

Palo Alto College Assessment of Institutional General Education Competencies Spring 2011 Report

During Spring 2011, Palo Alto College continued to strengthen existing processes for assessment of institutional general education competencies, using again the direct evidence approach it launched in Fall 2010. Three competencies were assessed: Critical/Creative Thinking, Personal Responsibility, and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills. Three learning outcomes were specified for each of these competencies. Embedded assignments were submitted to independent assessors who evaluated student work using a common descriptive rubric. The rubrics and assignment templates are in Appendix A of this report.

The Process and Procedures Used

Student and Course Selection:

A group of Palo Alto College students who had taken 45 or more college credit hours, who were enrolled in the Spring 2011 semester, and who were taking at least three courses was identified by Institutional Research. From this group a random sample of 105 students was chosen as the focus of the assessment effort (approximately 10% of projected graduates). Using the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's crosswalk between core curriculum courses and core curriculum competencies, courses were selected from each student's schedule in order to assess the student, where possible, in all three of these competencies: Critical/Creative Thinking Skills, Personal Responsibility, and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills.

In an effort to strengthen and produce better student outcomes in distance education, the decision was made to give preferences to online courses when selecting courses from the students' schedules. The following details the method used for course selection from each student's schedule:

- Any courses addressing Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills were identified. Of this
 group of courses, all of which were necessarily core curriculum courses, if any were distance
 learning courses, they were given priority. If more than one course was a distance learning
 course, then a random method was used to choose the course. If none of the courses were
 distance learning courses, then a random method was used to choose the Empirical and
 Quantitative Reasoning Skills course.
- 2. Any courses addressing Personal Responsibility were identified. Of this group of core courses, if any were distance learning courses, they were given priority. If more than one course was a distance learning course, then a random method was used to choose the course. If none of the courses were distance learning courses, then a random method was used to choose the Personal Responsibility course.
- 3. Critical/Creative Thinking Skills are addressed in every course, whether core curriculum course or not and thus guided the last selected course. Of the remaining courses, any distance learning



courses were identified. If more than one course fell into this category, then a random method was used to select the course. If there were no distance learning courses remaining, then core courses were given priority and a random method for selecting the course was used. If there were no core courses remaining, then a random method for selecting the course was used to choose the Critical/Creative Thinking Skills course.

Student Assignments for Assessment:

All assignments requested for a given competency were numbered to aid in disaggregating the data for overall results, core course results, and distance learning course results. The selected courses, with student names and the competencies to be assessed, were then disaggregated by faculty member and the department chairs disseminated the assignment requests to their respective faculty members. Faculty members used embedded assignments for each assessment, completing the "Assignment Template" for the competency in order to provide assessors with greater insight and to aid fair judgment.

Assessment Training and Logistics

Volunteer faculty Assessors received Calibration Training in order to standardize, to the degree possible, assessment of student artifacts. Assessors received training on the use of the Judgment Spreadsheets and the assessment process, and sample Critical/Creative Thinking, Personal Responsibility, and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills assignments were judged as a part of the training.

Student artifacts for Critical/Creative Thinking, Personal Responsibility, and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills, attached to Assignment Templates, were sent to the Director of Instructional Professional Development. Once assignments and Templates were received, they were provided a number and all instructor markings, student names, and instructor names were removed from the document. Two copies were made.

Each assessor received a set of assignments, each accompanied by the Assignment Template and the appropriate rubric. Every assignment was then independently assessed by two assessors. The results of the assessments were recorded on Judgment Spreadsheets, which were then sent with the assignments to the Director of Instructional Professional Development. The Director of Instructional Professional Development compiled all results on a master spreadsheet.

In cases where paired assessors reached judgments that were polar opposites, a third assessor was brought in. Third assessors reported their judgments to the Director of Instructional Professional Development. In cases where the third assessor's judgment agreed with one of the initial two assessors, the two common assessments were kept as the assessment findings. In cases where the third assessor's judgment did not match either of the original assessors judgments, the highest two judgments were chosen for that objective on that assignment and kept as the assessment findings. All assessment was completed by the last day of final exam week Spring 2011.



The Findings Report provided the data, reported by objective within each competency and also disaggregated by core courses and distance learning courses. These findings were shared with the faculty during Convocation Week, Fall 2011. Having reviewed the findings, faculty brainstormed to generate action plans for improving both the learning outcomes and the assessment process. The Findings Report and the worksheet used during faculty meetings early Fall 2011 semester to develop related action plans are in Appendix B of this report.

Summary of Findings

Participation Rates

Overall, 232 assignments from the 105 students in the sample were submitted for assessment of the three competencies. One hundred seventeen faculty were asked to submit at least one assignment. Of the 232 assignments requested, 207 were student assignments from core courses and 101 were student assignments from distance learning courses. Of the 232 assignments requested, 159 assignments were actually assessed (69%). Most of the missing assignments were attributed to students in the sample who had dropped their course(s). Of the 105 students identified, 49 students (47%) had missing assignments due to dropping the course or assignments not submitted in time to be assessed. Including faculty assessors, 130 faculty participated in the assessment of the competencies Spring 2011 semester.

Critical/Creative Thinking Findings

The total number of Critical/Creative Thinking assignments requested was 95. Of these 95, 70 were from core courses and 40 were from distance learning courses.

The total number of Critical/Creative Thinking assignments assessed was 71(75%). The reasons for the missing assignments are the following:

- 20 students dropped and did not complete the assessment assignment,
- 2 students submitted their assignments too late to be assessed,
- 1 faculty member did not respond to request for updates on the student so the reason for not submitting the assignment is unknown, and,
- 1 faculty member did not have an assignment in the course that addressed the competency.

Of these 71 assessed assignments, 49 were from core courses and 31 were from distance learning courses.

Overall, for the 71 assessed courses, the ratings for all three critical thinking outcomes exceeded the target of 70% either meeting or exceeding expectations.



The highest scoring outcomes overall were outcome 1: **Inquiry and Analysis** - Students pose vital questions and identify problems, formulating them clearly and precisely, and outcome 2: **Evaluation and Synthesis** -Students consider alternative viewpoints, recognize and assess assumptions, and identify possible consequences (for both of these outcomes, 84% of assessed assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations). The lowest scoring outcome overall was outcome 3: **Creative Thinking and Innovation** - Students apply creative ideas or approaches to achieve solutions or complete projects (70% of assessed assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations).

For the 49 core courses, the highest scoring outcome for critical thinking was outcome 2: **Evaluation** and **Synthesis** -Students consider alternative viewpoints, recognize and assess assumptions, and identify possible consequences (87% of assessed core course assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations). The lowest scoring outcome for core course assignments was outcome 3: **Creative Thinking and Innovation** - Students apply creative ideas or approaches to achieve solutions or complete projects (74% of assessed core assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations). The ratio of assessed to identified core critical thinking assignments was 70%.

The highest outcome for the 31 distance learning critical thinking assignments was outcome 2: **Evaluation and Synthesis** -Students consider alternative viewpoints, recognize and assess assumptions, and identify possible consequences (86% of assessed core course assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations). The lowest outcome for distance learning assignments was outcome 3: **Creative Thinking and Innovation** - Students apply creative ideas or approaches to achieve solutions or complete projects (70% of assessed core assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations). The ratio of assessed to identified distance learning critical thinking assignments was 75%.

Personal Responsibility Findings

The total number of Personal Responsibility assignments requested was 62. All 62 were from core courses and 32 were from distance learning courses.

The total number of Personal Responsibility assignments assessed was 33 (53%). The reasons for the missing assignments are the following:

- 21 students dropped and did not complete the assessment assignment,
- 1 student submitted the assignment too late to be assessed,
- 2 faculty members did not respond to request for updates on the student so the reason for not submitting the assignments is unknown, and,
- 5 faculty submitted assignments that did not address the outcome they indicated on the assignment template (the assignments could not be assessed using the rubric).

Of these 33 assessed assignments, 33 were from core courses and 13 were from distance learning courses.



For all 33 assessed courses, two Personal Responsibility outcomes exceeded the target of 70% or more either meeting or exceeding expectations. Those outcomes were outcome 2: Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems. (85% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations) and outcome 3: Students analyze alternative ethical perspectives and predict the ramifications of those perspectives to a situation (72% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations). One Personal Responsibility outcome did not meet the target of 70% either meeting or exceeding expectations. This outcome was outcome 1: Students assess their own ethical values and identify the origin of their values (68% either meeting or exceeding expectations).

Thus the highest scoring outcome overall was outcome 2: Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems (85% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations). The lowest scoring outcome overall was outcome 1: Students assess their own ethical values and identify the origin of their values (68% either meeting or exceeding expectations). Outcome 1 was the most addressed outcome in the submitted assignments and outcome 3 was the least addressed outcome in the submitted assignments.

For the 13 distance learning courses, the highest scoring outcome for personal responsibility was outcome 2: Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems (77% of assessed Distance Learning course assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations). The lowest scoring outcome for distance learning personal responsibility was outcome 3: Students analyze alternative ethical perspectives and predict the ramifications of those perspectives to a situation (30% of assessed distance learning assignments either meeting or exceeding expectations). The ratio of assessed distance learning personal responsibility assignments to identified personal responsibility assignments was 41%.

Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Findings

The total number of Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills assignments requested was 75. All 75 were from core courses and 29 were from distance learning courses.

The total number of Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills assignments assessed was 55 (73%). The reasons for the missing assignments are the following:

- 15 students dropped and did not complete the assessment assignment,
- 1 student submitted the assignment too late to be assessed,
- 3 faculty members did not respond to request for updates on their students so the reason for not submitting the assignment is unknown, and,
- 1 faculty member did not have an assignment in the course that addressed the competency.

Of these 55 assessed assignments, 55 were from core courses and 23 were from distance learning courses.



For all 55 assessed courses two Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills outcomes exceeded the target of 70% either meeting or exceeding expectations. Those outcomes were outcome 1: **E & Q Knowledge (Understand the Problem)** Students identify problems or hypotheses and related quantitative components (77% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations) and outcome 2: **E & Q Inquiry (Devises a Plan)** Students select appropriate quantitative approaches to analyze and solve problems and investigate hypotheses (79% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations). One Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills outcome did not meet the target of 70% either meeting or exceeding expectations. This was outcome 3: **E & Q Reasoning (Executes the Plan and Looks Back)** Students correctly apply quantitative approaches to analyze and solve problems or investigate hypotheses (65% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations).

Thus the highest scoring outcome for Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills overall was outcome 2: **E & Q Inquiry (Devises a Plan)** Students select appropriate quantitative approaches to analyze and solve problems and investigate hypotheses (79% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations), and the lowest scoring outcome overall was outcome 3: **E & Q Reasoning (Executes the Plan and Looks Back)** Students correctly apply quantitative approaches to analyze and solve problems or investigate hypotheses (65% of assessed assignments either meet or exceed expectations).

For the 23 distance learning courses, the highest scoring outcome for empirical and quantitative reasoning skills was outcome 1: **E & Q Knowledge (Understand the Problem)** Students identify problems or hypotheses and related quantitative components (100% of assessed distance learning assignments either meet or exceed expectations). The lowest scoring outcome for distance learning empirical and quantitative reasoning skills was outcome 3: **E & Q Reasoning (Executes the Plan and Looks Back)** Students correctly apply quantitative approaches to analyze and solve problems or investigate hypotheses (60% of assessed distance learning assignments either meet or exceed expectations).

Improvements Implemented Spring 2011 Based on Fall 2010 Assessment

The following is a list of improvements made in the Spring 2011 assessment that resulted from the Fall 10 assessment effort:

Professional Development to address Teamwork in Distance Learning Courses

Early in the Fall 2010 semester, some of the faculty teaching distance learning who were tapped for Teamwork assessment indicated that they do not address teamwork in their online course. This prompted professional development efforts to showcase ideas for addressing teamwork in distance learning courses. A document with ideas and suggestions was compiled, and a face-to-face Online Teamwork Show-and-Share session was held during the Spring 2011 Convocation Week. During the Convocation Week session, Alamo College faculty presented their courses to their colleagues. Additionally, July 13 and July 14, 2011, Dr. Judith Boettcher, author and national expert in online learning, presented workshops to the faculty on the framework and the best principles and practices for deepening learning experiences and knowledge building in online and blended learning. Dr. Boettcher



also addressed building community in online courses, and the use of teamwork as a community building strategy.

Professional Development to Aid Non-English and Non-Speech Faculty in the Promotion of Student Learning of Written and Oral Communication Skills

Employee Development Day (9/29/10) included a faculty-to-faculty session led by English and Speech Faculty. This session provided tips on promoting and assessing written and oral communication skills across the curriculum.

Efforts to Increase Student Learning in Written Communication

The weakest outcome for Communication Skills involved the student use of grammar and sentence structure. The Writing Center (the tutoring center that coaches students on written communication skills) created on-line help sheets for students addressing grammar and sentence structure, and during Spring 2011 faculty were directed to these summaries.

Efforts to Make the Assessment Process More User-Friendly to Faculty

Among the suggestions was the request that faculty be provided a longer span of time to submit assignments for assessment. During Fall 2010, data challenges in the process of identifying students gave faculty just one month to submit assignments. For Spring 2011, the process allowed faculty 2.5 months for collecting and submitting assignments for assessment from identified students. A second suggestion from the faculty was that a clarification of which Palo Alto College courses were responsible for addressing which general education competency be provided. A cross-walk file showing Palo Alto College courses and the General Education competencies that the courses addressed was created and disseminated to the faculty early in the Spring 2011 semester. A third faculty suggestion requested the creation of an Assessment website, facilitating faculty access to all assessment related materials. This website was launched February 25, 2011: http://www.alamo.edu/pac/assessment/development/. This website will be updated twice a year.

Professional Development Efforts to Assist Faculty in Understanding the Assessment Process

Faculty requested that professional development sessions be scheduled which would strengthen their understanding of the assignment expectations for the three competencies assessed Spring 2011. Three professional development sessions were scheduled. In a further effort to reach out to faculty, distribution lists of the faculty who would be submitting Critical Thinking assignments, Personal Responsibility assignments, and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning assignments were created. Each faculty group received tips on analyzing their rubric, selecting or modifying an assignment, filling out the assignment template, and submitting the assignment and template. During Summer 2011, guidelines specific to the competencies to be assessed in Fall 2011 were developed and distributed to faculty.

Professional Development Efforts to Revise Assessment of Communication Skills and Teamwork Skills



During Fall 2011 Palo Alto College will again assess Communication Skills and Teamwork Skills. In order to strengthen the assessment of these two learning outcomes, two professional development sessions were held in Spring 2011, inviting faculty to create a 'community of practice' interested in promoting Communication and Teamwork Skills. These sessions gave faculty an opportunity to continue the Communication and Teamwork discussions initiated during the Spring 2011 Faculty Development Day. During Summer 2011, the Palo Alto College Assessment Team revised the assessment of Communication Skills and Teamwork Skills. Processes for submitting oral and visual communication assignments were revised. Teamwork assessment was revised to include a definition of Teamwork and an improved rubric. This revision was based on faculty and student input which suggested that the assessment focus on teamwork processes rather than teamwork products. A student self- and peer-assessment document and a faculty assessment document were developed that aligned with the new rubric. Faculty advice and guideline documents were created to aid the faculty in using the new assessment process.

Opportunities for Improvement

Among the issues that should be examined as a result of the Spring 2011 assessment efforts are:

- Some faculty assessed their own students this happened predominantly in the Performing Arts (dance, music). The Summer Institute Team will examine this practice to determine if it is appropriate.
- Some assessors were not qualified to assess the assignments in their packet. In these cases,
 other qualified faculty were asked to serve as assessors. This tended to happen with math and
 science Critical Thinking and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills assignments. This may
 be remedied by the decision to recruit at least one assessor from each discipline that is
 associated with a competency being assessed.
- There were 73 assignments that were requested but not assessed. Of these 73, 56 were due to students dropping the course, 4 assignments were submitted too late to be assessed, 6 were from faculty who did not submit assignments, 5 were assignments that could not be assessed by the rubric, and 2 were from faculty who said that they did not address the competency in their course Fall semester. The number of students dropping courses was unexpectedly high; providing for this possibility will change the next sample size. A clarification of the purpose and process of general education assessment will be provided to the Chairs for distribution and discussion purposes.
- Some faculty submitted the assignment directions or test questions but did not submit student work. There is an ongoing need to provide guidance on appropriate submissions for assessment.
- Assessors reported that the Assignment Template questions were confusing. These Assignment Templates were revised during Summer 2011.



- Assessors reported that some assignments were difficult to assess because the assignment did
 not address the outcomes and their descriptors on the rubric. Faculty are reviewing assignments
 for applicability to assessment goals.
- Not all assignments submitted for Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills could be assessed
 on all three outcomes. This was not anticipated and the assignment template will be revisited.

Related Action Plans - Closing the Loop

All Palo Alto College faculty reviewed the Spring 2011 Assessment Findings Report and were invited to submit action plan suggestions during department meetings early Fall 2011 semester. Among the suggestions are the following:

Increase the Sample Size

Fall 2011 the size of the sample was increased to 125 students.

Provide More Information on the Findings Report to Aid in Interpreting the Report

The DL acronym was defined (Distance Learning) and information about the number of assessors judgments recorded for every assignment was included in the report.

Have Better Training and Guidance for the Faculty

Faculty Advice for Teamwork, Faculty Guidelines for Communication Assignments, Faculty Guidelines for Teamwork Assessments, and Faculty Assessor Guidelines documents were created. A Chair Talking Points document was created to help the chairs explain the revised Teamwork assessment process. Faculty asked to provide Communication or Teamwork artifacts for their students were invited to attend face-to-face training sessions. The Outcomes Assessment website was updated to include all rubrics, templates, guidelines, and supporting files.

Provide Individual Disciplines with Data Regarding the Material that Faculty are Submitting for Assessments

Faculty are asking for discipline-specific feedback to aid in the editing and fine-tuning of assignments and to support the development of action plans more directly affecting student learning outcomes. The implementation of the Key Assignments initiative will assist in the improvement of assignments for the Fall 2012 general education assessment cycle.

During the 2011-2012 Academic Year, faculty in all disciplines are creating curriculum maps for each college-level course which will cross-walk course student learning outcomes to their associated Institutional General Education Competencies. Faculty are then creating and submitting Key Assignments for each course which will address the course outcome and the General Education Competency associated with that outcome. These Key Assignments must be assessable using the



rubrics for the General Education Competency. Every department has at least one faculty member who has served as an assessor. The expertise of these faculty will aid in the vetting of the Key Assignments for that department (38 full-time faculty out of 111 full-time faculty have served as General Education Competency assessors).

