



## Office of Institutional Research

To: Scholarship Action Group  
From: Darby Hiller  
Date: Tuesday, September 28, 2004  
Subject: Analysis of Fall 2003 Artifacts

In fall 2003, 365 artifacts were scored to measure performance in our three general education outcomes. Over a hundred of the artifact students went on to graduate. There were 16 AAS graduates among the students, 29 ADN graduates, and 60 ASA graduates. None of these consists of a representative sample of our graduates. About 131 artifact submitters had 52 or more NMC credit hours.

### Communications

Table 1. Communications: Percent Scoring at least Sufficient		52 or more credit hours	ASA	AAS	ADN
Level 1	Understands, organizes and expresses ideas using standard English	85% (14)	80% (10)	75% (4)	100% (1)
Level 2	Use qualitative or quantitative info gathering methods; communicates with an awareness of audience and with a sense of purpose	100% (11)	100% (5)	100% (1)	No cases
Level 3	Applies strategies and theories to communicate in one or more discipline or profession	70% (10)	50% (6)	50% (2)	No cases

### Critical Thinking

Table 2. Critical Thinking: Percent Scoring at least Sufficient		52 or more credit hours	ASA	AAS	ADN
Level 1	Identify issues and articulate a process to resolve them	100% (4)	100% (3)	No cases	No cases
Level 2	Construct arguments, evaluate claims, and develop conclusion using evidence and logic	64% (14)	75% (4)	60% (5)	No cases

Level 3	Demonstrate the ability to resolve issues in one or more disciplines or profession	73% (15)	100% (5)	66% (3)	100% (4)
---------	--	----------	----------	---------	----------

## Cultural Perspectives

Table 3. Cultural Perspectives: Percent Scoring at least Sufficient		52 or more credit hours	ASA	AAS	ADN
Level 1	Demonstrates an awareness of diverse peoples and cultures	87% (15)	75% (4)	100% (1)	100% (8)
Level 2	Analyses the contributions and influences of diverse cultures upon peoples	83% (24)	94% (18)	No cases	No cases
Level 3	Evaluates the impact of diverse cultures in the context of one or mores disciplines or professions and importance in the global context	71% (24)	80% (5)	No cases	53% (15)

### What this tells us.

For Communications, our students with close to enough credits to graduate (52) need improvement in Levels 1 and 3. The last three columns tell us something similar. However, in those columns the number of students is miniscule. We cannot base our recommendations for improvement on the performance of one to six students. Moreover, there were two areas in which there were no ADN students to track. If we are determined to target our degree programs, then we must sample students accordingly.

For Critical Thinking, our improvement efforts ought to be focused on improving our students' ability to evaluate arguments (Level 2). This result is a trend and is substantiated by our other direct assessment method. Again, our sampling technique must be reviewed to get a better representation of students on whose work we can base our recommendations.

For Cultural Perspectives, nearly a quarter of our students are performing below sufficient on Level 2 and 3 skill statements. And we are well below 100% for Level 1 too. Looking within the graduates we have the same problem as for the other two outcomes. We have too few students' work to go on.

The sampling is not something we could have fixed in the past, necessarily, it's just something we have to change if we want to continue down this path of targeting the degree programs.

Having a core set of courses will help. We can look more thoroughly at classes and students in that core. Instead of having seven pieces of work from a

Spanish or dance or automotive class, we'll have 20+ pieces of work from a political science, chemistry, or history course, for instance.

For additional questions, contact the Office of Institutional Research.