INSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATIONS AS A MEANS TOWARD CONSISTENT ASSESSMENT FOR GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES
30,509 STUDENTS COLLEGE-WIDE*

*Unduplicated College-wide: Cross campus enrolled students are only counted once for College-wide purposes.

FALL 2017 HEADCOUNT BY INTENT

- **19,028 (62.4%)**
  - Associate Degree

- **7,091 (23.2%)**
  - Earn Credits for Transfer

- **2,157 (7.1%)**
  - Earn a Certificate

- **978 (3.2%)**
  - Improve Job Skills

- **340 (1.1%)**
  - Personal Enrichment

- **915 (3.0%)**
  - Did Not Respond

FALL 2017 CAMPUS ENROLLMENT

- **14,438 (40.7%)**
  - Central Campus

- **8,995 (25.4%)**
  - North Campus

- **12,022 (33.9%)**
  - South Campus

FALL 2017 STUDENT ATTENDANCE

- **7,081 (23.2%)**
  - Full-time

- **23,428 (76.8%)**
  - Part-time

FALL 2017 STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>7,163</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino Origin</td>
<td>17,370</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or Not Reported</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGE

- **4,573 (15.0%)**
  - 17 & Under

- **13,736 (45.0%)**
  - 18-21

- **9,736 (31.9%)**
  - 22-34

**AVERAGE AGE: 22.8**
San Jacinto College: Instructional Leadership

Board of Trustees

Chancellor: Dr. Hellyer

Deputy Chancellor: Dr. Williamson

3 Campus Provosts: Dr. Jones, Dr. Raffetto, and Mr. Wigginton

9 Instructional Deans

~ 39 Department Chairs

~ 1,700 Faculty (part-time and full-time)
Infrastructure for District-Wide Assessment

Office of Accreditation and Assessment
Dr. Chris Duke, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Institutional Effectiveness, Assessment, and Accreditation
Dr. Michelle Selk, Manager, Assessment (former faculty member!)
Mr. James Jones, Coordinator, Assessment and Program Review

Chris Duke
Accreditation and Assessment
Asst VC, Inst Eff, Assmt, Accr

James Jones
Accreditation and Assessment
Coord, Assessment/Prog Review

Matthew Lewis
Accreditation and Assessment
Analyst, Qualitative Research

Michelle Selk
Accreditation and Assessment
Manager, Assessments
Infrastructure for District-Wide Assessment

Technical Capabilities (need a tech guru like James!)

Blackboard Learning Platform (Blackboard Outcomes)
Cornerstone (Talent Management System)
Shared Network Drive
Website Creation
The THECB Requires Six General Education Outcomes:

*Faculty initially developed Common Assignments for each outcome for students to complete each semester.
General Education Outcomes: “Traditional”
Annual Timeline

- All-semester: Student submission of assignments using Blackboard.
- Mid-semester: **Calibration sessions** for the rubrics and instructional interpretations.

- Jan/Feb: **Calibration sessions** for the rubrics and instructional interpretations.
- Feb: “Kick-Off Lunch” (free!)
- March: Evaluation of assignments collected via Blackboard Outcomes.
- Late March: Data Crunch by Tech Gurus!
- April: Faculty focus groups review data, discuss action items for next cycle.

- June-July: Timeline for the next academic year developed.
- Late July: Timeline shared with Deans and Department Chairs at the Annual Academy.
- Late Aug/early Sept: Timeline and schedule of sessions shared with faculty.
Faculty Driven Assessment Process - How?