Appendices

Appendix A

- 1. The Critical Thinking Skills Rubric
- 2. The Critical Thinking Skills Assignment Template
- 3. The Personal Responsibility Rubric
- 4. The Personal Responsibility Assignment Template
- 5. The Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Rubric
- 6. The Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Assignment Template

Appendix B

- 1. Overall Findings
- 2. Critical Thinking Findings
- 3. Personal Responsibility Findings
- 4. Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Findings
- 5. Faculty Feedback Worksheet



PALO ALTO COLLEGE Spring 11 Semester

Appendix A.1

Critical Thinking Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students use inquiry and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information, and innovation and creative thinking.

Specific Outcomes	Ē	Exceeds Expectations (3)	ž	Meets expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
Specific Outcome #1	•	Student accurately and thoroughly	•	Student states the purpose of the	 Student does not identify the
Inquiry and Analysis		states the purpose of the inquiry.		inquiry.	purpose of the inquiry.
C. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	•	Student poses relevant questions	•	Student poses relevant questions	 Student poses questions that do not
Students pose vital questions and	_	that thoroughly fulfill the purpose.		that substantially fulfill the purpose.	fulfill the purpose.
identify problems, formulating	•	Student clearly and logically	•	Student clearly and logically states	 Student does not state questions
them clearly and precisely.		expresses questions and problems in		questions and problems.	and problems clearly and logically.
		several ways to recognize			
	_	complexity.			
Specific Outcome #2	•	Student identifies multiple (more	•	Student identifies two alternative	 Student does not recognize
Evaluation and Synthesis		than two) alternative viewpoints.		viewpoints.	alternative viewpoints.
	•	Student identifies and assesses	•	Student identifies and assesses	 Student does not recognize
Students consider afternative		assumptions related to the		assumptions related to the two	assumptions associated with a
viewpoints, recognize and assess		viewpoints.		viewpoints.	viewpoint.
assumptions, and identify	•	Student identifies logical, significant,	•	Student identifies some logical	 Student does not identify
possible consequences. Students		potential implications and		implications and consequences for	implications or consequences.
will develop well-reasoned		consequences of alternative		each viewpoint.	 Student expresses an illogical
		viewpoints.	•	Student expresses a well reasoned	conclusion or solution.
conclusions and solutions.	•	Student clearly expresses multiple		logical conclusion.	
		logical and plausible alternative conclusions and solutions.			
Specific Outcome #3	•	Student creates a unique personal	•	Student creates a personal idea,	 Student fails to create an idea,
Creative Thinking and Innovation		idea, question, format, or product.		question, format, or product based	question, format, or product from an
יין	•	Student incorporates new directions		on an example.	example.
Studelits apply creative ideas of		or approaches to the assignment in	•	Student personalizes an example	 Student makes no attempt to
approaches to achieve solutions		the final product		direction or approach to achieve a	personalize direction or approach
or complete projects.				solution or complete a project.	given an example.
	_				

* Faculty indicate which of the three outcomes the submitted assignment addresses on the Critical Thinking Assignment template.

Adapted from the following LEAP Value Rubrics: Creative Thinking Rubric, Critical Thinking Rubric, Inquiry and Analysis Rubric, and Problem Solving Rubric, and St. Philip's College Critical Thinking Quality Enhancement Plan http://www.alamo.edu/spc/admin/gep/default.aspx



Appendix A.2

Critical Thinking Assignment Information

In order to help the Assessors judge the specific outcomes for the assignment that you are submitting, please provide the following background information:

Indicate the primary Critical Thinking focus for the assignment (you may check more than one): Outcome #1: Inquiry and analysis	Outcome #2: Evaluation and synthesis	Outcome #3 : Creative thinking and innovation	2. Indicate the directions that you provided to the student for the assignment (feel free to attach your directions to this document):	Please send this form attached to the assignment that you are submitting for your student(s) to Pat Stone <u>pstone11@alamo.edu</u> by (need to decide when this is due)
1. Indicate t	Outco	Outco	2. Indicate th	Please send this fo



PALO ALTO COLLEGE Spring 11 Semester

Appendix A.3

Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decisionmaking.

Specific Outcomes	Exceeds Expectation (3)	Meets Expectation (2)	Does Not Meet Expectation (1)
Specific Outcome #1 Students assess their own ethical values and identify the origin of their values.	 Student articulates an understanding of the impact the source of his or her ethical values has on his or her development. 	 Student states his or her own ethical values and the source of his or her ethical values. 	 Student states either his or her own ethical values or the source of his or her ethical values, but not both.
Specific Outcome #2 Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems.	 Student recognizes ethical issues when presented in a complex context. 	 Student recognizes basic ethical issues within a given situation and demonstrates partial understanding of their complexities. 	 Student does not recognize the basic ethical issues.
Specific Outcome #3 Students analyze alternative ethical perspectives and predict the ramifications of those perspectives to a situation.	Student applies ethical perspectives to an ethical question and specifies implications of the application of that perspective.	 Student identifies two ethical perspectives of a situation and analyzes the implications of those perspectives. 	 Student does not apply ethical perspectives to an ethical question.

^{*} Faculty indicate which of the three outcomes the submitted assignment addresses on the Personal Responsibility Assignment template.



Appendix A.4

Personal Responsibility Assignment Information

In order to help the Assessors judge the specific outcomes for the assignment that you are submitting, please provide the following background information:

|--|

_. (need to decide when this is due)



ALAMO

PALO ALTO COLLEGE Spring 11 Semester Empirical and Quantitative Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students apply scientific and mathematical concepts to analyze and solve problems to investigate hypotheses.

Appendix A.5

analyze and solve problems to investigate in pources.		congaic mypomeses.			
Specific Outcomes	ш	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Σ	Meets Expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
Specific Outcome #1	•	Student formulates a clear	•	Student describes the problem or	 Student does not understand
E & Q Knowledge (Understand		description of the problem or		hypothesis and presents a list of	the problem or hypothesis and
the Problem)		hypothesis and correctly		related quantitative components	cannot specify quantitative
Students identify problems or		specifies all appropriate major		to be examined.	components to examine.
hypotheses and related		quantitative components to be			
quantitative components.		examined.			
Specific Outcome #2	•	Student selects and prioritizes all	•	Student selects and prioritizes a	 Student selects quantitative
E & Q Inquiry (Devises a Plan)		quantitative information		list of quantitative information	information that is inappropriate
Students select appropriate		appropriate to analyzing and		appropriate to analyzing and	to analyzing and solving the
		solving the problem or		solving the problem or	problem or to investigate the
duantifative approaches to		investigating the hypothesis.		investigating the hypothesis.	hypothesis.
analyze and solve problems and	•	Student identifies multiple	•	Student identifies one approach	 Student does not identify an
investigate hypotheses		approaches to analyzing and		to analyze and solve the problem	appropriate approach to analyze
		solving the problem or		or investigate the hypothesis	and solve the problem or
		investigating the hypothesis along		along with the associated	investigate the hypothesis.
		with the associated quantitative		quantitative information.	
	_	information.			
Specific Outcome #3	•	Student correctly applies	•	Student correctly applies	 Student incorrectly applies
E & Q Reasoning (Executes the		quantitative approaches to		quantitative approaches to	quantitative approaches to
Plan and Looks Back)		analyze and solve the problem or		analyze and solve the problem or	analyze and solve the problem or
Ctick Character Control of Character		to investigate the hypothesis.		to investigate the hypothesis.	to investigate the hypothesis.
Studellis collectify apply	•	Student reflects on his/her work			
quantitative approaches to		and identifies connections to			
analyze and solve problems or		similar problems or experiments.			
investigate hypotheses.	•	Student reflects on his/her work			
Students summarize and reflect		and identifies more efficient			
on their learning experiences		approaches.			



Appendix A.6

Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Assignment Information

In order to help the Assessors judge the specific outcomes for the assignment that you are submitting, please provide background information on the assignment (feel free to attach your assignment directions to this document). Please send this form attached to the assignment that you are submitting for your student(s) to Pat Stone pstone11@alamo.edu, EO 130, by the Wednesday before Finals Week this semester.

Palo Alto College Institutional General Education Competencies Assessment

Sp 2011 Findings Report: Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills, Personal Responsibility, and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills

Overall Findings							
	105 students who were taking 3 or more courses Spring 11 who had completed	no were taking 3	or more	courses Sprir	ıg 11 wh	o had complet	pa
Total Number of Students in the Sample:	45 cc	45 college credit hours at PAC before Spring 11 semester	ırs at PAC	before Sprin	g 11 serr	nester	ĺ
Total Number of Critical Thinking Courses Identified:		95	Core:	70	DL:	40	
Total Number of Critical Thinking Courses Assessed:		71 (75%)	Core:	49 (70%)	DL:	31 (78%)	
Total Number of Personal Responsibility Courses Identified:		62	Core:	62	DL:	32	
Total Number of Personal Responsibility Courses Assessed:		33 (53%)	Core:	33 (53%)	DL:	13 (41%)	
Total Number of Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Courses Identified:	ses Identified:	75	Core:	75		29	
Total Number of Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Courses Assessed:	ses Assessed:	55 (73%)	Core:	55 (73%)	DL:	23 (79%)	
Total Number of Courses Identified:		232	Core:	207	DL:	101	
Total Number of Courses Assessed:		159 (69%)	Core:	137 (66%)	DI:	(%99) 29	
Number of Faculty Requested to Submit At Least One Assignment	ment	116	5				
Additional Faculty Who Served as Assessors (Not in Above Group)	roup)	14	4				
Total Faculty Involved (both as submitters of assignments and assessors)	nd assessors)	130	0				
7 Critical Assessment Teams	3 faculty each						
5 Personal Responsibility Assessment Teams	3 faculty each						
5 Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Assessment Teams	3 faculty each						
Additional Information to Aid in the Interpretation of the Findings:	ndings:						
DL is Distance Learning							
Every assignment was assessed by at least two assessors. A third assessor was used in cases where the assessments were polar opposites	third assessor was used in ca	ases where the	ssessmer	its were pola	r opposi	tes	

Critical T	Critical Thinking Findings	nding	S					
Total Number of Critical Thinking Courses Identified:	95		Core:	70		DI:	44	
Total Number of Critical Thinking Assignments Assessed	71	0.747		49	0.7		31	0.775
Comprehensive Results for Critical Thinking This com	This competency has the best #Assessed/#Identified Ratio	he best	#Assesse	d/#lde	ntified Ra	tio		
Total Assessments for Outcome #1	116*		* 2 assess	ors/assi	assessors/assignment			
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	97	0.836	84%					
Total Assessments for Outcome #2	106*		* 2 assess	ors/assi	assessors/assignment			
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2	89	0.84	84%	8	Strongest C	Outcome		
Total Assessments for Outcome #3	54*		* 2 assess	assessors/assignment	gnment			
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3	38	0.704	20%	2	Weakest O	Outcome		
Core Course Results for Critical Thinking					B 11.			
Total Number of Critical Thinking Core Courses Identified	70							
Total Number of Critical Thinking Core Courses Assessed	49	0.7	20%	>	Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identified	of Assessed t	to Identified	
Total Assessments for Outcome #1	84*		* 2 assess	ors/assi	assessors/assignment			
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	20	0.833	83%					
Total Assessments for Outcome #2	*92		* 2 assess	ors/assi	assessors/assignment			·
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2	99	0.868	81%	S	Strongest C	Outcome		
Total Assessments for Outcome #3	38*		* 2 assesso	assessors/assignment	gnment			
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3	28	0.737	74%	_	Weakest Outcome	utcome		
DL Course Results for Critical Thinking								
Total Number of Critical Thinking DL Courses Identified	44							
Total Number of Critical Thinking DL Courses Assessed	33	0.75	75%	Ś	Strongest Ratio of Assessed to Identified	of Assessed	to Identified	
Total Assessments for Outcome #1	28*		* 2 assesso	assessors/assignment	gnment			
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	49	0.845	82%					
Total Assessments for Outcome #2	56*		* 2 assesso	ors/assig	assessors/assignment			
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2	48	0.867	86%	S	Strongest C	Outcome		
Total Assessments for Outcome #3	20*		* 2 assess	assessors/assignment	gnment			
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3	14	0.7	%02	<u> </u>	Weakest Outcome	utcome		
Critical Thinking Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students use inquiry and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information, and innovation and creative thinking.	e inquiry and ana	lysis, ev	aluation and	synthe	sis of inform	nation, an	d innovat	ion and
Specific Outcome #1 (Inquiry and Analysis): Students pose vital questions and identify problems, formulating them clearly and precisely	ons and identify	problem	s, formulati	ng them	clearly and	precisely		
Specific Outcome #2 (Evaluation and Synthesis): Students consider alternative viewpoints, recognize and assess assumptions, and identify possible consequences. Students will develop well-reasoned conclusions and solutions.	ernative viewpoi olutions.	nts, reco	gnize and a	ssess ass	umptions,	and ident	ify possib	a
Specific Outcome #3 (Creative Thinking and Innovation): Students and	Students apply creative ideas or approaches to achieve solutions or complete projects.	or appr	baches to ac	hieve so	lutions or c	omplete r	projects.	
	ווא הובמווגר והבה	2 2 E						

