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Design Thinking for Assessment

The design process is what puts Design Thinking into action.
It's a structured approach to generating and developing ideas.

The five phases of the design process:

1. DISCOVERY
   - I have a challenge. How do I approach it?

2. INTERPRETATION
   - I learned something. How do I interpret it?

3. IDEATION
   - I see an opportunity. What do I create?

4. EXPERIMENTATION
   - I have an idea. How do I build it?

5. EVOLUTION
   - I tried something. How do I evolve it?
Discovery: Background/Scope of Work

- Joined Texas Southmost College March 2018
- Reaffirmation scheduled for October 2019
  - Compliance Certification due March 2019
  - Four (4) Months to design Assessment Process
  - One Semester to Collect Data, Write Assessment Report and Provide Evidence
- General Education Assessment Committee Initial Steps:
  - Formed in 2017;
  - Evaluated current assessment model;
  - Reviewed and discussed existing Core Objective (CO) rubrics;
  - Attended LEAP Conference;
  - Assigned GEAC members one or more of the six COs to create new rubrics;
  - Requested submission of all GE assignment templates and rubrics used to assess COs;
  - Attended AAC&U Summer Institute and practiced ISAE Process to evaluate ENGL 1301 SA.
Current State of General Education Assessment Process

• **Initial Evaluation of Assessment Process**
  - Inconsistent Evaluation of Core Objectives by Course within discipline;
  - Inconsistent forms, data collection, analysis, interpretation and intervention at the program and course level;
  - Multiple Assignments by course within discipline;
  - Inconsistent alignment of Core Objective, Student Learning Outcomes and Performance Levels in General Education courses;
  - Minimal evidence of continuous improvement in student learning outcomes and performance levels General Education courses; and
  - Ambiguity exist among faculty regarding the use of VALUE rubrics in the assessment of core objectives and performance levels.
Interpretation: Self-Study Compliance Report

1. Lack or misuse of Curriculum Mapping by course for Core Objectives;
2. Misalignment of Student Learning Outcomes, Core Objectives and Performance Levels;
3. Misuse of forms, collection of data, analysis, interpretation and intervention at the program and course level;
4. Use of different assessment instruments by designated core courses;
5. Lack of, or misuse of direct and indirect measures of assessment;
6. Capture of data provided minimal evidence of extraction of assessment for core objectives from program student learning outcomes;
7. Ambiguity exists regarding locality of all components used for assessment at the course-level to include tracking, reporting and evidence of assessment;
8. Identified expected outcomes were the same regardless of content and skill complexity associated with program; and
9. Sampling of student completed works was not conducted.
Ideation: Changing the Deictic Nature

• Practice and Purpose:
  • Conceptual Framework of the Learning Environment
    • Its Effectiveness: Persistence, Completion, Graduate Employment & Student Debt;
    • Student, Instructor, Content;
    • Curriculum and Co-Curriculum (Content Development, Content Management, Content Transfer, Marketable Skills Attainment).
  • Assessment for Learning
  • Assessment as Learning
  • Assessment of Learning

• Our Expertise- Applied to Assessment Activities
  • Collaboration vs Rebuttal: Holistic Approach to Institutional Level Outcomes
  • Increase Student Learning, Faculty Learning, Program Learning & Institutional Learning Outcomes
Changing the Deictic Nature (cont’d)

• Build on Disciplinary Expertise and Perspectives:
  • Focus Group Calibration Sessions
  • Allow for flexibility within a shared framework (Unity of Mind);
  • Frame assessment as improving learning environment and academic rigor
  • Embed Assessment in the work faculty has created that feeds into assessment and improvement activities;
  • Provide support to encourage a culture of academic excellence and effective teaching through sustained intellectual engagement

• Operational Activities in Assessment
  • Creating and modifying the program’s PSLO/CLOs/SLOs/COs alignment
  • Redesign of Assessment Model to include timely data analysis, recommendation and creation of improvement plan
  • Exemplify a Culture of Academic Excellence that reflects TSC Core Values
Benefits of ISAE

- Reduce the Deictic Nature of Assessment Dialogue
- Inter-Rater Reliability-
  - the degree of agreement among raters;
  - gives a score of how much consensus is in the ratings given by judges;
  - useful in refining the tools by determining if a particular instrument or rubric is appropriate for measuring a particular variable.

- Develop ways to encourage Capacity Building and apply specific methods at TSC
- Expands Curriculum and Assessment knowledge base
- Determines training and professional development needs
- Improves evidence-based modifications and improvements at the course level
- Promotes Data Utilization, Collaborative Learning and Unity of Purpose
QUESTIONS
Experimentation: Inter-Rater Evaluation Process

1. Use ISAE Rubric to rate the Signature Assignment on its appropriateness for allowing student to demonstrate SLOs and Critical Thinking.

2. Review WECM or ACGM, Bloom’s Taxonomy and Critical Thinking rubric as a guide to evaluate Signature Assignment.

3. Inter-rater Evaluators apply a rubric to a single sample

4. Rate the quality of each sample assessed using the ISAE Rubric.

5. Complete ISAE Rubric and use whole number to score each criteria.

6. Provide valuable feedback in comment section on ISAE Rubric.

7. Connect the score to specific information on the signature assignment/rubric.

8. Calculate the Average on the ISAE Rubric.

9. Upload Completed Rubric to ISAE Work Group (SharePoint).
ISAE Rubric Components

• Assessment Criteria
• Usability of Signature Assignment
• Content Relevant
• Content Development
• Assignment Purpose

• Note:
• Student Satisfaction
• Employer Satisfaction

Five-Point Likert Scale Rubric
4 = Exemplary
  • Extensive and Comprehensive or All...
3 = Exceeds Expectations
  • Most or Considerably...
2 = Meets Expectations
  • Adequate or Some...
1 = Below Expectations
  • Not adequate or Only One or Slightly....
0 = No Evidence
  • Not clear or Do not reflect....Missing
# Inter-Rater Signature Assignment Evaluation Form

**Texas Southmost College**

**INTER-RATER SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT EVALUATION FORM**

Program:  
Grading/Scoring Rubric:  
Course:  
Program Learning Outcome (PLO):  
Core Objectives (COs):  
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usability of Signature Assignment</td>
<td>Signature Assignment criteria reflects an extensive and comprehensive assessment of learning outcomes in a meaningful and quantifiable or qualitative manner.</td>
<td>Signature Assignment criteria reflects a comprehensive assessment of learning outcomes in a meaningful and quantifiable or qualitative manner.</td>
<td>Signature Assignment criteria reflects an adequate assessment of learning outcomes in a meaningful and quantifiable or qualitative manner.</td>
<td>Signature Assignment criteria does not reflect an adequate assessment of learning outcomes in a quantifiable or qualitative manner.</td>
<td>Signature Assignment's criteria for assessing learning outcomes is not clear or missing altogether.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Relevant</td>
<td>All Core Objective criteria were aligned with Content Specific Topic(s) in the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>Most Core Objective criteria were aligned with Content Specific Topic(s) in the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>Some Core Objective criteria were aligned with Content Specific Topic(s) in the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>Only one Core Objective criterion was aligned with Content Specific Topic(s) in the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>No Competencies of Core Objective criteria were aligned with Content Specific Topic(s) in the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>All Core Objective competency level demonstration of the criteria was addressed within the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>Most Core Objective competency level demonstration of the criteria was addressed within the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>Some Core Objective competency level demonstration of the criteria was addressed within the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>Only One Core Objective competency level of the criteria was demonstrated within the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>No Core Objective competency levels of the criteria were demonstrated within the Signature Assignment.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Purpose</td>
<td>Instructions extensively reflect the purpose of the assignment and a comprehensive understanding of authentic assessment at the course level.</td>
<td>Instructions considerably reflect the purpose of the assignment and a comprehensive understanding of authentic assessment at the course level.</td>
<td>Instructions adequately reflect the purpose of the assignment and a comprehensive understanding of authentic assessment at the course level.</td>
<td>Instructions slightly reflect the purpose of the assignment and lacks a comprehensive understanding of authentic assessment at the course level.</td>
<td>Instructions do not reflect the purpose of the assignment and comprehensive understanding of authentic assessment at the course level is not evident.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In the future, Student and Employer satisfaction will be considered as Indirect Assessments of Learning Core Objectives for evaluation of the Signature Assignment. Below is the suggested narratives for each proficiency level.*

**Total:** 0

---

**Student Satisfaction:**  
Student reflection of Learning indicates whether all, most, some, one or none of the competencies of Core Objective criterion were addressed within the Signature Assignment.

**Employer Satisfaction:**  
Employer’s evaluation of Graduate’s Marketable Skills indicates whether all, most, some, one or none of the competencies of Core Objective criterion were addressed within the Signature Assignment.

