

2015 Asses Cycle (S & F 2015)

## Assessment Findings

### Finding per Measure

#### Institutional Assessment Outcome Set

##### Information Literacy

Students will read and use technology to prioritize and interpret relevant information to formulate justifiable theories and/or courses of action

##### Information Literacy Skill Areas

Evaluate information and its sources  
Synthesize main ideas to construct new concepts  
Document reference

##### ▼ Measure: Information Literacy Institution level; Direct - Student Artifact



**Details/Description:** Instructors who assessed Information Literacy chose their own assignment and used the common rubric to score the assignment.

**Acceptable Target:** 75% of student will score 3 out of a 5 point scale

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2014

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Designated faculty across all discipline areas.

##### Supporting Attachments:

-  Information Literacy rubric.docx (Word Document (Open XML))
-  Information Literacy Score.xls (Microsoft Excel)

#### Findings for Information Literacy

**Summary of Findings:** Spring 2015 (Written on November 17, 2015)

Out of 81 students, 69.1% of students met the criteria for Information Literacy scoring a 3 or above on a 5 point scale. There were 13.3% that scored in the developing level.

Fall 2015 (Written February 9, 2016)

Out of 15 students, 80% of students met the criteria for the Information Literacy scoring a 3 or above on a 5 point scale. There are 13.3% at the developing level.

**Results:** Acceptable Target Achievement: Not Met

**Recommendations :** Spring 2015

Special attention will be focused on the developing students. S3 recommends inviting Library Staff to classrooms to instruct and review Information Literacy skills such as documenting references (IL-3).

S3 recommendation is to adopt the Information Literacy VALUE Rubric for the 2016 assessment cycle pending faculty and chair approval.

Fall 2015

Reinforced our rubric for Information Literacy was not working and the importance of changing to the VALUE Rubric

Need to remap Information Literacy to include more classes assessing Info Lit

Review of rubric - train for inter-rater reliability on rubric

**Reflections/Notes :** Spring 2015

Documenting references seems to be the lowest skill needed students. By focusing on this level the acceptable target might have been achieved.

Eleven students did not complete the Information Literacy assignments and were not calculated in the final results. As of Spring 2015 concurrent students were included in this data.

Fall 2015

Documenting references had the lowest criteria again.

Things to think about: value of writing lab, emphasis on proper citations, help students determine when to use APA or MLA, should students be given ISLO rubrics when completing the assignment for this assessment, look at other resources for referencing - Easy Bib is not always accurate/reliable

### **Substantiating Evidence:**

 Info Lit Spring 2014 thru Fall 2015 ISLO Data.xlsx (Excel Workbook (Open XML))

### **These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

#### **Information Literacy**

(Action Plan; 2015 Asses Cycle (S & F 2015))

**Action details:** Fall 2015 CDHE is making the move to LEAP VALUE Rubrics. S3 made the recommendation that OJC adopt the LEAP Value Rubric for Information Literacy beginning the 2016 assessment cycle.

Spring 2016 This recommendation was approved and the Information Literacy VALUE Rubric will be used Spring 2016.

For those concerned with EasyBib not being accurate, be sure to use the paid version, EasyBib Pro. If concerns continue contact the library to look for another alternative.

Training for full time as well as adjunct faculty on using the rubrics, score sheets and Taskstream, .

The measure for this plan was 90% faculty who were assigned this ISLO completed it. Competition was at 75%. Clarify notification process for faculty assessing this ISLO.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2016

Training will be Fall 2016.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Assigned faculty across programs.

**Measures:** 90% of faculty assessing Information Literacy will submit assessment results/data.

**Budget approval required? (describe):** Yes through Cabinet - requesting 4 hours for training for all faculty completing ISLOs (This covers all ISLO/PSLO training).

**Budget request amount:** \$4,000.00

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**

## **Mathematics**

Students will use appropriate quantitative literacy methods and data analysis to investigate and solve problems.