	Critical Th	Critical Thinking Rubric	
Critical Thinking Competency Outcome: innovation and creative thinking.		Palo Alto College Students use inquiry and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information, and	and synthesis of information, and
Specific Outcomes	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Meets expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
Specific Outcome #1 Inquiry and Analysis Students pose vital questions and identify problems, formulating them clearly and precisely.	 Student accurately and thoroughly states the purpose of the inquiry. Student poses relevant questions that thoroughly fulfill the purpose. Student clearly and logically expresses questions and problems in several ways to recognize complexity. 	 Student states the purpose of the inquiry. Student poses relevant questions that substantially fulfill the purpose. Student clearly and logically states questions and problems. 	 Student does not identify the purpose of the inquiry. Student poses questions that do not fulfill the purpose. Student does not state questions and problems clearly and logically
Evaluation and Synthesis Evaluation and Synthesis Students consider alternative viewpoints, recognize and assess assumptions, and identify possible consequences. Students will develop well-reasoned conclusions and solutions. Specific Outcome #3 Creative Thinking and Innovation Students apply creative ideas or approaches to achieve solutions or complete projects.	• Student identifies multiple (more than two) alternative viewpoints. • Student identifies and assesses assumptions related to the viewpoints. • Student identifies logical, significant, potential implications and consequences of alternative viewpoints. • Student clearly expresses multiple logical and plausible alternative conclusions and solutions. • Student creates a unique personal idea, question, format, or product. • Student incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.	**Student identifies multiple (more than two) • Student identifies and assesses assumptions alternative viewpoints. • Student identifies and assesses • Student identifies inplications and consequences of conclusion. • Student expresses a well reasoned logical conclusion. • Student clearly expresses multiple logical and consequences of conclusions and plausible alternative conclusions and plausible alternative conclusions of student creates a unique personal idea, format, or product. • Student creates a unique personal idea, format, or product have a solution or complete a approaches to the assignment in the final approach to achieve a solution or complete a direction or approach given an example. • Student does not recognize assumption. • Student expresses an illogical conclusion and plausible alternative viewpoint. • Student creates a unique personal idea, question, format, or product from an example. • Student creates a unique personal idea, question, format, or product from an example. • Student creates a unique personal idea, question, format, or product from an example. • Student creates a unique personal idea, question, format, or product from an example. • Student does not recognize assumption or complete a direction or approach given an example. • Student does not recognize assumption or approach given an example. • Student does not recognize assumption or approach given an example. • Student does not recognize assumption or approach given an example. • Student does not recognize assumption or approach gi	Student does not recognize alternative viewpoints. Student does not recognize assumptions associated with a viewpoint. Student does not identify implications or consequences. Student expresses an illogical conclusion or solution. Student fails to create an idea, question, format, or product from an example. Student makes no attempt to personalize direction or approach given an example.
Solving Rubric, and St. Philip's Coll	ege Critical Thinking Quality Enhan	Solving Rubric, and St. Philip's College Critical Thinking Quality Enhancement Plan http://www.alamo.edu/spc/admin/qep/default.aspx	//spc/admin/qep/default.aspx