**Recommendations:**

---

**EVALUATOR NAME:**  
**DATE:**  
**Revision Date:** 09/27/18  
**Created by:** Dr. Karen M White-Goyzueta
Inter-Rater Evaluation: The Ground Rules

1. This is not grading. This is scoring.
2. Start with 4 and work to the right.
3. Pick one whole number score per criterion.
4. For each criterion, connect specific places in the work sample with the assigned score.
5. Zero is an option.
6. Think globally about the learning skill demonstrated on Signature Assignment (Artifact).
7. Does the Signature Assignment prompt the student to demonstrate SLOs or COs.
8. We cannot infer. Instructions must explicitly state what is required.
9. As we discuss scores given on each line of the rubric, notice whether a trend emerges in your own scoring.

Source: AAC&U 2018 Summer Institute
EVALUATION
- Assessing theories; Comparison of ideas;
- Evaluating outcomes; Solving; Judging;
- Recommending; Rating

SYNTHESIS
- Using old concepts to create new ideas;
- Design and Invention; Composing; Imagining;
- Inferring; Modifying; Predicting; Combining

ANALYSIS
- Identifying and analyzing patterns;
- Organisation of ideas; recognizing trends

APPLICATION
- Using and applying knowledge;
- Using problem solving methods;
- Manipulating; Designing; Experimenting

COMPREHENSION
- Understanding; Translating;
- Summarising; Demonstrating;
- Discussing

KNOWLEDGE
- Recall of information;
- Discovery; Observation;
- Listing; Locating; Naming
VALUE RUBRICS- LEARNING ASSESSMENT TOOLS

• VALUE- Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education
  
  • Campus-based assessment approach developed by AAC&U faculty members and other education professionals as part of its Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative.

  • VALUE rubrics were developed as a guiding framework for students to demonstrate essential learning outcomes needed for success in work, citizenship, and life.

  • VALUE rubrics are tools used to assess students’ own authentic work, produced across students’ diverse learning pathways, fields of study and institutions;

  • Facilitates evidence-based information on whether and how well students are meeting graduation level achievement in learning outcomes that both employers and faculty consider essential; and

  • Allow HEIs to demonstrate, share, and assess student accomplishment of progressively more advanced and integrative learning.

Source: AAC&U... https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics
CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition
Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Framing Language
This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life.

This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analyses of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

Glossary
The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

Ambiguity: Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.

Assumptions: Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are "taken for granted or accepted as true without proof." (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions)

Context: The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.

Literal meaning: Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green.

Metaphor: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.

Source: AAC&U... https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics
### Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric

**Definition**

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of issues</strong></td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence of context and assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</strong></td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</strong></td>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AAC&U... https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics
Student Learning Outcomes

1. Find Course on Student Learning Outcomes List.
2. Review SLOs and Appropriately identify level of competency.
4. Follow the instructions for the evaluation process using the ISAE Rubric Form to evaluate Signature Assignment.
Inter-Rater Evaluation Process

1. Use ISAE Rubric to rate the Signature Assignment on its appropriateness for allowing student to demonstrate SLOs and Critical Thinking.
2. Review WECM or ACGM, Bloom’s Taxonomy and Critical Thinking rubric as a guide to evaluate Signature Assignment.
3. Inter-rater Evaluators apply a rubric to a single sample
4. Rate the quality of each sample assessed using the ISAE Rubric.
5. Complete ISAE Rubric and use whole number to score each criteria.
6. Provide valuable feedback in comment section on ISAE Rubric.
7. Connect the score to specific information on the signature assignment/rubric.
8. Average the score on the Signature Assignment.
9. Upload Completed Rubric to ISAE Group File
**ENGL 1301 Persuasive/Argument Essay Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION 1</th>
<th>PURPOSE &amp; AUDIENCE (10%)</th>
<th>SLO 3</th>
<th>CO (PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary (4)</td>
<td>Well-developed introductory paragraph contains detailed background information, a clear explanation or definition of the issue, various techniques to create interest, and a well-formed, properly placed thesis statement with essay map. Thesis states a clear, precise, and compelling position. The essay demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient (3)</td>
<td>Introductory paragraph contains some background information, a technique for creating interest, and states the issue, but does not explain using details. The thesis states a clear position. There is an attempt at an essay map. The essay demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing (2)</td>
<td>The introduction has a thesis statement, but does not adequately explain the background of the issue, and the writer only minimally attempts to create interest. The issue is identified, but lacks detail. The thesis lacks clarity and/or the essay map may be unclear or emerging. The essay demonstrates basic awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>The introduction contains little to no background information and no attempts to create interest. The thesis and/or essay map is vague, unclear, and/or not present. Background details are a seemingly random or irrelevant collection of information. The essay demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION 2</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION (15%)</th>
<th>SLO 2</th>
<th>CO (CRITICAL THINKING)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary (4)</td>
<td>There is a beginning, middle, and end in the paper with smooth transitions between ideas. Ideas are presented in a logical order and there is a thought-provoking ending. The paper follows a consistent pattern when discussing the issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient (3)</td>
<td>The paper depicts a beginning, middle, and end with transitions between ideas. Ideas are presented in a logical order. The paper generally follows a consistent order when discussing the issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing (2)</td>
<td>There is a weak beginning, middle, and end with gaps between ideas and few transitions. Paper itself may be repetitive or contradictory, or show lack of organizational planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>There is no noticeable beginning, middle, and end. Writing lacks transitions and is disorganized. Ideas are confusing and difficult to follow. There are many examples of poor organizational planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION 3</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT &amp; SUPPORT (20%)</th>
<th>SLO 3</th>
<th>CO (CRITICAL THINKING)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary (4)</td>
<td>Main points/topics are well developed with supporting evidence. Refutation (Counterpoints &amp; Rebuttals) is exemplary. Supporting evidence provides concrete and accurate examples that advance the paper's position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient (3)</td>
<td>Main points/topics are present, but some may lack detail and development. Refutation (Counterpoints &amp; Rebuttals) is mostly proficient. Supporting evidence provides examples that advance the paper's position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing (2)</td>
<td>Main points/topics may exist, but many lack development. Refutation (Counterpoints &amp; Rebuttals) may be developing, but is vague or unclear. Supporting evidence provides limited examples that weakly advance the paper's position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>Main points/topics may be missing and/or exhibit poor development of ideas. Refutation (Counterpoints &amp; Rebuttals) is missing or substantially vague. There is limited to no supporting evidence and/or evidence does not advance the paper's position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION 4</th>
<th>ANALYSIS (20%)</th>
<th>SLO 4</th>
<th>CO (CRITICAL THINKING)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary (4)</td>
<td>The evidence comes from a variety of valid sources. Evidence is relevant and contributes to the development of the position. In-depth analysis and interpretation of the evidence is apparent throughout. Minimum number of sources is met or exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient (3)</td>
<td>The evidence comes from generally valid sources, but there may be some uncertainty about the reliability of at least one source. Most evidence is relevant to purpose. Accurate analysis of the evidence is apparent. Minimum number of sources is met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing (2)</td>
<td>Little evidence comes from valid sources; there may be much uncertainty about the accuracy of the information presented. Little evidence is relevant or adapted to purpose. Insufficient analysis or interpretation of the evidence is evident. Minimum number of sources is not met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>The evidence does not come from valid sources, contributing to serious doubt of the value of the material. Most evidence is not relevant or adapted to purpose. Analysis or interpretation of the evidence is missing or irrelevant to purpose. Minimum number of sources is not met.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CRITERION 5 | SOURCES & DOCUMENTATION (15%) | \_ | \_ |
|-------------|-------------------------------| | |
| Exemplary (4) | All in-text citations, as well as the Works Cited page, are documented accurately according to MLA Style. Source material is smoothly integrated into the text. The entire essay is formatted correctly. | | |
| Proficient (3) | The majority of in-text citations, as well as the Works Cited page, are documented accurately according to MLA Style. Source material is adequately integrated. Most of the essay is formatted correctly. | | |
| Developing (2) | A few in-text citations are attempted but feature poor execution. A Works Cited page is provided but fails to adhere to MLA Style guidelines. Source material is used, but integration may be awkward. Some of the essay is formatted correctly. | | |
| Beginning (1) | None of the in-text citations are documented accurately according to MLA Style, or the Works Cited page is missing. Source integration is very limited or missing entirely. Very little of the essay is formatted correctly. | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION 6</th>
<th>EDITED AMERICAN ENGLISH (20%)</th>
<th>SLO 5</th>
<th>CO (COMMUNICATION)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary (4)</td>
<td>Meaning is skillfully conveyed with clarity, fluency, and is virtually grammatically and mechanically error-free. Writing is at the college level and demonstrates clear sophistication of thought/style.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient (3)</td>
<td>Meaning is generally clearly conveyed, with few grammatical or mechanical errors. Sentence structure is generally correct and shows a stronger attempt at variety. Writing is mostly at the college level, with a proficient level of sophistication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing (2)</td>
<td>Meaning is sometimes impeded because of frequent grammatical or mechanical errors. The essay contains frequent sentence structure errors and sentence variety is significantly limited. Writing may seem basic/elementary, with a lower level of sophistication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning (1)</td>
<td>Meaning is significantly impeded because of numerous grammatical or mechanical errors. The essay contains multiple errors with sentence structure and there is no attempt at sentence variety. Writing may seem awkward and/or significantly unsophisticated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evolution: Inter-Rater Signature Assignment Evaluator (ISAE) Work Groups

• Sessions
  • 3-day Series scheduled for Friday; Fall and Spring semesters
  • ISAE work groups were composed of TSC Faculty, Staff and Students.
  • Worked in groups of two or three evaluators for \textbf{three-hour} (morning or afternoon) sessions.

• Selection Process:
  • Staff- recommended by Executive Director or VP
  • Student- recommended by Faculty
  • Faculty- demonstrated understanding of Classroom Assessment Techniques and/or Signature Assignment Design on their Faculty Improvement Plans

• Representation of all Programs & Disciplines

  \textbf{Characteristics of Participants:} 105 Faculty Members; 9 Staff; and 3 Students

  \textbf{Sample:} 377 Signature Assignments

  \textbf{Evaluated:} 377 Signature Assignments (100%);
  317 included in the Data Analysis (84%)
## PRELIMINARY DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### Core Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Area Option</th>
<th>Usability</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Total Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavior Science</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life &amp; Physical Science</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Area Option</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Divisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Usability</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Total Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDT</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTE</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Office</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral &amp; Social</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All Program courses have not been evaluated.

---

### Data Analysis

Scoring Range: 0 = Not Evident; 1 = Below Expectations; 2 = Meets Expectation; 3 = Exceeds Expectation; 4 = Exemplary

Recorded combined average score for criteria on each evaluated sample on the ISAE Data Spreadsheet.
PRELIMINARY DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Data Analysis:

- Scoring Range: 0 = Not Evident; 1 = Below Expectations; 2 = Meets Expectation; 3 = Exceeds Expectation; 4 = Exemplary
- Recorded the whole number score for criteria to calculate frequency counts.

Frequency Counts and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Usability</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 0</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 1</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRELIMINARY DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

2018 Inter-Rater Signature Assignment
% of Signature Assignments Deemed
Exceeds Expectation/Exemplary

- Purpose: 34%
- Development: 28%
- Relevant: 37%
- Usability: 24%
Findings....

• Some Evaluator Comments:
  • Easily understood connection of the assignment to the criteria.
  • Instructions for assignment were clear, down to the amount of words needed.
  • This project is well structured, aligned and assessed all COs/SLOs while allowing students to be creative and show their written skills.
  • Core reflected in the instructions.
Findings... (cont’d)

• Most Frequent Evaluator Comments:
  • No Course Name listed on assignment.
  • SLOs/COs are not explicitly indicated on assignment.
  • Instructions are vague and may be difficult to follow.
  • Rubric criteria and Assignment instructions don’t match. For example: if only written communication is addressed by this assignment, the text related to “oral and visual” communication should be removed from the assignment sheet.
  • Rubric is very long.
  • Prompts offered for assignment do not match or relate to SLOs or COs specified on rubric.
  • Rubric/Assignment assessment of outcomes are not reflected in a quantifiable or qualitative manner.
Recommendations

- Signature Assignments and Associated Rubrics
  - Explicit instruction & Opportunities for Practice
  - Transfer of Core Objectives from one context/situation
  - Deliberate Practice in Learning Communities
- Associated Rubrics
  - Explicit link to learning outcomes and rubric/grading criteria
  - Aim slightly above what students can do on their own
  - Meaningful beyond the classroom
  - Start with low-stakes, thinking activities and build to high-stakes critical thinking assignment
  - Include metacognitive activities (awareness of own thinking & processes)
Recommendations (cont’d.)

- **Benchmarks** are attainment targets with associated numerical ratings for student work.
  - High-Impact Practices which contribute to reliability and face validity of evidence of student learning outcomes are used for Direct assessment.
  - Self-reflective assignments and/or Satisfaction Surveys can be used as an indirect assessment tools.
  - Rating scale must align with type of task/performance. For example, “Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced, Expert” might be performance levels for Computer courses.
What’s Next?

• Department and Division Faculty Discussion
• Submission of Revised Signature Assignments to ISAE
• Returned Evaluation Scores and Feedback by September 15th
• Conducting Calibration Sessions
Recap/Q & A
Dr. Karen M. White-Goyzueta
Karen.whitegoyzueta@tsc.edu
Tel: 956-295-3369