### **Mathematics Skill Areas**

Perform college level arithmetic operations  
Demonstrate skills at estimating and approximating results  
Perform basic algebraic and/or logical operations that involve levels of abstraction  
Demonstrate basic

▼ **Measure:** Mathematics  
Institution level; Direct - Student Artifact



**Details/Description:** Instructors who assessed Mathematics chose their own assignment and used the common rubric to score the assignment

**Acceptable Target:** 75% of student will score 3 out of a 5 point scale

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2014

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Designated faculty across all discipline areas.

**Supporting Attachments:**

 Mathematics - Institutional rubric.docx (Word Document (Open XML))  
 Mathematics Score.xls (Microsoft Excel)

## Findings for Mathematics

### **Summary of Findings:** Spring 2015 (Written on November 17, 2015)

Out of 106 students, 61.3% of OJC students met the Mathematics ISLO of scoring 3 points or higher on a 5 point scale. 16.1% were at a developing level.

### Fall 2015 (Written February 9, 2016)

Out of 218 students, 67% of students met the Mathematics ISLO of score 3 points or higher on a 5 point scale. 16.1% were at a developing level.

**Results:** Acceptable Target Achievement: Not Met

### **Recommendations :** Spring 2015

Courses assessing Mathematics will place an emphasis on perform college level arithmetic operations (M-1) and demonstrate skills at estimating and approximating results (M-2). These criteria needs to be improved across campus.

S3 decided students not completing the assessed assignment would be placed on the score sheet but a No Score (NS) would be on the sheet.

### Fall 2015

Train for inter-rater reliability.

Look at data with and without the Mathematics 120, 121 and 135 courses

### **Reflections/Notes :** Spring 2015

M1 and M2 were the lowest performing ISLO areas overall.

Ten students did not complete the math assignments and were not calculated in the final results. As of spring 2015 concurrent students were included in this data.

After looking at the VALUE Rubrics, S3 decided to keep the current Mathematics ISLO rubric


### Fall 2015

M1 and M2 continue to be the lowest areas.

Are students using a calculator? Some faculty allow some do not.

Sample size has doubled from Spring 2015. Fall enrollment in Math courses tends to be higher than spring enrollment.

### **Substantiating Evidence:**

 Mathematics 2014 thru Fall 2015 ISLO Data.xlsx (Excel Workbook (Open XML))

### **These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

#### **Mathematics**

(Action Plan; 2015 Asses Cycle (S & F 2015))

**Action details:** Fall 2015 S3 committee members will continue to look at which courses are being assessed in Mathematics as well as measurements used.

Spring 2016 Train for inter-rater reliability. Note if students are allowed to use calculators or not. Look at data with and without Math 120, 121, 135. These Math classes use a standard test across all three courses.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2016

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Assigned Faculty across campus

**Measures:** 90% of faculty assessing Mathematics will submit assessments/data results

Spring 2016 - This measure was met with 100%.

**Budget approval required? (describe):** See Information Literacy

**Budget request amount:** \$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

## Technology

Students will select and apply appropriate forms of technology to solve problems or compile information.

### Technology Skill Areas

Identify the problem or compile information  
Distinguish what technology, tools and information are available and select the most appropriate  
Apply appropriate technology and demonstrate mastery of technology/tool

▼ **Measure:** Technology  
Institution level; Direct - Student Artifact


**Details/Description:** Instructors who assessed Technology chose their own assignment and used the common rubric to score the assignment


**Acceptable Target:** 75% of student will score 3 out of a 5 point scale

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2014

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Designated faculty across all discipline areas.

**Supporting Attachments:**

 Technology Rubric.docx (Word Document (Open XML))

 Technology Score.xls (Microsoft Excel)

### Findings for Technology

**Summary of Findings:** Spring 2015 (Written on November 17, 2015)

Out of 46 students, 54.3% scored a 3 or above on a 5 point scale. There were 28.3% that scored at the developing level.

