

Course Assessment– Part B: Your Results & Analysis

#271

<https://www.cgcc.edu/institutional-assessment/exemplary-course-outcomes-assessment-examples-best-practices>

Your Email *

Please select your course and name from the drop-down menu. If your course or name are incorrect or missing, please contact Instructional Services.

LIB 101 – Library Research and Beyond: Find, Select, and Cite –1091667
– John Schoppert – Fall 2017

Part B: Your Results

Directions

1. Report the outcome achievement data gathered via the assignments, tests, etc. you identified for each outcome (question 3) of your Part A. (Only include data for students who completed the course. Do not include students who withdrew or earned an incomplete) *

Outcome #1 is: Student are asked to turn in an final annotated bibliography as their final assignment. The annotated bibliography is built week-by week. Most weeks the students turn in an mini- bibliography utilizing sources found in specific medium that they explored that week.

Outcome #2 is: The weekly mini-bibliographies (and the final one) ask the students to find resources pertinent to their topic, evaluate them and submit a short list of relevant sources and why they chose them. The weekly discussion (required) also ask the students to discuss and reflect on the lecture & readings for that week.

Outcome #3 is: The students have a quiz related to plagiarism, as well as a discussion posts about privacy, security, and censorship. Previous week's post about "articles", and "internet" are also meant to discuss the information life cycle, publishing, and the scholarship as conversation concept, in addition to other concepts surrounding the place of information in our society.

Outcome #1

The final – Annotated bibliography

*

% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) * 87.5% (7 out of 8 students achieved a C or higher.)

Outcome #2 *

The mini-bibliographies. There were 5 mini-bibliographies: Internet sources – $11.38/15 = 76\%$; Books – $15/15 = 100\%$; EBooks – $13/15 = 87\%$; Articles #1 – $14.5/15 = 97\%$; Articles #2 – $13.7/15 = 91\%$. Results for the mini-bibliographies = 90% overall.

The final bibliography – $87.5/100 = 87.5\%$.

Weekly discussions: There were 5 discussions assessed: Introductions = $10/10 = 100\%$; Research – $8.75/10 = 81\%$; The Internet as Resource Tool – $9.6/10 = 96\%$; Trials and Triumphs – $10/10 = 100\%$; eBooks – $8.7/10 = 87\%$; Research databases – $10/10 = 100\%$; Information Ethics – $10/10 = 100\%$; Wrap-up – $10/10\%$. Overall results for the discussions = 96% reached the stated outcome.

% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) * Overall for outcome #2 = 91% achieved stated outcomes.

Outcome #3 *

Understand many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information. This consisted of quiz related to plagiarism, as well as a discussion posts about privacy, security, and censorship. The first part of this outcome, the discussion on privacy, security, and censorship resulted in 75% pass rate for the outcome (6 out of 8 students). The second part, the plagiarism quiz resulted in 87.5% having met the outcome (7 out 8 students.)

% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above) * Overall for outcome #3 = 81.2% of students who successfully achieved the outcome (C or above)

ANALYSIS

3. What contributed to student success and/or lack of success? *

Thoughtful attention to discussion posts contributed to student success. Substantive Interactive (SI) practice was incorporated during discussion posts and announcements being instigating before students started weekly discussions. They really responded to tips and study suggestions, and shared experiences from the point of view of instructors. SI wasn't practiced in previous classes and the difference in student-to-student interaction was much higher this time. Of course, you can't absolutely make a correlation between the two, but I think a higher level of engagement demonstrated by the instructor might have helped student engage in the class.

4. Helping students to realistically self-assess and reflect on their understanding and progress encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning. Consider comparing your students' perception of their end-of-term understanding/mastery of the three outcomes (found in student evaluations) to your assessment (above) of student achievement of the three outcomes. *

The course student evaluation only received one response. I don't think that's enough to determine the self-assessment of the course's students. Although, the one response did indicate improvement in information retrieval skills, and increased understanding of evaluating sources of information. There was also an heightened awareness of database access and multiple keyword search strategies. The student also indicated that the syllabus was only "good" in providing clear standards for grading, quizzes, and tests.

5. Did student achievement of outcomes meet your expectations for successfully teaching to each outcome (question 4 from Part A) *

Using the measurement of a final cumulative annotated bibliography, students did achieve expectations. Everyone who finished all the course assignments including the final bibliography passed with a score of at least 80 out of 100 (=80%).

6. Based on your analysis in the questions above, what course adjustments are warranted (curricular, pedagogical, student instruction, etc.)? *

A clearer syllabus is needed, and I would add clearer instructions at the beginning of the class in a preemptive announcement going over the pertinent scoring and possible scoring weights of the measurements. The course will also incorporate active projects such as a wikipedia project.

7. What resources would be required to implement your recommended course adjustments (materials, training, equipment, etc.)? What Budget implications result?

The recommended course adjustments can be done with no additional material budget. The majority can be done with time and some free professional development training around the use of Wikipedia as an editor/author.

8. Reflect on any adjustments you made from the last assessment of this course (if applicable) and their effectiveness in student achievement of outcomes. *

N/A

9. Describe how you have shared information about course outcomes with your students.

At the beginning of each weekly module, the course points out the learning outcomes for the lesson and ties them back to the course learning outcomes listed on the Syllabus provided in week one. The instructions for the discussion posts often ask the students to tie the lecture/readings back to the outcomes in terms of how they plan to use the knowledge and asks them to describe areas that they might still find confusing or need clarification on. In the replies to the discussion posts and assignments we also try to point out how these tie back to the outcomes.

10. Please describe any changes/additions to instruction, curriculum or assessment that you made to support students in better achieving the CGCC Core Learning Outcomes:

Our course is centered around the idea of realizing students' deficits in information and how they go about rectifying that. This has a great deal to do with organizing one's question; finding, evaluating, and retrieving information/evidence; and then reorganizing, presenting, and arguing for something.

CLO #1: Communication. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Source and Evidence" and "Organization and Presentation"

and

CLO #2: Critical Thinking/Problem Solving. The areas that faculty are focusing on are: "Student's Position" (Critical Thinking) and "Evaluate Potential Solutions" (Problem Solving).

"Student's Position" and "Evaluate Potential Solutions" are both major aspects of our course. Evaluating information and arguments is something our course calls for regularly.

<p>Created 26 Jan 2018 10:47:45 AM</p>	
<p>PUBLIC</p>	