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Introduction

This document contains a series of charts and tables that disaggregate spring 2018 core competencies assessments by demographic category. The two different assessments that were conducted were **Written Communication** and **Teamwork & Collaborative Skills**. While classroom faculty assessed both of these, a concurrent assessment in Student Services was performed but only for Teamwork and Collaborative Skills. Given the small number of students assessed, care should be taken when interpreting the results. This information is designed to provide baseline data for future large-scale assessment efforts.

Background on the Assessment

1. **Instructional Division**: Upon official adoption of the Core Competencies (CCs) in 2017, instructional departments were required to evaluate and map their course SLOs (CSLOs) to the competencies. Faculty were provided with a list of Core Competencies and their definitions/descriptions related to scoring rubrics that would be used and were developed through the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AACU). In fall semester, the Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) drew up plans to pilot the assessment process in the spring of 2018 with two of the 15 competencies. The two competencies chosen were “Written Communication” and “Teamwork and Collaborative Skills” which would involve both instruction and student services divisions. OAC representatives then identified CSLOs that were mapped to the two competencies from courses that satisfied the GE requirements for the “Plan A” associate degree. Associate faculty and full-time faculty teaching mapped courses in the diverse areas of Plan A were contacted by OAC and asked to participate in the assessment. Ten faculty members volunteered to participate in a summative assessment of their CSLOs that mapped to the two CCs. Students from three courses that had CSLOs which mapped to the Teamwork CC and five courses mapping to Written Communication were assessed near the end of the semester after faculty met to discuss the process, calibrate and be trained on the common use of the specific VALUE rubric (AACU reference). Overall, a total of 163 students were assessed on Written Communication skills and 102 students were assessed on Teamwork & Collaborative skills. Faculty reported the VALUE rubric score (1-4) for each student in their SURF Grade Rosters.

**Student Services/Student Life & Leadership:** Four representatives from Student Life & Leadership (including the dean) made separate plans to assess the Teamwork core competency. Twelve students involved in student government were selected/volunteered to participate, and seven of them also participated in a follow-up interview process which included a discussion of the assessment results, including the students’ self-evaluations alongside the observers’ assessments. The information and tentative findings regarding this portion of the assessment are provided in a separate report, beginning on page 21.

1. **Sequence of Events in the Assessment Process:**
* VALUE Rubric Calibration meeting for faculty & staff participants (March 30, 2018)
* Administer Assessment to Students (May 2018)
* Students Perform Self-Assessment of their Assignment (May 2018)
* Assessment Artifacts are Evaluated by Faculty/Staff (May 2018)
* Faculty Respond to Online Survey of Process (May 2018)
* Assessment Results are Submitted to OAC (May-June 2018)
* Data Analyzed by OAC & RPIE (June- July 2018)
* Participating faculty and representatives from Student Life & Activities met to review the process and results (July 2018)

# Executive Summary for Instructional Division Assessment

Core competencies are the overarching learning outcomes MiraCosta College expects students to have gained in the process of completing a transfer pattern and/or completing an Associate Degree. In the spring of 2018, a team of faculty undertook the process of assessing two of these competencies; Written Communication, and Teamwork. Participating faculty conducted a summative assessment at the course level, and then a self-assessment survey was completed by the students to determine if there was a correlation between the two groups.

As this was a pilot project, the population of students assessed was very small. (n= 163 for Written Communication and n= 102 for Teamwork) The data yielded interesting insights into student achievement, but the size of the populations meant that the results weren’t necessarily reflective of the student body as a whole. Additional assessment over multiple terms will be necessary before valid inferences can be drawn from the data.

## Initial Findings

### Written Communication

* The average faculty rubric rating was 3.20 out of 4.00.
* There appeared to be a relationship between the grade received in the course and their rubric rating. More data will be needed to test for statistical significance
* There did not appear to be a relationship between rubric rating and units completed, nor was there evidence of a relationship between students with different enrollment types. (i.e., first-time college freshmen, continuing, returning and students transferring in.)
* While there were differences with respect to different demographic categories (i.e., age, gender and ethnicity), additional data will be needed to determine whether the differences are statistically significant.
* For the survey portion of the assessment, (n=114) student and faculty data were compared side-by-side. Overall, students assessed their own achievement slightly higher than that of their faculty. Ninety-two percent (92%) of students rated themselves as meeting the competency threshold, compared to the faculty rating of 88%.
* Students were most likely to agree with the statement related to their understanding of audience, context and purpose. Students were least likely to agree with the statement about communicating meaning with limited errors.