as the worst #Assessed/#Identied R iMost Addressed & Weakest Outcome ignment Strongest Outcome illeast Addressed & Weakest Outcome ignment Strongest Outcome ignment Strongest Outcome ignment Strongest Outcome ignment Strongest and Most Addressed Outco ignment ig	4	DI:	
as the worst #Assessed/#Identied R Most Addressed & Weakest Outcome Ignment Strongest Outcome Ignment Strongest Outcome Ignment Strongest Outcome Ignment Strongest Addressed Outcome Identification of Assessed to Identification Ignment Ign	4		
total Assessments for Outcome #1 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 Total Assessments for Outcome #3 Total Assessments	nal Responsibility 4	0.532	0.40625
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	4	y has the worst #Assessed/#Identied	d Ratio
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	30	assi Most Addressed & Weakest Outcom	me
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2 48 * 2 assessors/assignment	***	88%	
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 36 *2 assessors/assi least Addressed & Weakest Outcome #1 36 *2 assessors/assi least Addressed & Weakest Outcome #1 36 *2 assessors/assi least Addressed Outcome #3 36 *2 assessors/assignment for Outcome #3 36 *2 assessors/assignment for Outcome #3 36 *2 assessors/assignment 37 *3 assessors/assignment 37 *4 assessments for Outcome #1 38 *3 *3 assessors/assignment 38 *3 *3 assessments for Outcome #2 38 *3 *3 assessors/assignment 38 *3 assessments for Outcome #2 38 *3 *3 assessments for Outcome #3 38 *3 assessments for	9	ssignment	
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 36* *2 assessors/assis Least Addressed Outcome 3 44*	41 0.854	5% Strongest Outcome	
Core Course Results for Personal Responsibility 26 0.722 72% Processory Core Course Results for Personal Responsibility Core Courses Assessed 32 0.532 Processory Processory Processory Processory Processory Processory Processory Processory Processory Processor	*98	assi Least Addressed Outcome	
Core Course Results for Personal Responsibility Total Number of Personal Responsibility Core Courses Assessed 33 0.532 6.532 <td< td=""><td>#3 26 0.722</td><td>2%</td><td></td></td<>	#3 26 0.722	2%	
Total Number of Personal Responsibility Core Courses Assessed 33 0.532 Reseasors/assignment Cotal Number of Personal Responsibility Core Courses Assessed 33 0.532 Reseasors/assignment			
Total Number of Personal Responsibility Core Courses Assessed 33 0.532 Most Addressed & Weakest Outcome Total Assessments for Outcome #1 30 0.682 68% Most Addressed & Weakest Outcome Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2 48 * * 2 assessors/assignment 48 * * 2 assessors/assignment 10.854 85% Strongest Outcome Total Assessments for Outcome #3 36 * * 2 assessors/assignment 10.854 85% Strongest Outcome 10.00 DL Course Results for Outcome #3 10.040 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessments for Outcome 11 0.406 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identified Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Identified 32 13 0.406 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessment for Outcome #1 10.4 4.06 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessment for Outcome #1 10.00 10			
Total Assessments for Outcome #1 44* *2 assessors/assignment 44* *2 assessors/assignment 44* *2 assessors/assignment 48* *2 assessors/assignment 40% 41% 40% <t< td=""><td>33</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	33		
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1 30 0.682 68%	*44	ussi Most Addressed & Weakest Outcom	me
Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #3 Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed Total Assessments for Outcome #1 Total Assessments for Outcome #1 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #3 Total A	30 0.682	88	
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 41 0.854 85% Strongest Outcome Total Assessments for Outcome #3 36* *2 assessors/assigleast Addressed Outcome DL Course Results for Outcome #3 26 0.722 72% Course Addressed Outcome DL Course Results for Personal Responsibility DL Courses Identified 32 A 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identified Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed 13 0.406 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identified Total Assessments for Outcome #1 10* * 2 assessors/assignment 4 0.4 40% A 6 A 7 A 6 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 A 7 <td< td=""><td>48*</td><td>assignment</td><td></td></td<>	48*	assignment	
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 DL Course Results for Personal Responsibility Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Identified Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed 13 0.406 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identified Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed 10* *2 assessors/assignment Total Assessments for Outcome #1 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2 Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceed	41 0.854	5% Strongest Outcome	
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 DL Course Results for Personal Responsibility Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Identified Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed Total Assessments for Outcome #1 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 Total Assessments for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or	*98	ssi Least Addressed Outcome	
DL Course Results for Personal Responsibility DL Courses Identified 32 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identified Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed 13 0.406 41% Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identified Total Assessments for Outcome #1 4 0.4 40% 10 10 Total Assessments for Outcome #2 22* *2 assessors/assignment 10 77% Strongest and Most Addressed Outcome Total Assessments for Outcome #3 10* *2 assessors/assignment 10 *2 assessors/assignment Total Assessments for Outcome #3 0.3 30% Weakest Outcome 10 Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	#3 26 0.722	2%	
Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed3241%Weakest Ratio of Assessed to IdentifiedTotal Assessments for Outcome #110* *2 assessors/assignment4 0.440%1Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #222* *2 assessors/assignment10.7733 77%Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #310* *2 assessors/assignment10.7733 77%Strongest and Most Addressed OutcomeTotal Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #310* *2 assessors/assignment10.7733 0.330%Weakest OutcomeTotal Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #33 0.330%Weakest Outcome1Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	urse Results for Personal Responsibility		
Total Number of Personal Responsibility DL Courses Assessed130.40641%Weakest Ratio of Assessed to IdentifiedTotal Assessments for Outcome #110**2 assessors/assignment10**2 assessors/assignmentTotal Assessments for Outcome #2170.77377%Strongest and Most Addressed OutcomeTotal Assessments for Outcome #310**2 assessors/assignment10*Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #330.330%Weakest OutcomeTotal Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #330.330%Weakest Outcome			
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #110* *2 assessors/assignment4 0.440%9Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #222* *2 assessors/assignment22* *2 assessors/assignment17 0.77377%Strongest and Most Addressed OutcomeTotal Exceeds or Meets Outcome #310* *2 assessors/assignment3 0.330%Weakest OutcomeTotal Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #33 0.330%Weakest OutcomePersonal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	13 0.406	1% Weakest Ratio of Assessed to Identi	tified
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #240.440%Possessors/assignmentTotal Assessments for Outcome #2171717% Strongest and Most Addressed OutcomeTotal Assessments for Outcome #310* *2 assessors/assignmentTotal Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #330.330% Weakest OutcomePersonal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	10*	ssignment	
Total Assessments for Outcome #2 22* *2 assessors/assignment Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #3 17 0.773 77% Strongest and Most Addressed Outcome Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 3 0.3 30% Weakest Outcome Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	4 0.4	%0	
Total Assessments for Outcome #3 Total Assessments for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	22* *2 assessors	ssignment	
Total Assessments for Outcome #3 10* *2 assessors/assignment Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 3 0.3 30% Weakest Outcome Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	17 0.773	7% Strongest and Most Addressed Outc	tcome
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3 Outcome #3 Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	10*	ssignment	
Personal Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, actions and consequences to ethical decision-making.	#3 0.3	0% Weakest Outcome	
	al Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students connect choices, action	s and consequences to ethical decision-ma	naking.
Specific Outcome #1: Students assess their own ethical values and identify the origin of their values.	Specific Outcome #1: Students assess their own ethical values and identify the origin of their values.	es.	
Specific Outcome #2: Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems.	c Outcome #2: Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems.		

	Personal Resp	Personal Responsibility Rubric	
Social Responsibility Competency	Outcome: Palo Alto College Stude	ents demonstrate intercultural o	Social Responsibility Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students demonstrate intercultural competency, civic knowledge, and the
ability to engage effectively in reg	ability to engage effectively in regional, national and global communities.	nities.	
Specific Outcomes	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Meets expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
Specific Outcome #1 Students assess their own ethical values and identify the origin of their values.	Student articulates an understanding of the Student states his or her own ethical impact the source of his or her ethical values and the source of his or her ethical has on his or her development. Values.	 Student states his or her own ethical values and the source of his or her ethical values. 	 Student states either his or her own ethical values or the source of his or her ethical values, but not both.
Specific Outcome #2 Students recognize ethical issues in the social context of problems.	 Student recognizes ethical issues when presented in a complex context. 	 Student recognizes basic ethical issues within a given situation and demonstrates partial understanding of their complexities. 	 Student does not recognize the basic ethical issues.
Specific Outcome #3 Students analyze alternative ethical perspectives and predict the ramifications of those perspectives to a situation.	 Student applies ethical perspectives to an ethical question and specifies implications of the application of that perspective. 	 Student identifies two ethical perspectives of a situation and analyzes the implications of those perspectives. 	 Student does not apply ethical perspectives to an ethical question
Adapted from the LEAP Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric	asoning VALUE Rubric		

Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Findings	titative Reasonir	ng Skills Finding	10	
Total Number of E and O Reasoning Skills Courses Identified:	75	Core. 75	DI	29
Total Number of F and O Reasoning Skills Courses Assessed:	0.7333		0.733333	23 0.793103
Comprehensive Results for E and Q Reasoning Skills				
Total Assessments for Outcome #1	104* *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	80 0.7692	%LL		
Total Assessments for Outcome #2	102* *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2	81 0.7941	79% Stongest Outcome	utcome	
Total Assessments for Outcome #3	104* *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3	68 0.6538	65% Weakest Outcome	rtcome	
Core Course Results for E and Q Reasoning Skills				
Total Number of E and Q Reasoning Skills Core Courses Identified	75			
Total Number of E and Q Reasoning Skills Core Courses Assessed	55 0.7333			
Total Assessments for Outcome #1	104 *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	80 0.7692	77%		
Total Assessments for Outcome #2	102 *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2	81 0.7941	79% Strongest Outcome	utcome	
Total Assessments for Outcome #3	104 *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3	68 0.6538	65% Weakest Outcome	utcome	
DL Course Results for E and Q Reasoning Skills				
Total Number of E and Q Reasoning Skills DL Courses Identified	29			
Total Number of E and Q Reasoning Skills DL Courses Assessed	23 0.7931			
Total Assessments for Outcome #1	40* *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #1	40 1	100% Strongest Outcome	Jutcome	
Total Assessments for Outcome #2	38* *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets Outcome #2	32 0.8421	84%		
Total Assessments for Outcome #3	40* *2 assessors/assignment	rs/assignment		
Total Exceeds or Meets for Outcome #3	24 0.6	60% Weakest Outcome	utcome	
Empirical and Quantitative Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students apply scientific and mathematical concepts to analyze and solve problems to investigate	s apply scientific and m	nathematical concepts	to analyze and solve probler	ns to investigate

hypotheses.

Specific Outcome #1 E & Q Knowledge (Understand the Problem) Students identify problems or hypotheses and related quantitative components.

Specific Outcome #2 E & Q Inquiry (Devises a Plan) Students select appropriate quantitative approaches to analyzing and solving problems and investigating hypotheses

Specific Outcome #3 E & Q Reasoning (Executes the Plan and Looks Back) Students correctly apply quantitative approaches to analyze and solve problems or investigate hypotheses.

Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Rubric

Empirical and Quantitative Competency Outcome: Palo Alto College Students apply scientific and mathematical concepts to analyze and solve problems to investigate hypotheses.

Specific Outcomes	Exceeds Expectations (3)	Meets expectations (2)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
Specific Outcome #1 E & Q Knowledge (Understand the Problem) Students identify problems or hypotheses and related quantifiative components.	 Student formulates a clear description of the problem or hypothesis and correctly specifies all appropriate major quantitative components to be examined. 	 Student describes the problem or hypothesis and presents a list of related quantitative components to be examined. 	Student does not understand the problem or hypothesis and cannot specify quantitative components to examine.
Specific Outcome #2 E & Q Inquiry (Devises a Plan) Students select appropriate quantitative approaches to analyzing and solving problems and investigating hypotheses	• Student selects and prioritizes all quantitative information appropriate to analyzing and solving the problem or investigating the hypothesis. • Student identifies multiple approaches to analyzing and solving the problem or investigating the hypothesis along with the associated quantitative information.	 Student selects and prioritizes a list of quantitative information appropriate to analyzing and solving the problem or investigating the hypothesis. Student identifies one approach to analyze and solve the problem or investigate the hypothesis along with the associated quantitative information. 	 Student selects and prioritizes a list of quantitative information that is information appropriate to analyzing and solving the inappropriate to analyzing and solving the problem or to problem or investigating the hypothesis. Student identifies one approach to analyze and solve student identify an appropriate approach to the problem or investigate the hypothesis along with the analyze and solve the problem or investigate the hypothesis.
Specific Outcome #3 E & Q Reasoning (Executes the Plan and Looks Back) Students correctly apply quantitative approaches to analyze and solve problems or investigate hypotheses. Students summarize and reflect on their learning experiences	 Student correctly applies quantitative approaches to analyze and solve the problem or to investigate the hypothesis. Student reflects on his/her work and identifies connections to similar problems or experiments. Student reflects on his/her work and identifies more efficient approaches. 	Student correctly applies quantitative approaches to analyze and solve the problem or to investigate the or to investigate the or to investigate the hypothesis. Student reflects on his/her work and identifies more efficient approaches.	 Student incorrectly applies quantitative approaches to analyze and solve the problem or to investigate the hypothesis.

Carlton College FIPSE Proposal, "Quantitative Inquiry, Reasoning, and Knowledge to Strengthen the Educational Foundations of Citizenship"

Appendix B.5

Feedback for Improvement

Write suggestions for improvement for the Palo Alto College General Education Assessment of Critical

Thinking Skills, Personal Responsibility, and Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Spring 2011	
1.	Review the data on the Overall Results tab on the Findings Report Sp 11 Spreadsheet and the Findings Analysis Document.
	Provide any suggestions that would improve our assessment findings or our assessment process for our next cycle of these general education competencies:
2.	Review the data on Critical Thinking tab on the Findings Spreadsheet along with the Critical Thinking Rubric and Assignment Template.
	Provide any suggestions that would improve our assessment findings or our assessment process for our next assessment cycle of this general education competency:
3.	Review the data on Personal Responsibility tab on the Findings Spreadsheet along with the Personal Responsibility Rubric and Assignment Template.
	Provide any suggestions that would improve our assessment findings or our assessment process for our next assessment cycle of this general education competency:
4.	Review the data on the Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Findings Spreadsheet along

with the Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Skills Rubric and Assignment Template.

Provide any suggestions that would improve our assessment findings or our assessment process for our next assessment cycle of this general education competency: