by the SCAAC members insured reliability in scoring.

## Reflection

---

### **In what areas are students doing well?**

Students are doing well on basic knowledge and on presenting their ideas well. Most students are competently addressing ethical questions related to these fields.

### **What areas need attention to improve student outcomes?**

Improvement could be made on finding sources to support their ideas rather than just stating these are their beliefs "because".

## Continuous Improvement

---

**What changes in the curricular area and/or courses will be made to improve student learning?**

Some courses are not adequately addressing either values 2. They will attempt to incorporate this into their future iterations of these courses.

**What changes in the curricular area and/or courses will be made in the assessment process (i.e. different artifacts, common assignments, different time in the semester to collect artifacts, etc.)?**

The courses that are not currently assessing values 2 will be creating a new, as of yet undetermined artifact to assess this area. Courses that are adequately assessing both values 1 and values 2 will continue using the same procedures.

## Feedback

---

### **What changes are recommended for Core assessment?**

While we feel that values 2 is an important area for our students to master, we are not sure that it can or should be assessed in every scientific discipline and every course. We would recommend that it be dropped from the science area assessment or, at the very least, that those courses that do not teach anything related to this value be exempt from this portion of the assessment.

## Comments

---

### Other comments?

As usual, there was difficulty in getting data from some of the concurrent courses.

We also ran into a logistical issue when one of the SCAAC members from the 2017-2018 year left the university. While a new member from that department has been appointed, the data for many of the courses was either not collected by the former member or was not transferred to the new member in time for reporting. We don't have a concrete recommendation for how to address this issue but it is something that we feel the Core Council should be aware of.

**END OF REPORT**