CENTRAL OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Outcome Assessment Analysis

Theme: Transfer and Articulation
Program Focus Area: Writing, Information Literacy
Course: WR 122 English Composition

Outcome(s)
Theme-Level Outcome: Have a high-quality education by meeting AAOT/AS student learning outcomes in the AAOT SLOs.   **Program-Level Focus Area Outcomes:**   **Writing**   2. Locate, evaluate, and ethically utilize information to communicate effectively   **Information Literacy**   4. Evaluate information and its source critically   **Course-Level Outcome:** Identify and use sources appropriately, including evaluating information for accuracy and reliability.

Assessment		
Classification: Would you classify your assessment as direct or indirect? *(See reverse.)*	☒ Direct	☐ Indirect

Description:
Description: Briefly describe the methodology of your assessment. How did you set up and administer your assessment? How did you collect data? (e.g. Rubric, Exam, Skills Performance Checklist, Survey)   A four-person evaluation team performed a secondary evaluation on WR 122 annotated bibliographies sent in from a random sampling of sections (see attached rubric). These sections included computer-mediated, online, and College Now sections.   Each paper received four evaluations. Results were compiled into mean and median scores, including variation and standard deviation measures. Accompanying graphs illustrate the average distribution of scores.   ***Benchmark (if available)***: *Desired performance of ___ % success rate by the cohort of students*

Assessment Cohort Demographics
Number of course sections assessed: 7 / Number offered: 14 = 50% of courses assessed   Number of students assessed: 20/ Number of students in all sections: 292= 7% of students assessed

Results
Reporting: What did you find? How many students or what percentage of students met, partially met or did not meet the outcome(s)?   Students performed well for both outcomes though it is not possible at this time to state whether the outcome benchmark, which has not yet been set, has been met.

Analysis
Overall summary of observations: What do the assessment results say about how well all students achieved the intended student learning outcomes? If the outcome(s) was partially or not met, does your analysis of the assessment suggest possible reasons why?

Generally, the Writing outcome assessment suggests that of the WR 122 students assessed 60% located or evaluated information ethically at an exceptional or proficient level. In the Information Literacy assessment, the evaluators found no sources were discreditable and found 55% of the sources to be highly creditable.

Inter-rater Reliability
Average variation was 0.319–0.464, and few scores were higher than the average, suggesting that the four instructors scored students similarly.

Krippendorff's alpha coefficient was chosen in order to assess inter-rater reliability because of the number of evaluators and the nature of coding textual units into analyzable quantities on a rubric, and the ability to assign a rank from several choices (ordinal data). The reliability of the evaluation was .691 in both assessments, which is within in the acceptable range for Krippendorff's alpha.

Closing the Loop

Preliminary Recommendations: What does this project suggest is the next step? Run the assessment again and continue to collect data? Modify the assessment? Make changes to the curriculum?

The best step is to run the assessment again and again until meaningful trends can be analyzed.

Plans for reassessment following curriculum change: If changes are made to your course, how might you reassess for improvement?

The assessment does not suggest a clear indication of what would need to be improved.

Are you satisfied with this assessment project? If so, why? If not, how might you modify it so that it might produce more meaningful data?

The data suggests that WR 122 students are doing well at ethically locating and evaluating sources, which may indicate the success of our efforts to align outcomes and assignments across WR courses.

The lack in significant variation may also suggest that composition committee norming exercises have been effective. We must, however, be cautious with either of these assertions since a single assessment does not indicate sustained performance.

When we designed the study, we hoped to drill into how different modes of instruction might play a role in WR 122 (e.g. if computer-mediated classroom students had an advantage over online or face-to-face instruction or vice versa). While we took samples from each of these areas, this initial assessment does not differentiate the students' learning experience, which is something that we would like to look at in the future, likely with a larger sample size.

Distribution of WR SLO #2 Scores (by Average Score)

Level of Proficiency

- Exceptional: 20%
- Proficient: 40%
- Learner: 25%
- Novice: 15%
- Unacceptable: 0%

■ % of Students

Distribution of IL #4 Scores (by Average Score)

- Highly Credible - 4: 20%
- Highly Credible -3: 35%
- Credible -2: 35%
- Credible-1: 10%
- Discreditable

■ % of Students