--Framework Fridays
--Discipline Enrichment
--Accessible Faculty Resources
  Website and G: drive have detailed documents.
--Accountability through Performance Management
  Cornerstone talent management system used to monitor annual performance.
--Constant Communication
  Bi-weekly emails from the Assessment Office
## Snippet of Faculty Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Sessions 2018 (November)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Critical Thinking</td>
<td>11/5/2018</td>
<td>S-12.101</td>
<td>1:20 p.m.</td>
<td>2:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Social Responsibility</td>
<td>11/7/2018</td>
<td>C-11.1081</td>
<td>1:20 p.m.</td>
<td>2:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>11/14/2018</td>
<td>N-33.101</td>
<td>2:55 p.m.</td>
<td>4:20 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>11/16/2018</td>
<td>A-1.104</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Sessions 2019 (January-February)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Critical Thinking</td>
<td>1/29/2019</td>
<td>S-12.101</td>
<td>1:20 p.m.</td>
<td>2:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Social Responsibility</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>N-33.101</td>
<td>2:55 p.m.</td>
<td>4:20 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>1/30/2019</td>
<td>C-1.102</td>
<td>2:55 p.m.</td>
<td>4:20 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration, Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>2/8/2019</td>
<td>A-1.104</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LUNCH (ONLY NEED TO ATTEND ONE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education, Evaluation Kick Off Lunch</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education, Evaluation Kick Off Lunch</td>
<td>2/21/2019</td>
<td>C-1.102</td>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Focus Group Sessions 2019 (April)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Focus Group, Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results Focus Group, Social Responsibility</td>
<td>4/17/2019</td>
<td>N-33.101</td>
<td>1:20 p.m.</td>
<td>2:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Focus Group, Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>4/25/2019</td>
<td>C-1.102</td>
<td>11:45 a.m.</td>
<td>1:10 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Focus Group, Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>4/19/2019</td>
<td>A-1.104</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>11:45 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation period will run Sunday, February 24 through Sunday, March 24 in 2019**
Faculty are given student artifacts (papers) to read and rate. They read and rate the artifacts individually. When complete, they discuss as a group. Their comments regarding “level 1/non-success” versus “level 2/success” are essential to capture.
ALL faculty are invited to the April Focus Groups regardless of participation in the evaluation process.

Two overarching questions:
What do the results mean? What is our interpretation of the results?
What do we need to do, as an institution, to improve future results?

These discussions are recorded and lead to action plans for the next assessment cycle.
Example from the last focus group:

Evaluators expressed concerns about their role in assessment: how can an evaluator know all the conventions of multiple disciplines?

Solutions:

--have faculty outside of a discipline vet signature assignments on a team with a discipline expert;
--consider developing discipline-specific institutional interpretations to assist non-discipline experts with evaluation.
Focus group feedback revealed a need to review the common assignments.

Too many artifacts were rated a “level 3” by evaluators.

Faculty spent fall 2017 reviewing & revising the assignments.

A second group of faculty vetted the assignments Spring 2018.

All assignments are now in use Fall 2018.
## Assignment Design Worksheet: Critical Thinking (Example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>SPCH 1315: Public Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Title</td>
<td>Persuasive Speech Outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Speech Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment ID</td>
<td>(to be assigned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criterion | Design

**Explanation of Issues**
Although the common assignment does not ask for this specifically, it is implied. A persuasive speech is designed to reinforce or to change the beliefs or actions of audience members, therefore, the issue/problem must be critically considered to accomplish this. A potential drawback is that items may be omitted from the outline but verbally addressed during the live presentation.

**Evidence**
The assignment asks students to find experts or peers who support their ideas using a variety of sources (books, periodicals, electronic media, etc.). They are not asked to question these experts and/or their viewpoints. Perhaps this section could be slightly revised: "You should use a variety of reputable sources and materials to assist with the analysis of your topic. Be sure to thoroughly engage with these sources. In persuasive speaking it is essential to question experts and their viewpoints."

## After revisions → signature assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>SPCH 1315: Public Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Title</td>
<td>Persuasive Speech Preparation Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Michelle Selk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment ID</td>
<td>(to be assigned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criterion | Design

**Explanation of Issues**
Under Section I (Organization), students are required to use the Problem-Solution or the Problem-Cause-Solution organizational patterns. Under Section III (Audience), they are further asked to "clearly state the topic/problem and sufficiently describe it for the audience."

**Evidence**
Under Section IV (Sources), students are required to conduct scholarly research and to use sources that will "assist with the analysis" of the topic. Furthermore, they are challenged to "thoroughly engage and interact with these sources. It is essential to question experts and their viewpoints."
Critical Thinking Criterion Levels 2-4

A Level 4 “clearly and comprehensively describes” the problem or issues. A Level 3 “describes and clarifies” the problem or issue. What do “clearly” and “comprehensively” look like within the context of your discipline?

A Level 3 “describes and clarifies” the problem or issues and a Level 2 “describes” the problem but “leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored [...].” What is a Level 3 student including that a Level 2 student is not including?
SACSCOC Self-Study – Focused on IIs and SAs

- **Spring 2018:**
  - focus groups reviewed survey data/provided additional feedback

- **Summer 2018:**
  - qualitative analysis led to revised institutional interpretations

- **Fall 2018:**
  - newly revised IIs for CT, EQR, and SR will be calibrated

- **Spring 2019:**
  - IIs will be used to assess student artifacts
Institutional Interpretation Survey and Focus Group Results

Example: Gen. Ed. Outcome Critical Thinking

Rubric

| Information taken from source(s) w/ some interpretation or evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation or evaluation. // Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question. | Does not meet “Level 1” standards. |

Old Interpretation

Evidence

- Successful students interpret, evaluate, and perhaps qualify the evidence and the source of evidence they may use. Unsuccessful students use evidence and accept the viewpoints of the source as fact.
- This criterion focuses more on the student’s interpretation of the evidence and the questioning and analysis of experts’ viewpoints than it does simple inclusion of sources in the response.
- “Taken from sources” suggests the use of evidence to support analysis; this may include informal references to a primary source. This criterion does not require or suggest any particular method for documenting references or sources.
- Students may often include a source/quote and then restate, explain, or describe the source's claim; that is indicative of a Level 1 performance. To attain a Level 2, a student should begin to offer their own analysis or evaluation of the source’s claim or begin to use it in a new or different manner though that analysis or interpretation may not be enough to be coherent.
New Interpretation: EXCERPTS

- **Students may indicate evaluation of the interpretation:**
  - **Level 2**
    - Student uses sources but does not provide proper context for them.
    - Student offers some interpretation or evaluation, but does not develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.
  - **Level 1**
    - Student uses poor quality and/or irrelevant sources.
    - Student heavily relies on a single source (depending on the nature of the assignment).
    - Student makes few, if any, connections and fails to produce an analysis or synthesis.
    - Student simply takes everything at face value.
  - **Level 0**
    - Student offers personal opinion only.
    - Student does not include any information or sources.
Reports & Reminders

- Reminders via email are sent to Dept. Chairs and Deans
- Faculty sent a survey to gauge their interest (#s)
- Alignment Reports (“naughty list”)

### What is your role at the college?
- Full-time Faculty, academic courses
- Full-time Faculty, technical or health science courses
- Full-time Faculty, both academic and either technical or health science courses
- Administrator or Professional Full-time Staff

### Please select the general education segment you would most prefer:

- Critical Thinking for Communication, Language/Philosophy/Culture, Creative Arts, Speech, and Modern Language
- Critical Thinking for History, Government, and Social/Behavioral Science
- Critical Thinking for Math, Science, and Physical Education
- Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning for Mathematics
- Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning for Science and Physical Education
- Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning for Social/Behavioral Science
- Social Responsibility for Language/Philosophy/Culture and Creative Arts
- Social Responsibility for History, Government, and Social/Behavioral Science
Alignment Reports to Chairs and Deans

Abbreviated cover sheet

General Education Outcomes Assessment
Alignment Report as of Monday, March 5

Current numbers as of March 5, 2018: Central campus has a 50% proper alignment rate with 50% still needing verification. North campus has a 55% proper alignment rate with 45% still needing verification. South campus has a 65% proper alignment rate with 35% still needing verification. District-wide the percentages are 57% aligned properly and 43% still needing verification.

The Notes column indicates what information needs to be verified/checked.  
a. No Alignments indicates that no alignments were identified within the course.  
b. Missing indicates that an alignment to a particular outcome is expected but it does not appear in the course.  
c. Present indicates that an alignment to an outcome has been made when that outcome is not relevant to the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>CRN</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1301</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>23553 SR Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23623 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23619 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>23614 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1301</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>23528 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1301</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>23556 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1301</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>23555 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23620 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23577 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1301</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23510 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>23618 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>23617 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>23613 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1301</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23532 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1301</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>23530 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 1302</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>23627 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMA 1301</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23722 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMA 1301</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>23720 No Alignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC 2301</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24947 COMM Missing, EQR Missing, SR Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• Assessment is faculty driven and faculty should be involved throughout the process—

This is the Assessment Office Mantra!

• Administrators acknowledge importance of this work and prioritize it.

• Moving toward consistent general education outcomes assessment.
  • IIs provide evaluators with valuable guidance.
  • Scalable (campus-wide, district-wide, state-wide)
  • Multi-State Collaborative
Questions?

- Dr. Michelle Selk
  - michelle.selk@sjcd.edu
- Dr. Rachel Garcia
  - rachel.garcia@sjcd.edu