### Teamwork

* The average faculty rubric rating was 2.88 out of 4.00.
* Results for the Teamwork competency were almost identical to those seen in the Written Communication competency. There was evidence of a relationship between the grade received in the course and a student’s rubric rating. Additional data will be needed to test for statistical significance.
* There did not appear to be a relationship between rubric rating and units completed, nor was there evidence of a relationship between students with different enrollment types. (i.e., first-time college freshmen, continuing, returning and students transferring in.)
* While there were differences with respect to different demographic categories (i.e., age, gender and ethnicity), additional data will be needed to determine whether the differences are statistically significant.
* For the survey portion of the assessment, (n=63) student and faculty data were compared side-by-side. Overall, students assessed their own achievement higher than that of their faculty. Almost 97% of students rated themselves as meeting the competency threshold, compared to the faculty rating of 76.2%.
* The final question on the Teamwork survey was whether or not they had met each of the four qualities that made up the competency. More than half (65%) indicated that they believed they had met all four qualities. None indicated they had met less than two qualities.

While this pilot assessment process generated interesting results, additional study will be necessary to determine whether the information can be applied to larger populations.

# **Full Report - Instruction**

# Written Communication

Courses assessed: 9 sections- ENGL 100 (2 sections), BIO 220, (2 sections), COMM 101 (2 sections), HIST 110, HIST 111.

Table 1: Written Communication Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Number of Course Sections | 8 |
| Students Rated | 163 |
| Average Rating | 3.20 |

Figure 1: Number of Students by Written Communication Score

(VALUE rubric scores: 1=Benchmark; 2= Milestone 1; 3=Milestone 2; 4=Capstone. Scores of 0 in SURF Roster indicated that student was not assessed but was given a final grade. Refer to the actual VALUE Rubrics for further information)

Table 2: Average Rubric Score by Grade Received

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Received | Number of Students | Average Written Communication Score |
| A | 74 | 3.50 |
| B | 47 | 3.11 |
| C | 31 | 2.74 |
| D | 7 | 2.71 |
| F | 0 | - |
| NP | 0 | - |
| P | 3 | 3.33 |

Table 3 compares the grade students received in the course with their Written Communication scores. Of the students who received a grade of “A” in the course, 55.4% also received a Written Communication score of “4.” The data suggests that there is a relationship exists between the grade and the score, but currently there is not enough data to measure statistical significance.

Table 3: Course Grade and Written Communication Score Comparison

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Written Communication Score |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Course Grade | A | 1.4% | 2.7% | 40.5% | 55.4% |
| B | 2.1% | 10.6% | 61.7% | 25.5% |
| C/P | 11.8% | 14.7% | 55.9% | 17.7% |
| D | 14.3% | 28.6% | 28.6% | 28.6% |

Figure 2: Average Written Communication Score by Units Completed Prior to Spring 2018

Table 4: Average Written Communication Score by Admit Type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of Students | Average Written Communication Score |
| First Time Freshmen | 18 | 3.11 |
| Continuing Student | 120 | 3.20 |
| Returning Student | 11 | 3.09 |
| Transfer Student from Another College | 9 | 3.33 |
| High School Student | 5 | 3.60 |

Table 5: Average Written Communication Score by Age

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of Students | Average Written Communication Score |
| 17 and Under | 2 | 4.00 |
| 18-20 | 47 | 3.30 |
| 21-24 | 48 | 3.06 |
| 25-29 | 39 | 3.18 |
| 30-34 | 17 | 3.29 |
| 35-39 | 4 | 3.75 |
| 40-44 | 3 | 3.00 |
| 45-54 | 1 | 2.00 |
| 55-64 | 1 | 3.00 |
| 65 and Older | 1 | 3.00 |

Table 6: Average Written Communication Score by Gender

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of Students | Average Written Communication Score |
| Female | 102 | 3.23 |
| Male | 60 | 3.17 |
| Unknown | 1 | 3.00 |

Table 7: Average Written Communication Score by Ethnicity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of Students | Average Written Communication Score |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 2 | 3.50 |
| Asian | 7 | 3.29 |
| Black/African American | 3 | 3.00 |
| Hispanic | 55 | 3.24 |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | 3.00 |
| Two or More Races | 21 | 3.19 |
| Unknown | 4 | 3.25 |
| White | 70 | 3.17 |

# Teamwork & Collaborative Skills

Courses assessed: 5 sections- CSIT 120 (3 sections), ART 104, COMM 106

Table 8: Teamwork Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Number of Course Sections | 5 |
| Students Rated | 102 |
| Average Rating | 2.88 |

Figure 3: Number of Students by Teamwork Score

Table 9: Average Rubric Score by Grade Received

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Received | Number of Students | Average Teamwork Score |
| A | 58 | 3.12 |
| B | 31 | 2.71 |
| C | 10 | 2.30 |
| D | 2 | 2.00 |
| F | 0 | - |
| NP | 0 | - |
| P | 0 | - |

Like Table 3 in the section on Written Communication, Table 10 compares the grade students received in the course with their Teamwork scores. Of the students who received a grade of “A” in the course, 19.0% also received a Written Communication score of “4.” The data suggests that there is a relationship exists between the grade and the score, but currently there is not enough data to measure statistical significance.

Table 10: Course Grade and Teamwork Score Comparison

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Teamwork Score |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Course Grade | A | 0.0% | 6.9% | 74.1% | 19.0% |
| B | 0.0% | 35.5% | 58.1% | 6.5% |
| C/P | 0.0% | 70.0% | 30.0% | 0.0% |
| D | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

Figure4: Average Teamwork Score by Units Completed Prior to Spring 2018

Table 11: Average Teamwork Score by Admit Type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of Students | Average Teamwork Score |
| First Time Freshmen | 5 | 2.80 |
| Continuing Student | 89 | 2.88 |
| Returning Student | 5 | 2.80 |
| Transfer Student from Another College | 1 | 4.00 |
| High School Student | 2 | 3.00 |

Table 12: Average Teamwork Score by Age

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of Students | Average Teamwork Score |
| 17 and Under | 2 | 3.00 |
| 18-20 | 28 | 2.82 |
| 21-24 | 47 | 2.87 |
| 25-29 | 10 | 2.80 |
| 30-34 | 8 | 3.13 |
| 35-39 | 1 | 2.00 |
| 40-44 | 0 | - |
| 45-54 | 5 | 3.00 |
| 55-64 | 1 | 4.00 |
| 65 and Older | 0 | - |

Table 13: Average Teamwork Score by Gender

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of Students | Average Teamwork Score |
| Female | 43 | 2.98 |
| Male | 59 | 2.81 |
| Unknown | 0 | - |

Table 14: Average Teamwork Score by Ethnicity

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of Students | Average Teamwork Score |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 0 | - |
| Asian | 13 | 3.00 |
| Black/African American | 0 | - |
| Hispanic | 37 | 2.76 |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | 3.00 |
| Two or More Races | 6 | 2.83 |
| Unknown | 1 | 3.00 |
| White | 44 | 2.95 |

# **Student Self-Assessment Surveys**

As a part of the analysis, students were also asked to assess achievement of their own core competencies using a survey instrument which reflected the categories in the VALUE scoring rubric. Not every student assessed by their instructor also completed the survey, so the population sizes will appear smaller than those seen in the previous tables. One section was unable to complete the survey, and another section completed the survey anonymously, so that data is also not included in the assessment. The tables below reflect only those student responses that have a corresponding faculty assessment.

For the Teamwork survey responses, question 4 of the survey asked students to summarize the aspects of the competency that were met. This was the figure that was used for comparison purposes with the faculty assessment. The Written Communication survey did not have such a question. Each of the questions addressed an aspect of the core competency. An average of the overall assessment was used.

## Written Communication

Overall, average student ratings tended to be slightly higher than those of their instructors (figure 5).

Figure 5: Comparison of Faculty and Student Self Assessments

Figure 6 shows that 92% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they met the competency, compared to 88% of faculty.

Figure 6: Distribution of Faculty and Student Assessments

Figure 7 shows the distribution of responses to the Written Communication survey questions. Overall, students responded with high levels of agreement with each of the statements. Students were most likely to agree with the statement related to their understanding of audience, context and purpose. Students were least likely to agree with the statement about communicating meaning with limited errors.

Figure 7: Response distribution for the Written Communication Core Competency

## Teamwork

The Teamwork core competency had a total of 63 responses. Students indicated higher levels of achievement than those reported by their faculty (figure 8).

Figure 8: Comparison of Faculty and Student Self Assessments

Neither faculty nor students gave a rating of “Strongly Disagree.” The biggest disparity was between the “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” categories (figure 9).

Figure 9: Distribution of Faculty and Student Assessments

The responses to the three survey questions provided to the students did not vary significantly. More than 95% of students either agreed or strongly agreed with each of the three items.

Figure 10: Response Distribution for the Teamwork Core Competency

The final question dealt with an overall assessment of how well students felt they had mastered their core competencies. The question was:

*“I supported a constructive team climate by doing the following:*

* *Treated team members respectfully; &*
* *Presented a positive attitude during my work with the rest of the team; &*
* *Motivated my teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team’s ability to complete it; &*
* *Provided assistance and/or encouragement to team members.”*

Students were then asked to respond based on whether they felt they had exhibited 1, 2, 3 or 4 qualities. More than half (65%) indicated that they believed they had met all four qualities. None indicated they had met less than two qualities.

Figure 11: Response to the question," I supported a constructive team climate…”

Samples of the student self-assessment surveys are found below.

**Name**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Self-Assessment on Written Communication Skills**

**Now that your assignment or project is complete, you are being asked to evaluate the degree to which you feel that the work which you have completed meets the following statements (#1-5 below). This evaluation will have no impact on your score or grade in the course. It is only for me to compare each of our impressions of the work that you completed. I will not be looking at these surveys until the end of the semester.**

**Instructions: Please take a couple minutes to read each of the following 5 comments related to your completed assignment. Then fill in the blank to the left of each statement with the letter corresponding to each question number that best reflects your opinion of your own work in the completion of this assignment.**

**A: Strongly agree (Great Job)**

**B: Agree (Good job)**

**C: Disagree (Fair job)**

**D: Strongly disagree (poor job)**

ON THIS ASSIGNMENT:

1. I demonstrated a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose.
2. I used appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying my understanding of the assignment/material which was assigned to me.
3. I exhibited detailed attention to organization, content, presentation, formatting and stylistic choices.
4. I demonstrated skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the essay/paper/report that I wrote.
5. I used language that skillfully communicated meaning to my reader(s) with clarity and fluency, and was essentially error-free, having proof-read it.

**Name**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Self-Assessment on Teamwork & Collaborative Skills**

**Now that your assignment or project is complete, you are being asked to evaluate your own contributions to the team effort. This evaluation will have no impact on your score or grade in the course. It is only for me to compare your perception of your work and then compare it to my perception of your work.**

**Instructions: Please take a couple minutes to read each of the following 4 comments related to your contribution to the work on this project or assignment. Then fill in the blank to the left of each statement with the letter corresponding to each question number that best reflects your opinion of your own work in the completion of this assignment.**

**A: Strongly agree (all the time)**

**B: Agree (most of the time)**

**C: Disagree (sometimes)**

**D: Strongly disagree (occasionally or rarely)**

IN COMPLETING THIS ASSIGNMENT/PROJECT:

1. I was able to help the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.
2. I engaged with team members by building upon their contributions, noticing when they were not participating, and encouraging them to become more involved.
3. I completed all assigned tasks by the deadline; my work was thorough, comprehensive and advanced the project. I was proactive in providing assistance as needed to help others on my team to complete their tasks at a high level of achievement.

*(On question 4, it is suggested that you select A if you exhibited ALL 4 qualities; select B if just 3 qualities; C if you exhibited 1 or 2 qualities; and select D if you did not exhibit any of the qualities.*

1. I supported a constructive team climate by doing the following:
* Treated team members respectfully; &
* Presented a positive attitude during my work with the rest of the team; &
* Motivated my teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team’s ability to complete it; &
* Provided assistance and/or encouragement to team members.

**Faculty Survey of Assessment Process**

Participating faculty were asked to complete a survey on the Core Competency assessment process. Five out of ten faculty responded to the survey.

QUESTIONS:

1. Do you feel that your course SLO aligned with the core competency that you assessed?

2. Do you feel that you received sufficient instruction on the assessment process through the calibration meeting and email communication?

3. Was the rubric calibration training session useful to you in preparing for the assessment?

4. Please provide any suggestions that you may have for improving the training and instructions that were given to you in preparation for the assessment.

5. Did your participation provide you with a better understanding of the core competency assessment process?

6. Was the use of the calibrated VALUE rubric useful to you in terms of providing a more objective evaluation?

7. Do you use rubrics to evaluate your own course SLOs?

8. How beneficial/useful do you think it would be provide your students with the calibrated VALUE rubric before they undertake their assignment?

9. During the assessment process, please indicate the approximate, collective amount of time spent on evaluation of the assignments completed by your students for the purpose of the core competency assessment.

10. During the assessment process, please indicate the approximate, collective amount of time spent on evaluation of the assignments completed by your students for the purpose of the core competency assessment.

