**FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORTING FORM**

**RDG 100**

|  |
| --- |
| **Program or Course:** RDG100 |
| **Date**: 4/18/2021 – 5/09/2021 |
| **Number of Student Participants:** 24 |
| **Number of Faculty/Staff Participants:**  3 |
| **Name of person completing report:** Mary Kieser |
| **Assessment Reporting Form:** This report is to show that assessment is occurring and that the results are being used to make changes to improve student learning. The assessment being reported could be an assessment of a Program Learning Outcome (PLO) or a Measurable Student Level Outcome (MSLO). Each program should be assessing and gathering data for at least two PLOs OR two MSLOs that contain CSLOs each year. |
| 1. **What PLOs and/or MSLOs and CSLOs are you going to assess this year?**  * **CAC.CSLO.02:** Integrative Knowledge. Identify, comprehend, apply and synthesize facts, concepts, theories and practices across broad and specialized knowledge areas. * **CAC.CSLO.04:** Reasoning Skills. Inquire and analyze to solve problems, draw logical conclusions, or create innovative ideas. * **RDG100.MSLO.02:** (Analysis Level) Analyze textbook information and readings for topics, main ideas (stated or implied), and supporting details. * **RDG100.MSLO.07:** (Comprehension Level) Identify author's purpose, tone and possible bias. * **RDG100.MSLO.08:** (Application Level) Apply critical reading/thinking strategies in order to evaluate evidence used to support specific claims. |
| **2. Describe the assessment method used and criteria for successful achievement of student learning outcomes. (e.g., rubrics, licensing exam, internship, portfolio, exam, research paper, performance exam, EAC, etc.)**   * **Critical Thinking/Reading Quiz:** An 11 question Critical Thinking/Reading Quiz was administered through Blackboard by all faculty (there were no adjunct faculty this spring due to the decrease in the number of reading classes due to the removal of the reading requirement). It was administered to every RDG 100 student. The above CSLOs and MSLOs were aligned to each of the 11 questions and reports on data regarding student performance on each question was compiled and analyzed. In the fall, the same assessment was administered to establish a benchmark report. Then the results were discussed to determine if there were any gaps in instruction or if the assessment needs to be modified. * **Changes Made after the Benchmark Data Analysis:** The Reading Department found a question that most students did poorly on. We decided to edit the question once we realized that it asked students about the “generalities” in a question on types of support. Generalities were not covered in the textbook and was not a MSLO or CLSO. In addition, we found that the quiz had been revised and not all instructors had the revised quiz in their course so the KR(20) / Cronbach Alpha Score was not given.The revised quiz was uploaded into each faculty’s course for consistency. Also, the mastery level was raised from 60% to 80% to more accurately reflect mastery. |
| 1. **How many students were proficient in the PLOs OR MSLOs and CSLOs and how many were not? What was determined as proficient? (i.e. 70% = proficient)**   **Fall 2020 - Benchmark (60% Proficiency)**  The following CSLO’s and MSLO’s were assessed in this Critical Reading Assessment.   1. **CAC.CSLO.02:** Proficient - 88% - Not Proficient - 12% 2. **CAC.CSLO.04:** Proficient - 87% - Not Proficient - 13% 3. **RDG100.MSLO.02:** Proficient - 89% - Not Proficient - 11% 4. **RDG100.MSLO.07:** Proficient – 94% - Not Proficient - 6% 5. **RDG100.MSLO.08:** Proficient - 86% - Not Proficient - 14%   **Spring 2021 - Final (80% Proficiency)**  The following CSLO’s and MSLO’s were assessed in this Critical Reading Assessment.   1. **CAC.CSLO.02:** Proficient - 88% - Not Proficient - 12% 2. **CAC.CSLO.04:** Proficient - 87% - Not Proficient - 13% 3. **RDG100.MSLO.02:** Proficient – 83.3% - Not Proficient – 16.7% 4. **RDG100.MSLO.07:** Proficient – 70.8% - Not Proficient – 29.2% 5. **RDG100.MSLO.08:** Proficient – 83.3%% - Not Proficient – 16.7%  * All students were proficient in each of the CSLO’s and MSLO’s except for RDG100.MSLO.07: (Comprehension Level) Identify author's purpose, tone and possible bias. * The Mean Score overall was 9/11 = 82% which was up from 73% in the fall.   (See the attached EAC Summary Report) |
| **4. What changes/improvements were made or will be made in response to the outcomes of the assessment process?**   1. In August, the Reading Department will discuss adding additional instruction and/or assignments to Identify author's purpose, tone and possible bias. 2. The assessment will not have to be revised since the scores accurately reflected student learning. |

## Critical Reading Assessment EAC Report – RDG 100

**4/18/2021 - 5/9/2021**

Test instruments differed among students. While statistics remain directionally useful, interpret them with caution.

| **Courses Included** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Instructors** | **Enrollment** | **Responses** | **Percent** |
| RDG10017 - College Reading (Spring 2021, ONL Online) (21SP-RDG100-Teel) | Kieser, Mary; Teel, Skyla | 16 | 11 | 69 |
| RDG10017 - College Reading (Spring 2021, Section 21SP3634, ONL Online) (21SP3634) | Kieser, Mary | 8 | 6 | 75 |
| RDG10017 - College Reading (Spring 2021, Section 21SP3617, ONL Online) (21SP3617) | Kieser, Mary; Hanson, Alyson | 17 | 7 | 41 |

| **Summary Statistics** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Scored Responses24 | Actual Item Scores240 | Mean Score8.75 |
| Scorable Questions11 | Highest Score10 | Median Score9 |
| Possible Item Scores240 | Lowest Score1.5 | Std Dev1.86 |
|  | KR(20) / Cronbach AlphaNA | |

| **Item Analysis** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Title** | **Question** | **P-Value** | **Point Biserial** | **Cronbach Del** | **DI (27)** |
| 1 |  | What is the tone of the article? Choose the two that are the best fit. | 0.83 | 0.32 | NA | 0.5 |
| 2 |  | Match the following statements to the type of support that it is. | 0.36 | 0.32 | NA | 0.67 |
| 3 |  | What is the issue (point of the argument)? | 0.88 | 0.58 | NA | 0.17 |
| 4 |  | The first major supporting details is | 0.96 | 0.77 | NA | 0.17 |
| 5 |  | The second major supporting detail is | 0.88 | 0.76 | NA | 0.5 |
| 6 |  | What is the author’s purpose for writing the article? | 0.96 | 0.77 | NA | 0.17 |
| 7 |  | What is the authority (credentials) of the author? | 0.96 | 0.77 | NA | 0.17 |
| 8 |  | Which of the following is relevant support for the author's argument that boxing should be banned? | 0.92 | 0.65 | NA | 0.33 |
| 9 |  | What information could the author have included to make his argument stronger? | 0.96 | -0.02 | NA | 0 |
| 10 |  | What would someone who opposes the author's position argue about the issue? | 0.83 | 0.49 | NA | 0.5 |
| 11 |  | Match the following statements to the type of support that it is. | 0.77 | 0.43 | NA | 0.17 |

| **Distractors** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Type** | **Question** | **Correct** | **PtBis** | **Responses** |
| 1 | MA | What is the tone of the article? Choose the two that are the best fit. | Correct | -- | 17 (70.8%) Persuasive::Serious |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) Persuasive |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) Serious::Uncertain |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) Serious::Sentimental |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) Persuasive::Sentimental |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 3 (12.5%) Other responses |
| 2 | MAT | Match the following statements to the type of support that it is. | Correct | -- | 4 (36.4%) Boxing is the only sport where the sole object is to injure the opponent. ::generality\*\*Boxing in morally offensive because its intent is to is to inflict brain injuries on another person::opinion\*\*Medical science can't take someone who has suffered repeated blows to the head and restore that person to normal function. ::fact |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 4 (36.4%) Boxing is the only sport where the sole object is to injure the opponent. ::fact\*\*Boxing in morally offensive because its intent is to is to inflict brain injuries on another person::opinion\*\*Medical science can't take someone who has suffered repeated blows to the head and restore that person to normal function. ::generality |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 2 (18.2%) Boxing is the only sport where the sole object is to injure the opponent. ::fact\*\*Boxing in morally offensive because its intent is to is to inflict brain injuries on another person::opinion\*\*Medical science can't take someone who has suffered repeated blows to the head and restore that person to normal function. ::fact |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (9.1%) Boxing is the only sport where the sole object is to injure the opponent. ::generality\*\*Boxing in morally offensive because its intent is to is to inflict brain injuries on another person::fact\*\*Medical science can't take someone who has suffered repeated blows to the head and restore that person to normal function. ::fact |
| 3 | MC | What is the issue (point of the argument)? | Correct | 0.63 | 21 (87.5%) The sport of boxing should be banned. |
|  |  |  |  | -0.81 | 1 (4.2%) Boxing gets poor kids out of the ghetto. |
|  |  |  |  | -0.16 | 2 (8.3%) Medical science says boxing is morally offensive. |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 (0%) Boxing is a wonderful sport. |
| 4 | MC | The first major supporting details is | Correct | -- | 23 (95.8%) Boxing sets an example that violence is an accepted behavior. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) Boxing is the only sport where the sole object is to injure the opponent. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) Medical Science can't restore a person who has suffered repeated blows to the head. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) None of the above. |
| 5 | MC | The second major supporting detail is |  | 0 | 0 (0%) Boxing sets an example that violence is an accepted behavior. |
|  |  |  | Correct | 0.76 | 21 (87.5%) Boxing is the only sport where the sole object is to injure the opponent. |
|  |  |  |  | -0.32 | 2 (8.3%) Medical science can't restore a person who has suffered repeated blows to the head. |
|  |  |  |  | -0.81 | 1 (4.2%) Boxing gives poor kids the opportunity to get out of the ghetto. |
| 6 | MC | What is the author’s purpose for writing the article? | Correct | -- | 23 (95.8%) To inform the reader about the dangers of boxing and  persuade the reader to support his viewpoint. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) To persuade the reader that boxing is an opportunity for poor kids to get out of the ghetto. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) To entertain the reader by discussing boxing. |
| 7 | MC | What is the authority (credentials) of the author? | Correct | -- | 23 (95.8%) He is a doctor |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) He is a boxer |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) He is an author |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) He is the parent of a former boxer |
| 8 | MC | Which of the following is relevant support for the author's argument that boxing should be banned? |  | -- | 2 (8.3%) Injuries occur in other sports. |
|  |  |  | Correct | -- | 22 (91.7%) Boxing injuries often lead to irreversible medical consequences. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) Boxing gives poor kids an opportunity to get out of the ghetto. |
| 9 | MC | What information could the author have included to make his argument stronger? |  | -- | 1 (4.2%) Statistics on the number of boxers that end up with brain damage. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) The amount of money a professional boxer makes during his/her career. |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 0 (0%) An example of a professional boxer who suffered brain damage. |
|  |  |  | Correct | -- | 23 (95.8%) Both A and C. |
| 10 | MC | What would someone who opposes the author's position argue about the issue? |  | -0.85 | 2 (8.3%) Boxing causes many other injuries beyond brain injuries. |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 (8.3%) Boxing promotes violence. |
|  |  |  | Correct | 0.63 | 20 (83.3%) Boxing is an activity that promotes physical fitness. |
| 11 | MAT | Match the following statements to the type of support that it is. | Correct | -- | 10 (76.9%) Boxing in morally offensive because its intent is to is to inflict brain injuries on another person::opinion\*\*Medical science can't take someone who has suffered repeated blows to the head and restore that person to normal function. ::fact |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 2 (15.4%) Boxing in morally offensive because its intent is to is to inflict brain injuries on another person::fact\*\*Medical science can't take someone who has suffered repeated blows to the head and restore that person to normal function. ::fact |
|  |  |  |  | -- | 1 (7.7%) Boxing in morally offensive because its intent is to is to inflict brain injuries on another person::fact\*\*Medical science can't take someone who has suffered repeated blows to the head and restore that person to normal function. ::opinion |

| **Goals Summary** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goals** | **Scored** | **Avg** | **Target** | **Percent Met** | **# Qs** | **% Qs** |
| CAC.CSLO.02\_\_Integrative Knowledge | 240 | 0.88 | 0.8 | 87.5 | 11 | 100 |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| CAC.CSLO.04\_\_Reasoning Skills | 192 | 0.87 | 0.8 | 83.3 | 9 | 81.8 |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| RDG100.MSLO.02 | 72 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 83.3 | 3 | 27.3 |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| RDG100.MSLO.07 | 48 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 70.8 | 2 | 18.2 |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | | | | | | |
| RDG100.MSLO.08 | 144 | 0.85 | 0.8 | 83.3 | 7 | 63.6 |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | | | | | | |