General Education Assessment Committee Report
Fall 2021- Spring 2022

Critical Thinking

Compiled by Joseph Genslinger, Associate Professor, Physical Sciences

During the 2021-2022 school year, critical thinking was assessed 103 times which is an increase of 55 assessments from the prior academic year. In regards to individual categories on the rubric, students were assessed on four subcomponents: perspective, analysis, vocabulary, and judgement. On a scale of 1-5, 3-5 is considered proficient, while 1-2 is considered to be not proficient.

Perspective: In 2021-2022, the students' average score on the perspective category was 4.14, and in 2020-2021, the average was 4.33. In the proficiency category, out of 103 rubrics, 100 were proficient which is 97.1%. This is a 1.3% increase from the 2020-2021 school year. In the not proficient category, out of the 103 rubrics, 3 scored not proficient, which is 2.9%.

Analysis: In 2021-2022, the student's average score on the analysis category was 3.91, and in 2020-2021, the average was 4.06. In the proficiency category, out of 103 rubrics, 90 were proficient which is 87.4%. This is a 6.4% decrease over the 2020-2021 academic year. In the not proficient category, out of the 251 rubrics, 13 scored not proficient, which is 12.6%.

Vocabulary: In 2021-2022, the student's average score on the vocabulary category was 4.10, and in 2020-2021, the average was 4.17. In the proficiency category, out of 103 rubrics, 97 were proficient which is 94.2%. This is a 0.4% increase from the 2020-2021 school year. In the not proficient category, out of the 251 rubrics, 6 scored not proficient, which is 5.8%.

Judgement: In 2021-2022, the students' average score on the judgement category was 4.06, and in 2020-2021, the average was 4.33. In the proficiency category, out of 103 rubrics, 98 were proficient which is 95.2%. This is a 2.7% decrease over the 2020-2021 academic year. In the not proficient category, out of the 251 rubrics, 5 scored not proficient, which is 4.8%.

	Perspective (5)	Analysis (5)	Vocabulary (5)	Judgement (5)
AY 2021/2022 Average Scores	4.14	3.91	4.10	4.06

AY 2020/2021 Average Scores	4.33	4.06	4.17	4.33
# of Scores 3 or Above out of 103	100	90	97	98
AY 2021/2022 Proficiency	97.1%	87.4%	94.2%	95.2%
AY 2020/2021 Proficiency	95.8%	93.8%	93.8%	97.9%
% Change	*+1.3%*	*-6.4%*	*+0.4%*	*-2.7%*

After reviewing the data, it should be noted that the total number of students assessed increased by 55 students but the average score on the rubrics stayed above a 3.0 in each category (P-4.11, A-3.91, V-4.10, J-4.06). While the proficiency percentages decreased in 2 of 4 categories, the change was minimal. This is very likely the result of having a much smaller data set as well as the flip to online learning mid-semester, SPR 2020 and COVID during the 2020-2021 academic year.

In further analysis of the data, when looking at the assessment in totality, the average score was 16.20 out of a maximum of 20. This correlates to an 81.02%. If we average each category at 3, a minimum of 12 would be proficient. Of the 103 rubrics, 91.3% were 12 or higher. Of the 9 scores under 12, 2 of those students received a D or F in the course. Of the 3 rubric submissions of students who received D or F in the course, the average score was 8 out of 20.

Due to each category score being in the boundary of proficient, it should be noted that the interventions that faculty are using are potentially helping students' critical thinking skills. An intervention that could take place would be addressing if students understand the assignment vocabulary. Faculty could explain what vocabulary is expected in the assignment and what is appropriate. One way to do this is to relate the assignment or material back to the textbook or review the vocabulary that should be included in the assignment via a rubric. This would ensure students knew what vocabulary is expected. Another intervention that would support the students' understanding would require faculty using the rubric to make sure

students are helped to analyze their work in a way that the instructor expects for the assignment to be done, via a rubric for the individual assignment.

The overall score of not proficient is low but could be improved through the lead working with faculty directly to determine if students need to work on these skills or if an intervention, such as an assignment rubric, could be developed.

Diversity Awareness

Compiled by Justin Bernaix, Assistant Professor, English

During the Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 semesters, 38 students were assessed using the Diversity Awareness rubric for the General Education Assessment Committee. Students were assessed on assignments asking them to **identify, compare, contrast, and appreciate** diverse perspectives on topics that may be limited to the United States. (Such as American Indigenous Peoples.)

Scores were documented for 9 assignments in 6 different courses across campus in Fall 2021 and Spring 2022, offering a low sample size of 38 for the academic year. The AY averages were: 4.7 for Identify, 4.5 for Compare, 4.4 for Contrast, and 4.6 for Appreciate. All averages were well above 3.0.

Diversity Awareness Averages

Identify	Compare	Contrast	Appreciate
4.7	4.5	4.4	4.6

While a few more students were scored in Fall 2021 compared to Spring 2022, there is not a significant difference between average student scores.

	Students	Identify	Compare	Contrast	Appreciate
Fall 2019	23	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.6
Spring 2020	15	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7

Diversity Awareness Proficiency Rates (percent of all scores that were 4 or 5)

Fall 2021-Spring 2022

Identify	Compare	Contrast	Appreciate
95%	89%	89%	95%

Despite a very low sample size, our data seems consistent with previous semesters. While this year's average scores were higher across each rubric category, the scores reflect a similar trend (higher scores on Identify/Appreciate, lower scores on Compare/Contrast) to previous school years. As Kelly Obernuefemann notes in her 2019/2020 report: "Students can identify that there is an issue involving diversity, and they appreciate the need for a diversity of opinions, but when asked to show evidence comparing and contrasting diverse points of view, they come up short." However, although the trend is similar, it is difficult given the low sample size to determine whether students struggle with comparing/contrasting diverse cultures, or perhaps with analytical thinking in general.

Moving forward, we will need to work on faculty participation with GEAC and the Diversity Awareness criteria. The sample size during 2021/2022 dropped significantly. While some of the lack of participation might be attributed to the data breach in November 2021 that presented continued issues in the spring of 2022, the overall engagement with this work needs to improve to better assess our students. This might include embedded assessments in certain courses, as well as specific partnerships with selected faculty. I plan to work with both Mya Lawerence and our faculty to increase GEAC participation in this category and drive up the number of assignments and students we assess.

Math Reasoning

Compiled by Abby Stephens, Assistant Professor, Biology

No data was collected for the Math Reasoning outcome during this time period.

Oral Communication

Compiled by Jeff Harrison, Associate Professor, Speech Communication

During the 2021-22 academic year 94 students were assessed in the general education area of oral communication for the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC). The committee returned to the cohort method of selecting students to assess rather than assessing all students in a class, as had been past practice. Some of these students were assessed more than once. Overall, the average score of students on the speaking rubric for this time period was 44.3 (out of 50) or 88.6%. This score falls well within the boundaries set for proficiency (80%).

Category	Average 2021-2022 (1-5)
Grabber/Preview	4.6
Main Points	4.6
Support	4.6
Conclusion	4.4
Organization	4.5
Does Not Read	4.0
Language	4.5
Vocal Elements	4.2
Nonverbal Elements	4.2
Meets Criteria	4.7
Total (out of 50)	**44.3**

The individual scores on the speaking rubric ranged from 4.7 (Meets Criteria) to 4.0 (Does Not Read Presentation). The area Meets Criteria is consistently in the top tier of scores. This year they are followed closely by the categories of Grabber/Preview, Main Points, and Support. It is not unusual to see these categories hold this distinction. Once again, the category of Does Not Read Presentation was on the bottom, however it still meets the criteria for proficiency, with an average score of 4.0. In past years that category has seen average scores between 3.5-3.8. When analyzing the average scores for individual categories on the speaking rubric, all categories fell within the boundaries of proficiency (4.0). While the average score of the category Does Not Read Presentation fell within the proficiency level during this time, it still remains the category with the lowest average score. Faculty can aid in raising this category's scores in several ways.

First, instructors should encourage students to not write out their entire oral presentation and take it to the podium with them. Students will then not be tempted to read their speech. Suggesting the use of a speaking outline or notes that contain only keywords and/or phrases to help students remember what they want to say will help with an extemporaneous delivery. Templates and examples of speaking outlines can be obtained in the Communications Lab.

Faculty should also address the topic of speech anxiety when the oral presentation is assigned. Speech anxiety is natural, and talking about ways to help reduce anxiety symptoms before speaking will help make speakers more comfortable about delivering their presentations extemporaneously.

Instructors should encourage their students to practice their presentation out loud several times before delivering it for a grade. Practicing will help instill confidence in the speaker, knowing they are well-prepared. As students become more confident, they rely less on notes.