Fall 2015 (Written February 9, 2016)

Out of 64 students, 82.8% scored a 3 or above on a 5 point scale. There were 17.2% at the developing level.

**Results:** Acceptable Target Achievement: Not Met

**Recommendations :** Spring 2015

Since the numbers are so small S3 determined the need to remap and add additional courses assessing technology to increase the sample size.

S3 recommendation is to adopt the Problem Solving (for Technology) VALUE Rubric for the 2016 assessment cycle pending faculty and chair approval.

Fall 2015

Need to do remapping to include more students, CIS 118 needs to be added both concurrent and on campus.

Need to look at technology rubric as it was decided not to use the Problem Solving VALUE Rubric.

Look at what courses and what information in each course is being assessed.

**Reflections/Notes :** Spring 2015

Since only 34 students were assessed across campus one student can make a significant difference in the outcome.

Fall 2015

Why is there such a huge jump in the students scoring 3 or above from the spring semester to the fall semester?

With the changes to the gT CDHE competencies is technology something we want to continue to assess?

**Substantiating Evidence:**

 Technology 2014 thru Fall 2015 ISLO Data.xlsx (Excel Workbook (Open XML))

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Technology**

(Action Plan; 2015 Asses Cycle (S & F 2015))

**Action details:** Spring 2015 S3 committee members will in another year, re-evaluate the rubric being used for this assessment.

Reflections/Notes : This is a small sample.

Since the numbers are so small S3 determined the need to remap and add additional courses assessing technology to increase the sample size.

S3 recommendation is to adopt the Problem Solving (for Technology) VALUE Rubric for the 2016 assessment cycle pending faculty and chair approval.

Fall 2015

Need to do remapping to include more students, CIS 118 needs to be added both concurrent and on campus.

Need to look at technology rubric as it was decided not to use the Problem Solving VALUE Rubric.

Look at what courses and what information in each course is being assessed.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2016

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Assigned faculty across campus

**Measures:** 90% of faculty assessing Technology will submit assessment/data results.

2015 Assessment cycle 57% of the classes that were to assess technology assessed it.

**Budget approval required? (describe):** See Information Literacy

**Budget request amount:** \$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

**Written Communication**

Students will write effectively to communicate concepts using applicable vocabulary.

**Written Communication Skill Areas**

Organization  
Development  
Style/Communication  
Grammar/Mechanics

▼ **Measure:** Written Communication  
Institution level; Direct - Student Artifact


**Details/Description:** Instructors who assessed Information Literacy chose their own assignment and used the common rubric to score the assignment

**Acceptable Target:** 75% of student will score 3 out of a 5 point scale

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2014

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Designated faculty across all discipline areas.

**Supporting Attachments:**

 Writing Rubric scoring sheet.xls (Microsoft Excel)

 Written Communication Rubric Otero Junior College Fall 2013.docx (Word Document (Open XML))

**Findings for Written Communication**

**Summary of Findings:** Spring 2015 (Written on November 17, 2015)

Out of 219 students, 89% of students scored a 3 or above on a 5 point scale on this ISLO. 10% were at a developing level.

Fall 2015 (Written February 9, 2016)

Out of 92 students, 72.8% scored a 3 or above on a 5 point scale. 21.7% were at a developing level.

**Results:** Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations :** Spring 2015

S3's recommendation is to breakdown and analyze scores by courses - English, non-English, and concurrent.

Fall 2015

Look at the data with and without English 121 and 122.

The Written Communication rubric has proven over time it is reliable so will be retained.

Possible training on inter-rater reliability

**Reflections/Notes :** Spring 2015

With the large sample size the committee wondered how many were ENG 121, 122 students. It also had the highest number (38) of concurrent students with an average score of 3.95%.

Eleven students did not complete the Written Communication assignment and were not calculated in the final results.


After looking at the VALUE Rubrics, S3 decided to keep the current Written Communication ISLO rubric

Fall 2015

The sample was smaller than in the spring.

Due to change in department chair, ENG 121 and 122 did not get assessed this semester.

### **Substantiating Evidence:**

 written communication Spring 2014 thru Fall 2015 ISLO Data.xlsx (Excel Workbook (Open XML))

### **These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

#### **Written Communication**

(Action Plan; 2015 Asses Cycle (S & F 2015))

#### **Action details:** Spring 2015

S3 recommendation is to breakdown and analyze scores by courses - English, non-English, and concurrent.

Fall 2015

Look at the data with and without English 121 and 122.

The Written Communication rubric has proven over time it is reliable so will be retained.

Possible training on inter-rater reliability

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** 2016 Assessment Cycle

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Assigned faculty across campus

**Measures:** 90% of faculty assessing Technology will submit assessment/data results.

**Budget approval required? (describe):** See Information Literacy

**Budget request amount:** \$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

## Critical Thinking

### Critical Thinking Skill Areas

Synthesize evidence  
Correlate information  
Identify credible information  
Analyze credible information  
Develop well-supported solution  
Apply variety of ideas  
Communicate variety of ideas

▼ **Measure:** Critical Thinking  
Institution level; Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** Critical Thinking is imperative to student success, and is integrated with Information Literacy, Mathematics, Technology and Written Communication ISLOs. Instructors who assess Critical Thinking chose their own assignment and use the common rubric to score the assignment

**Acceptable Target:** 75% of student will score 3 out of a 5 point scale

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Spring and Fall 2014

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Designated faculty across all discipline areas.

### Findings for Critical Thinking

**Summary of Findings:** Spring 2015 (Written on November 17, 2015)

Out of 484 students, 77.1% of the students scored 3 points or above on a 5 point scale. 17.6% were at the developing level.

Fall 2015 (Written February 9, 2016)

Out of 373 students, 78.3% scored 3 points or above on a 5 point scale. 15.5% were at a developing level.

**Results:** Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations :** Spring 2015

S3 recommendation is adopt the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric for the 2016 assessment cycle pending faculty and chair approval. If approved, Critical Thinking will assessed as a standalone ISLO as originally assessed

Fall 2015

Decided not to assess critical thinking with the other ISLOs but as a standalone ISLO but will be assessed Fall of 2016.

Mapping to determine which courses will be assessed will be completed.

**Reflections/Notes :** Spring 2015

Currently all ISLOs assess Critical Thinking. This group had the most students with 484. This large number could possibly represent duplicate count of students. Remapping may need to be done to align to the VALUE Rubric.

Fall 2015 Remapping will need to be done to realign the Critical Thinking VALUE rubric with OJC curriculum across campus.

### Substantiating Evidence:

 Critical Thinking 2014 thru Fall 2015 ISLO Data.xlsx (Excel Workbook (Open XML))

### These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

#### Critical Thinking

(Action Plan; 2015 Asses Cycle (S & F 2015))

**Action details:** After looking at results S3 recommended that the LEAP VALUE Rubric be adopted in the Fall of 2016 and will be assigned to courses after remapping.

The committee felt there was too much duplication of Critical Thinking since we are assessing it with all other ISLOs. There has also been talk that the way the criteria are all lumped together we are not gathering specific enough information about to critical thinking and we need to return to doing CT assessment the way we were approx 3 years ago before the new ISLO rubrics were adopted.

Fall 2015 S3 adopted the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Mapping of Critical Thinking Spring 2016

Implementation of VALUE rubric Fall 2016

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** - Chairs and S3 for mapping - Assigned faculty across campus for Fall 2016 implementation of Critical Thinking assessment using the VALUE Rubric

**Measures:** Courses will be mapped for assessment of Critical Thinking. 90% of faculty assessing Critical Thinking will submit assessment/data results

**Budget approval required? (describe):** See Information Literacy

**Budget request amount:** \$0.00

**Priority:**

**Supporting Attachments:**

## Overall Recommendations

*No text specified*

## Overall Reflection

*No text specified*

---

**Last Modified:** 03/02/2016 11:03:52 AM MST