# Recommendations

A. Minimum achievement (benchmark) levels were not established for this assessment. Future goal is to set that benchmark.

B. Request a re-assessment in fall 2018 with same faculty. Additional faculty will be recruited for both Core Competency assessments, including more Associate Faculty.

C. Provide training for new faculty on the use of the VALUE rubric.

D. Provide scoring rubric to students when assigning the assessment artifact.

E. Students will complete assessment survey and submit when assignment is submitted for scoring.

F. Assess 2 different Core Competencies in the Spring of 2019.

# **Full Report – Student Life & Leadership**

Background & Methodology

In late March 2018, the Office of Student Life and Leadership was asked to assess the Associated Student Government (ASG) utilizing the AAC&U VALUE Teamwork Rubric. They focused on the Executive Council of the ASG, a group of 12 student leaders that have lead responsibilities within the ASG, including committee leadership. The Executive Council meets on a bi-weekly basis throughout the fall and spring semesters.

Application of the AACU VALUE Teamwork Rubric included an observation period, self-assessment, advisors’ (Gonzales and Schumacher) assessment, and an interview in which the Executive Council member and advisors calibrated scores and reflected on the member’s growth in teamwork over the course of the past year.

In April 2018, Gonzales and Schumacher began to observe members of the Executive Council in Executive Council meetings, Student Senate meetings, and ASG committee meetings (e.g. Law Committee, Finance Committee, etc.) to assess teamwork skills. Within the same month, the AACU VALUE Teamwork Rubric was adapted into a self-assessment form. The self-assessment was presented to the Executive Council in April and revisited in early May. In mid-May, Gonzales and Schumacher scheduled meetings with Executive Council members. In June, interviews were held. Seven (7) executive council members were interviewed.

Reflections on the Observation Phase

Initially, the evaluators decided to observe teamwork behaviors within the Executive Council and Student Senate spaces. Within minutes of doing so, it became clear that the size of each space (12 and 26 members respectively) was much too large for effective observation. Gonzales and Schumacher continued to take note of Executive Council members’ participation within the aforementioned spaces, but decided that observations of members in the smaller committee spaces (Law, Finance, etc.) would be a better approach.

Gonzales and Schumacher developed an observation schedule, but unexpected cancellations of meetings moved the implementation timetable back by a couple of weeks.

Reflections on the Interview Phase

Each student was interviewed with both ASG advisors in a comfortable conversational setting, providing an opportunity to review the rubrics and observe any differentiation between scores thereby providing a basis for conversation. Below are samples of such comparative scoring. The interview followed a Socratic line of inquiry grounded in the teamwork rubric and the student’s ASG experience.

**Student Member A**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Member’s self-Score** | **Advisor’s Score** | **Difference** |
| Contributes to Team Meetings | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Facilitates the Contribution of Team Members | 4 | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Fosters Constructive Team Climate | 4 | 3.5 | .5 |
| Responds to Conflict | 3 | 3 | 0 |

**Student Member B**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Member’s self-Score** | **Advisor’s Score** | **Difference** |
| Contributes to Team Meetings | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Facilitates the Contribution of Team Members | 3 | 2.75 | .25 |
| Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Fosters Constructive Team Climate | 4 | 3.75 | .25 |
| Responds to Conflict | 4 | 4 | 0 |

Findings of 2018 Observations

Two themes emerged from this year’s observations:

1. The learning outcome related to response to conflict emerged as a subtle, yet ongoing issue within this year’s ASG. In general, this year’s group worked well as a team and overt conflict was not present in Executive Council and Student Senate meetings. However, there were occasions where members engaged in conflict over ASG business outside of meetings; interactions that initially caused anxiety among individuals but ultimately lead to resolution and a strengthening of ties. The conflict process resolved member’s concerns but did so outside of meetings. Conversely, one of the leaders at the CLC elected to avoid conflict and not press her concerns in or outside of meetings. As such, she felt disconnected from the Executive Council team. Her experience reflected a perception that all was well at the CLC when, in fact, there were concerns. In her occasion, the absence of conflict created a missed opportunity for the students to address and improve their leadership team at the CLC.
2. Accountability through a clear and consistent attendance policy made a big difference in keeping the team on task and engaged throughout the entire academic year. Members expressed appreciation and valued the attendance guidelines of the team.

Limitations of Implementation

Implementation of the rubric took place mid-way through the semester, leaving little time to effectively observe Executive Council members. Thus, this placed heavier emphasis on the self-reflection portion of the assessment. Further, because Schumacher began his role halfway through the year, heavier emphasis was placed on Gonzales’ observations.

