

GEC Learning Outcomes (GLOs) Assessment Critical Thinking

Assessment Type: GEC

Year/Term: AY18

Course: COM 112 ([online](#))

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Assessment Method/Tool: Common Rubric-EPCC

Measurement Scale: 3-1

Sample Size: 27

	Proficient (# of students %)		Adequate (# of students %)		Developing (# of students %)	
Identifies and explains Issues	19	71%	2	7%	6	22%
Recognizes contexts and assumptions	19	71%	2	7%	6	22%
Acknowledges multiple perspectives	21	78%	0	0%	6	22%
Effectively evaluates evidence to reach conclusions	20	74%	1	4%	6	22%
Median % (based on 27 student sample size)		73%		5%		22%

Benchmark:

85%

Institutional benchmark goal for median percentage of students to meet “Proficient” or “Adequate” levels in the GEC

Median % Achieving Benchmark:

78%

median percentage of students meeting “Adequate” or “Proficient” levels

Closing the Loop:

1) Summarize the results. For GEC the Target is 85% scoring a 2 or 3.

The end-of-term enrollment for COM 112 was 27 students. Of those, five students completed a few assignments and then “disappeared.” One student completed only the course Orientation Quiz and in week 9 requested the course grade Incomplete. This student is completing assignments and on track for a successful completion of COM 112. As a result, 6/27 (22%) of my students performed at the GEC CT Developing level. On the other hand, 21 students (78%) of my students scored in the 2 or 3 categories. Clearly, I did not meet the 85% performance goal. The question is why?

A) Strengths: Account for why students did well. Assignment Design? Sequencing of assignments, building toward end-of-term assessment of each Criteria? Program focus on Critical Thinking? Instructor Feedback?

I have taught multiple sections of COM 112 every term since 1993. My course/instructor evaluations are consistently characterized as exceptional. It is nearly impossible for a student to receive a course grade less than a B. We have three speeches that are scaffolded from less to more cognitively challenging. I mention in multiple places in Canvas and our all-class weekly emails that I am available 24/7 for calls and questions. I list my cell number on the course syllabus. I also ask that students call to preview each speech before submitting it. Our conversations are much like a Writer’s Workshop. The first speech preview typically takes 15-20 minutes. The two remaining speech previews tend to be briefer lasting 8-10 minutes. Add to this, the rubrics I created are detailed, specific, and descriptive. Once a speech is submitted I listen to it, use the Canvas rubric to enter points and, add scoring comments for each rubric item. I also record a 10 minute feedback response for the student. In total, a student receives three different feedback sources for each speech assignment. The pattern I have seen in the last 24 years is those students who call and preview their speeches before recording and submitting receive an A or B. Those who do not score a D or F.

B) Challenges: Account for any dips in performance, even if meeting the Target: Was there a dip in any given criterion? Why?

COM 112 has a bi-modal competency distribution. The first group are those who complete the assignments. This group (78%) is within the Proficient/Adequate category. The second student group are those who simply do not attempt the speeches. This group (22%) is in the Developing category.

Action Plan:

After considerable reflection, I am troubled that 22.2% of my students are not meeting GEC CT requirements. The competency distribution is painfully obvious. Those who call and attempt a

speech will succeed. Sadly, those 6 students did not reach out despite multiple invitations from multiple sources to talk. Short of calling each student who has not engaged in the course by Week 2 I do not know what else to do? Suggestions?

Program faculty should discuss issues associated with encouraging student success in terms of simply doing the assignments for addressing them.