Finally, instructors should encourage their students to visit the Communications Lab where they can receive one-on-one help with speeches and/or presentations. The tutors in the lab can help students do everything from choosing a topic, to properly structuring and organizing a speech, to choosing appropriate presentation aids, to practicing their speech extemporaneously. Students have the option of having their practice session videotaped, where the tutor will then sit with the student and immediately review the presentation, pointing out both the positive elements the speaker possesses along with any elements that still may need work.

According to Mary Busler, lead tutor in the Communications Lab, during the 2021-22 semester she made 9 in-person visits to various classrooms to speak to students about the lab. She states there was a total of 234 visits to the Communications Lab by students seeking help with oral presentations before presenting them in class for a grade. Some of the disciplines from which these students came include Computer Information Systems, English, Medical Assisting, Supported College Transition, and Speech Communication. With all average scores being within the proficiency level, we can surmise these visits to the Communication Lab help contribute to those scores.

It should be noted that not all disciplines who visited the Communications Lab participated in assessing oral presentations for GEAC, and those students and their scores are not represented in this report.

Teamwork Skills

Compiled by Rebecca Gockel, Professor, Paralegal Studies

During the 2021-2022 academic year, the General Education Assessment rubric for Teamwork Skills was utilized to assess a sample of students in various disciplines for which data was collected and reported based on faculty and peer evaluations of students participating team-based projects where the four criteria (Cooperation, Contribution, Preparation and Member Responsibility) could be appropriately applied. Two hundred twenty-eight (228) students were assessed (Fall 2021 through Summer 2022) by two (2) different instructors. Six (6) different sections of one discipline, with two (2) different courses within those disciplines, participated in assessing teamwork skills at Lewis & Clark Community College.

All partnering faculty members used the same standardized assessment rubric to evaluate students' teamwork skills proficiency levels in various classes. The instructors submitted the rubric scores electronically. Point values on the rubric ranged from 1-5, with one being Nonexistent/Unacceptable and five being Superior. A perfect score of 5 on the evaluation deemed proficient, therefore a score of 4 or higher on individual elements was considered proficient. Theoretically, it would be possible for a student to receive a score below proficiency

level on an individual criterion and yet score at or above proficiency overall. A total score between 60-80% is deemed to be below proficiency, and a total score below 60% is deemed not to be proficient. There were four criteria for measuring social relations proficiency: Cooperation, Contribution, Preparation, and Member Responsibility.

Overall, the average score of students on the Teamwork Skills rubric in AY 2021/2022 was 89%. This average is above the boundaries set for proficiency. The four criteria ranked from highest to lowest with Cooperation on top (4.72), Preparation and Member Responsibility tied at second (4.6) and Contribution was the lowest (4.4). When analyzing the mean scores for individual criteria on the Teamwork Skills rubric, I found that no categories fell within the "below proficiency" or "not proficient" levels. Changes from the previous reporting period are as follows: Total number of students assessed decreased from 228 to 25 from last reporting period. (Note: This significant decrease in the number of students assessed as compared to previous reporting cycles can be attributed to the change in process and conversion to cohort samples.) Cooperation level (4.69 v. 4.72) increased by .01%%. Contribution level (4.57 v. 4.4) decreased by .04%. Preparation level (4.63 v. 4.6) increased by .01%. Member Responsibility level (4.59 v. 4.6) increased by .002%. The overall level of proficiency average (93.3% v. 89%) decreased by 4.3%

Teamwork Skills Results AY2019/2020 vs. AY 2021/2022:

	Cooperation (5)	Contribution (5)	Preparation (5)	Member Responsibility (5)
AY 2019/2020 Average Scores	4.69	4.57	4.63	4.59
AY 2021/2022 Average Scores	4.72	4.40	4.60	4.60
% Change	*+.01%*	*-.04%*	*+.01%*	*+.002%*

AY 2019/2020 Proficiency	93.8%	91.4%	92.6%	91.8%
AY 2021/2022 Proficiency	94%	88%	92%	92%
% Change	*+.2%*	*-3.4%*	*+.6%*	*+.2*

Participating faculty collected data from faculty members at L&C who used the General Education Teamwork Rubric. The teamwork skills lead provided consulting, mentoring, assistance, expertise, analysis and other support to the teamwork skills partners with the intent to determine areas for future improvement within their respective classes/programs. The teamwork skills lead followed up with the faculty-partners through either written or face-to-face communications. The teamwork skills lead provided assistance with interpreting data, creating appropriate tools for measuring teamwork skills, identifying areas for improvement, suggesting actions to take, and analyzing the impact of interventions.

While all levels of proficiency were nearly unchanged from the last reporting cycle, three (Cooperation, Preparation and Member Responsibility) were just slightly higher than last reporting period and one (Contribution) was slightly lower with an overall 4.3% decrease in teamwork skills proficiency. This is an insignificant decline when you consider the low percentages of change for all four criteria. There was a less than one percent change in all four criteria this reporting cycle. It could be speculated that the high proficiency levels in all four criteria is a direct result of the interventions done by our faculty at L&C who design projects and utilize the teamwork skills rubric, because they have developed a solid understanding of the definitions of each criterion and how to assess those skills (Cooperation, Contribution, Preparation and Member Responsibility). The wide variety of assignments faculty are using the rubric for has been growing to an impressive list of creative assignments in certain areas of disciplines, which may not be obvious for teams. Our data continues to support the fact that our students at L&C demonstrate high proficiency levels in their abilities to participate, cooperate, contribute and share responsibility when working together as a team.

Writing

Compiled by Emily Corby, Professor, English

In our first full semester of teaching virtually during the pandemic, Fall 2020, the committee began to plan for a return to assessing a GEAC Cohort. Discussions involved the criteria by which we'd establish a Cohort, changes to the Blazernet scoring system, and testing the new methods with our own classes before rolling out the changes to all faculty in the academic year 2021-2022. Below is the wrap-up email I sent to committee members in May 2021 as I finished my tenure as chair:

> Happy Tuesday, GEAC Team.
>
> As we're rapidly approaching the end of 2020-2021, I wanted to send one more email to highlight all that we've accomplished this year. Working virtually has provided the opportunity to pause, reflect, and redirect our committee tasks. As a result of taking a planning year, we:
>
> 1. Decided to return to a cohort model of general education assessment,
> 2. Created a set of criteria for the Gen Ed Cohort,
> 3. Requested Blazernet changes to identify the cohort for scoring,
> 4. Tested the Blazernet score submission tool for the cohort,
> 5. Tested the live worksheet tool for viewing submitted cohort scores,
> 6. Revised the cohort criteria to better suit our needs, and
> 7. Finally updated the website (www.lc.edu/geac).
>
> The pandemic didn't slow us down at all.
>
> Assuming fall 2021 will mostly/fully allow a return to "normal," next year's Chair should be able to announce these changes to all faculty at that point and request their participation. Then by fall 2022, we'll be ready to gather the year's scores and report on how well our GEAC Cohort students are doing in the six outcomes.
>
> I hope you all have a wonderful summer. May the 4th be with you. :)
>
> Emily

The following report captures the student writing scores using the new methods, from the trial semester of Spring 2021 through the academic year 2021-2022 (Fall 2021, Spring 2022, and Summer 2022). There were no Summer 2021 scores submitted.

In Spring 2021 and AY 2021-2022, 5 faculty partners shared 49 sets of their students' writing scores with GEAC through Blazernet. Courses where students were assessed include ART 153, DENT 248, ENGL 132, HIST 132, HIST 135, HIST 231, HIST 232, HUMN 241, LITT 135, and PLGL 160.

While these numbers are down substantially from the previous year, we acknowledged in our committee planning discussions that we should expect to see fewer students meet the criteria for Cohort scoring. In my own classes, I see a range of 0-3 GEAC Cohort students per section. While I was sharing all students' scores at times with the old method, I'm now limited to sharing scores only for those who've already completed a specific combination of courses. GEAC partners are likely seeing similarly low numbers of Cohort students marked on their rosters.

With this smaller Cohort, we expect to see "generally educated" students performing well in our six outcomes. This first test of the theory did demonstrate evidence that students in the Cohort are writing very well in their classes across campus. Comparing scores from just over one year to scores from the previous six-year study (2014-2020) is merely a snapshot, though, and we'll continue tracking these Cohort writing scores for years to come as the sample grows larger with each report.

The six writing criteria which are assessed by instructors include Thesis, Support, Organization, Critical Thinking, Grammar, and Word Choices. Point values range from 1-5, with 5 representing a superior score, 4 representing a good score, 3 an average score, 2 below average, and 1 unacceptable or nonexistent. A score of 4 or 5 is considered proficient in this report.

A proficient **thesis** contains a clear subject and argument and is placed close to the beginning of the assignment, addressing the prompt; it may also be presented creatively. The Cohort samples submitted between Spring 2021 and Summer 2022 demonstrate 95.9% thesis proficiency. This proficiency rate is well above the previous study's 76.6% thesis proficiency, when a student in any course, with any range of course completions in their educational background could be part of the sample.

A proficient score for **support** requires at least two strong main points and/or examples which relate to the main topic, and if a word count requirement is established, it meets or exceeds that sum. The Cohort samples submitted between from Spring 2021 to Summer 2022 demonstrate 81.6% support proficiency. This is also a higher proficiency rate than the previous study's 73.2%.

A proficient **organization** score indicates that the writing assignment is well organized with good topic sentences and possibly even transitions to smoothly guide the reader from one point to the next. The Cohort samples submitted between Spring 2021 and Summer 2022 demonstrate 79.6% organization proficiency. The previous study indicated a 74.3% proficiency rate for organization.

A proficient **critical thinking** score demonstrates analysis-, synthesis-, and/or evaluation-level thinking. The Cohort samples submitted between Spring 2021 and Summer 2022 demonstrate 83.7% proficiency. The critical thinking proficiency rate for the previous study was 70.6%.

A proficient **grammar** score is assigned to a paper with no more than one major grammar error (typically subject-verb agreement errors, fragments, or run-on sentences) and no more than ten

minor grammar errors (for example, misspelled words or typos, missing or misplaced articles or prepositions, missing or misplaced commas or apostrophes, pronoun-antecedent agreement errors, or inconsistent application of capitalization rules). The Cohort samples submitted between Spring 2021 and Summer 2022 demonstrate 87.7% grammar proficiency. This compares favorably to the previous study's 72.1% proficiency in grammar.

A proficient score for **word choices** means there are no more than two problems with word choice, awkward phrasing, or inconsistent point of view in the writing assignment. The Cohort samples submitted between Spring 2021 and Summer 2022 demonstrate 89.8% proficiency in word choices. The previous study indicated that only 72.4% of students were proficient in this area.

Samples from this Spring 2021 + AY 2021-2022 Cohort scored 90.6% of the **total** possible points on the GEAC writing rubric. The previous study, from Fall 2014 to Fall 2020, showed that students were scoring 80.3% of the total available points.

Across the board, the Spring 2021 + AY 2021-2022 Cohort sample performed very well in all categories, averaging above four points in all six criteria and outperforming the 2014-2020 all-student sample in all categories.

Our shift to a Gen Ed cohort eliminated some of the unknown variables of concern from the previous study, such as students' educational background (courses/sequences completed), total course credits completed, and course level at which the writing was assessed. All students in the Cohort have completed ENGL 131 or ENGL 137, for example, so they've had at least one full semester of practicing their essay writing skills. This can help explain their higher writing scores. The full Cohort description is below:

> A cohort student is any student who has completed at least 30 hours at L&C including at least one course from each of the following categories:
>
> - BIOL, CHEM, PHSC, or PHYS
> - ECON 151 or 152; HIST 131, 132, 231, or 232; PSYC 131, or SOCI 131
> - ART, HUMN, LITT, MUSI, or PHIL
> - MATH 131, MATH 138, MATH 145, or MATH 171
> - SPCH 131* or 145*
> - ENGL 131 or 137
>
>   OR
>
> A career student who has completed at least 30 hours at L&C including at least one course from each of the following categories:
>
> - ECON 151 or 152, HIST 231 or 232, PSYC 131, or SOCI 131
> - ENGL 131 or 137

- SPCH 131* or 145*
- MATH 112 or above or any BIOL, CHEM, PHSC, or PHYS

*=Completed or currently enrolled in one of these sections

Score averages and proficiency rates indicate that GEAC Cohort students are writing well in their classes across campus.

Writing Averages

	Thesis (out of 5)	Support (out of 5)	Organization (out of 5)	Critical Thinking (out of 5)	Grammar (out of 5)	Word Choices (out of 5)	Total (out of 30)
Current: SP 2021-SU 2022	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6	27.2
Previous: FA 2014-FA 2020	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	24.1

Writing Proficiency Rates (percent of all scores that were 4 or 5)

	Thesis	Support	Organization	Critical Thinking	Grammar	Word Choices
Current: SP 2021-SU 2022	95.9	81.6	79.6	83.7	87.7	89.8
Previous: FA 2014-FA 2020	76.6	73.2	74.3	70.6	72.1	72.4