

ASSESSMENT *Fall 2002*

“Do assessment for improvement; nothing else matters.”

Northwestern Michigan College

August 2002

To: All Faculty

From: The College-Wide Assessment Team (C-WAT)

Subject: Assessment of Student Outcomes

Spring 2002 GenEd Results

In a day-long scoring session this spring, 13 faculty read 135 artifacts from 27 classes. Three scoring teams, organized by outcome, read 45 artifacts for each outcome. At some levels, scorers determined that not all of the artifacts could be scored. Feedback will be provided to those faculty who provided the artifacts. Here are the results of the scoring.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Level 1: (The student) Understands, organizes and expresses ideas using standard English.

64.4 percent of students scored were rated “Proficient” or higher. These students

- understand the main idea and support it with some detail;
- use clear and focused organization; and
- express ideas using the conventions of English appropriate to the task. There are few errors in spelling,

Level 2: (The student)Uses appropriate qualitative or quantitative information-gathering methods, and communicates with a sense of audience and purpose.

43.3 percent of students scored were rated “proficient” or higher. These students

- use appropriate methods for a specific task; evaluate and apply some relevant results and
- establish a purpose and maintain that purpose most of the time while communicating with the intended audience.

Level 3: (The student) Applies strategies, theories, or technologies to communicate in an appropriate manner in one or more disciplines. 80 percent of students scored were rated “proficient” or higher. These students

- usually understand and use appropriate strategies or theories to communicate effectively and
- apply technology appropriately most of the time.

CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS

Level 1: (The student) Identifies issues or problems and articulates a process for resolving them. 90 percent of students scored were rated “proficient” or higher. These students

- identify the issue or problem with substantial accuracy and
- articulate (demonstrate) a process for resolving an issue or problem that is substantially workable.

Level 2: (The student) Constructs arguments, evaluates claims and develops conclusions using evidence and logic to resolve problems or issues. 50 percent of students scored were rated “proficient” or higher. These students

- generally use information that is relevant;
- reasoning is generally clear;

- draw conclusions that are generally defensible.

Level 3: (The student) Demonstrates the ability to resolve problems or issues in one or more professions or disciplines. While 20 percent of the students scored were rated “Advanced” at this outcome level, 50 percent were rated “Developing.” The remaining student artifacts were not scored. Scorers determined that the student work presented was not closely enough linked to the outcome.

CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES SKILLS

Level 1: (The student) Demonstrates an awareness of diverse peoples and cultures. 50 percent of students scored were rated “proficient” or higher. These students

- demonstrate some awareness of diverse peoples and cultures.

Level 2: (The student) Analyses the contributions and influences of diverse cultures upon people(s). 31 percent of students scored were rated “proficient” or higher. These students

- demonstrate awareness of the source of the contributions and influences of diverse cultures;
- demonstrate understanding of the internal aspects of culture; and
- demonstrate understanding of the economic, historic, political and/or social influences on the culture and/or exerted by the culture.

Level 3: (The student) Evaluates the impact of diverse cultures in the context of one or more disciplines or professions. 50 percent of students scored were rated “proficient” or higher. These students

- demonstrate understanding of how diverse cultures impact a discipline or profession, and
- demonstrate understanding of cultures and the importance of the global context.

Lottery winners (faculty providing artifacts) for Fall 2002

The faculty who will be providing artifacts next fall were notified this summer. You may notice that some names have appeared for the second and third time! This is because very few courses support Level 2 and 3 of Cultural Perspectives. This is an issue that academic areas are discussing and hope to improve.

Please support these faculty in any way you can; they make the assessment process possible.

They are: **Communications**, Level 1: Mike McIntosh (once for Automotive and once for Welding) and Jerry Williams; Level 2: Mary Ann Linsell, Mary Norris, Mark Smith; Level 3: Gary Klotzbach, Ann Ivers and Tami Livengood, Marjory Taylor. **Critical Thinking**, Level 1: Dave Terrell, Rob Houston, Sonja Olshove; Level 2: Gary Klotzbach, Laura McCain, John Pahl; Level 3: Jane Zlojutro, Marv Studinger, Ann Ivers. **Cultural Perspectives**, Level 1: Ann George, Jean Rokos, Mike Jacobsen; Level 2, Jackie Shinnors, John Zachman, Susan Odgers; Level 3, Barb Tatarchuk, John Zachman, Darla Hill.

Another opportunity later this semester.

The collection and scoring of artifacts will be done twice this year. So if you didn't make the list this semester, you have another chance for Spring 2003. Those faculty will be randomly selected (again) and notified later this semester.

Programs assess at another level.

As a result of completing the PSSA process, programs will be making changes to improve their programs, which in turn should improve student learning. Following are examples of changes made by programs who have recently completed the process.

The **Social Sciences** academic area will be working to achieve a 100 percent increase in adoption of general education outcomes over the next two years. An emphasis will be placed on supporting cultural perspectives. To realize this goal, these faculty will be working on assignments that assess understanding of cultural perspectives as well as the other general education outcomes.

The **Visual Communications** program will be working to improve their students' ability to work independently as well as within a team environment. Beginning this semester, faculty teaching courses that provide team activities will brainstorm additional ways to reinforce and emphasize the importance of this outcome. New activities will be added to improve this skill.

The **Humanities** academic area reported that in meeting the outcome related to the needs of occupational areas, most were doing a fine job. However, the Allied Health department asked that modifications be made in the Contemporary Ethical Dilemma course to better serve the needs of their students. Faculty will be meeting with Allied Health faculty to determine specific changes

One outcome in the **Dental Assistant** program is demonstration of basic dental office business skills. Students scores averaged 2.52, missing the standard of 3 or better on a 4-point scale. A computerized practice management system has been installed in the Center for Learning, and the instructor has developed hands-on dental office applications for student practice.

Results of Licensure Exams for 2000-01

Data provided by licensing agencies permits programs to identify areas of program strength and weakness and make necessary course and program revisions to improve student performance. Two

groups—Dental Assistant, CDA, and Practical Nursing— achieved a 100 percent passing level. All other groups taking exams were at the 88 percent or higher level, with the exception of the Automotive Mechanic group which had a pass rate of 65 percent. Overall, the average pass rate for all licensure and certification exams was 88 percent, with 139 students qualifying out of the 158 students taking the exam.

IDEA scores for 2001-2002

A total of 4,142 students in 254 classes were surveyed between the Spring semester 2001 and Spring semester 2002. NMC's average scores on the 12 objectives are very similar to the national norm (IDEA System). For the Spring semester of 2001 which represented 82 percent of the NMC students during this interval, 100 percent of the NMC means scores were above the national norm. For the Fall and Spring semesters 2001-02 which represented the remaining 18 percent of NMC students, none of the NMC scores were above the national norm.

Want more of the story?

Complete results in all of these categories will be available in the Significant Learning Outcomes indicator report which is scheduled to go to the Board of Trustees in September. Following the September Board meeting, the report will be available on the NMC web site and in hard copy from the President's Office.

Assessment Team members: Sallie Donovan, Marilyn Jaquish, Craig Mulder (coordinators); Jack Berman, Sue DeCamillis, Ann George, Bill Hendry, Darby Hiller, Kari Kahler, Laura Schmidt, Terry Sievert and Cathy Sommerfield

Meetings: Every Monday beginning Sept. 9 from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in the Educational Services Conference Room.