Recommendations

Moving forward, we recommend utilizing the following timeline for implementation:

* Summer: present the AACU VALUE Teamwork rubric to ASG
* Summer and fall semester: evaluators (Gonzales and Schumacher) observe and take notes on ASG members teamwork behaviors
* Late fall semester: ASG members meet with advisors to set a teamwork goal to accomplish by the end of spring
* Throughout spring: ASG members meets with an advisors at regular periods to assess progress toward teamwork goal and recalibrate plan where necessary
* End of spring: Deliver self-assessment tool; schedule and hold interviews to assess teamwork throughout the year. Note, self-assessment and interview reflection are now a requirement for ASG members to receive their final service scholarship.

# **Appendix A: MCC-Modified VALUE Rubrics**

VALUE: Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (<https://www.aacu.org/value-faqs#value1> )

Written Communication VALUE Rubric (MCC version):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Category/Criterion** | **Level**4 | **Level****3** | **Level****2** | **Level****1** | **0** |
| **Context of and Purpose for Writing***Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s). Do not deduct points if some comments are not cited in the text.*  | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work. | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s). | Demonstrates partial understanding of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions). | Demonstrates minimal understanding of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience). | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Content Development** | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the WHOLE work. | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the WHOLE work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through MOST of the work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas, which need development, in some PARTS of the work. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Genre and Disciplinary Conventions***Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields*  | Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, andstylistic choices | Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices | Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation | Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation. In other words, there is awareness of the format, but was not fully successful. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Sources and Evidence** | Demonstrates skillful use of high- quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline andgenre of the writing | Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre ofthe writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline andgenre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Control of Syntax and Mechanics** | Usesl language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is **virtually error-free.** | Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has **few errors**. | Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include **some errors**. | Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of **many errors** in usage. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |

VALUE: Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (<https://www.aacu.org/value-faqs#value1> )

**Teamwork & Collaborative Skills VALUE Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring category/criterion** | **Level****4** | **Level****3** | **Level****2** | **Level****1** | **0** |
| **Contributes to Team Meetings** | Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals. | Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others. | Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group. | Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members** | Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage. | Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others. | Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification. | Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings** | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence. | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project. | Completes all assigned tasks by deadline. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Fosters Constructive Team Climate** | Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following:* Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.
* Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.
* Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.
* Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.
 | Supports a constructive teamclimate by doing any **three** of the actions in Level 4 column. | Supports a constructive teamclimate by doing any **two** of the actions in level 4 column.  | Supports a constructive teamclimate by doing any **one** of the actions listed in level 4 column. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |
| **Responds to Conflict** | Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness. | Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it. | Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict). | Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions. | *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet level one (1) performance.* |

**Appendix B: List of Courses & Faculty Participants Involved in Spring 2018 Assessment**

7 of the 9 areas in Plan A (MCC GE Requirements) are represented (Area D-Social & Behavioural Sciences & Area E2 – Self-Develolpment) were not represented.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Faculty Member** | **Course** | **section number** | **section number** | **section number** | **Plan A GE Area** |
| **Cassoni** | **CSIT 120** | **1769** | **1770** | **1768** | **E1: Lifelong learning (Technology & Information Fluency)** |
| **Diaz** | **Eng 100**  | **1042** |  |  | **A1: Language & Reasoning (English Composition)** |
| **Lindgren** | **Bio 220** | **1995** |  |  | **B: Natural Sciences** |
| **O'Cain** | **Art 104** | **3448** |  |  | **C: Humanities** |
| **O'Connor** | **Eng 100**  | **2543** |  |  | **A1: Language & Reasoning (English Composition)** |
| **Ortiz** | **Comm 101** | **1350** |  |  | **A2: Language & Reasoning (Comm & Analytical Thinking)** |
| **Powers** | **Comm 106** | **1354** | **1355** |  | **A2: Language & Reasoning (Comm & Analytical Thinking)** |
| **Robertson** | **Comm 101** | **1889** | **1353** | **1908** | **A2: Language & Reasoning (Comm & Analytical Thinking)** |
| **Romo** | **Hist 110** | **1273** |  |  | **F: Cultural Diversity** |
| **Romo** | **Hist 111** | **2748** |  |  | **F: Cultural Diversity** |
| **Thomford** | **Bio 220** | **1988** |  |  | **B: Natural Sciences** |

1. Approved by the Outcomes Assessment Committee, December 4, 2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)