

CORE Assessment

Fall 2006-Fall 2007

**Michael J. Anderson, Ph.D.
Director of Academic Assessment**

Individual tables prepared by Helen Johnson

Background

The emphasis of the assessment effort in the CORE for the first 2 years of its existence has been to develop a cycle for assessing the learning goals of the core and to increase awareness of, and participation in, assessment by the CORE faculty. In approaching these tasks we had to deal with an inherited method of direct assessment that had some flaws, but because of institutional constraints could not be wholly abandoned. Another challenge was that Brooklyn College has an unusually long list of learning goals compared to other CUNY institutions and similar institutions nationally. Some of the goals also were, for practical assessment purposes, too “dense” in that they contained several, sometimes unrelated, learning goals.

Actions

Prior to the arrival of the Director of Academic Assessment, a decision had been made to have a director of the CORE Curriculum. The decision had been made by the CORE director to assess a component of goal #1, namely “critical thinking.” Since no college wide rubric for this skill had been developed the following series of actions were undertaken by the Director of Assessment:

- Starting with “Critical Thinking” the main focus would be to try and assess, by reaching down into core courses some of the components of goal #1 to gain some idea of a feasible overall cycle. It was apparent right away that a 3 year cycle discussed in some planning documents inherited by our office was neither feasible nor desirable.
- We used the inherited method, a three part rubric with each faculty member defining “critical thinking” and their own criteria for success. This was done as a way to build participation and awareness of assessment among the faculty; as well as gather information in order to build a more refined, college wide, rubric. In short the definitions of critical thinking (and the other components we assessed) generated by faculty are forming the basis for broader discussions about the need for common rubrics and what these should look like.
- We supported the idea of having individual faculty serve as coordinators for the various core courses. The Director of Academic Assessment helped draft the job description eventually used to insure that assessment management was a significant part of their job. When CORE Course Coordinators were put in place for the 2007-08 academic year, both the director of the CORE and the director of Academic Assessment were part of the various meetings with them and their faculty as needed.
- We asked that the student evaluation of courses be modified so that the existing questions that ask students about their learning be aligned with the college wide

learning goals adopted by the college. This would provide an indirect measure to go with the other more direct assessment we are developing and would help us meet accreditation standards for economical, sustainable and simple multiple measures of student learning.

Results

In general participation in core assessment has increased greatly over the course of 3 semesters. The number courses participating went from 5 in fall 2006 to 18 in fall 2007. The increase in number of sections and the number of student artifacts scored was even more dramatic. The results are summarized in the table below and the individual results are in the tables provided in the appendix.

Semester	Goal	Sections	Courses	Artifacts
Fall '06	Critical Thinking	19	5	405
Spring '07	Critical Thinking	40	14	664
Fall '07	Critical Thinking	40	13	967
	Critical/Creative Thinking	16	1	406
	Logical Reasoning	9	1	382
	Understanding the Past	8	1	577
	Quantitative Reasoning	39	2	443
Total Fall '07		112	18	2775

We were unable to convince the institution to align the items in the student evaluations at this time. We did, however, assemble the results for CORE courses in 06-07 for Question #20 which we took as a proxy for “critical thinking” (see tables in the appendix).

Analysis / Future Actions

Much of the improvement in participation in the assessment process is due to the presence of the core coordinators and the ability for them to be held accountable to some extent for the collection of assessment results from the faculty. Also the efforts of the Directors office at faculty development are raising awareness. The actual results, in terms of the level of student learning are not comparable, however, due to the lack of a common rubric. At meetings with coordinators and/or CORE faculty this spring we will not only

seek their feedback on the process but continue conversations about what a college wide common rubric will look like. In addition:

- We hope to work with the college's IR people to design and carry out a content analysis of the faculty generated rubrics for critical thinking as a way to provide shape to discussions. This information will be supplemented by our research into the elements discussed by faculty in the process of developing the current college wide goals.
- We will continue our efforts to have the institution align the student evaluation instrument with the college wide learning goals.
- We will continue to initiate conversations and processes to develop common rubrics including such forums as the annual CORE Conference, the Center for Teaching, and the Assessment Task Force.
- In fall 08 we will try to spread more widely the assessment efforts to capture more of the goals simultaneously. This will provide crucial information and insight into the shape of a regular assessment cycle in the CORE.

Appendix 1: Results by Semester and Goal

CRITICAL THINKING FALL			
2006			
Core Sections	Less Than Good	Good	Better
Computer Information System: 3.12			
ET6	2	15	
EW6	11	9	5
F12	4	20	3
JAN1A	3	2	20
MR10A	12	0	10
MR12A	5	11	4
MR8	16	8	5
MR9B	13	8	6
MW12A	6	12	0
MW3	1	9	3
MW4	1	7	3
TR3	4	8	10
TZ1	6	10	6
U9	5	11	0
WZ9B	2	12	3
Italian American Lit.: 10.03	3	4	3
Art: 20.01	2	12	9
Cosmology: 30.01	4	17	7
Energy Choices & Climate: 30.02	6	17	10
Total:	106	192	107

CRITICAL THINKING				
SPRING 2007				
CORE Section		Less Than Good	Good	Better
Classis: 1.1-TR4		3	12	5
Art: 1.2				
MR10B		15	32	37
TR3		15	19	38
Music: 1.3		15	16	16
Sociology: 2.3		13	13	8
Computer Information: 3.12				
WZ9A		0	0	13
TR3		0	0	8
MR9A		1	1	12
TR4		2	0	6
TF10A		1	0	8
TF9A		2	2	10
TZ1		3	1	13
U9		0	0	7
ER6		2	0	3
WZ1		2	1	5
MR8B		0	2	9
TF12		1	1	4
F12		0	0	11
TF10B		0	0	7
MW3		2	3	4
MZ10		1	0	5
ET6		0	0	4
MR8A		0	2	8
MW12		2	4	12
MW1B		0	1	10
EM6		0	2	9
NET1A		2	3	7
NET1B		1	2	10
Chemistry: 3.22				
Classical Philosophy: 20.02-W29		7	2	8
Latin: 20.03-TR3		3	4	13
Spanish Speaking Comm.: 20.04-MW12		5	13	9
Judaic Studies: 20.05-MR12		3	4	4
Development of the Silk Road: 20.06				
MW3		4	9	9
MR9		5	9	7
Exploring/Earth Systems: 30.04-TR12		11	2	6
Exploring Scientific Issues: 30.05 MW1		5	7	3

Scientific Revolution: 30.06			
T29	5	7	3
W23	1	1	6
Total:	132	175	357

2007 CRITICAL THINKING FALL				
Core and Section	Less Than Good		Good	Better
Philosophy: CC2.1/ Reality, Knowledge & Values				
TR3	5		15	8
WZ9B	4		14	11
MW3	7		16	11
MW4	9		15	9
ER6	8		11	9
T29	4		19	14
MW12B	10		12	8
MW1B	4		17	5
TR4	6		18	11
MR10A	12		22	7
MR12	7		16	12
MW8A	6		18	16
MZ3	12		15	6
EM6	4		17	9
WZ9A	5		22	5
TFQ12	9		10	1
S9	5		15	9
TA1	1		14	7
U9	4		8	10
MW1A	7		20	9
MW12A	4		15	12
*History: CC2.2 Shaping of the Modern World				
TR4	10		12	12
TR5	5		12	10
EM6	5		18	6
Political Science CC 2.3 People, Power & Politics				
TR3A (12/07)	7		14	7
TF9 (12/07)	5		0	10
T10CF	7		8	10

English CC10.01/ Literature, Ethnicity & Immigration			
EW6	10	1	6
English: CC10.02/Western Literary Tradition			
MR10	6	13	5
Philosophy: CC10.05			
Philosophical Issues FZ9	5	8	8
Self & Society/ ER6	4	11	4
English: CC10.07 /Emergence of the Modern			
SEEK MR8	4	6	0
MR10	18	4	0
Philosophy: CC10.09			
Self & Society MW1	7	9	6
Philosophical Issues in Literature ER6	4	13	3
Art: CC20.01/Art & Archaeology/ Egypt-			
MW3	3	5	9
Philosophy CC20.02 Classical Philosophies/India & China			
S12	5	6	23
Philosophy: CC20.04/Global Spanish-Speaking			
MW12	4	12	11
Physics: Cosmology CC30.01-ET6			
ET6	4	10	6
	4	10	6
Geology 30.04 Exploring The Earth System			
MW3	1	10	3
Totals:	122	511	334

CREATIVE/CRITICAL THINKING FALL 2007				
Core and Section	Less Than Good		Good	Better
Classic CC1.1 Classical Cultures				
U9		12	9	5
S9		7	7	6
ETR6B		13	9	4
MW1H		1	3	24
MW3F		8	4	8
TR3A		7	18	4
MR9Q		7	5	4
TF9		7	10	7
TF10B		7	11	6
MR8		9	10	3
MW12F		4	11	7
TR4B		5	17	5
MW1		5	20	9
TR12B		5	17	9
MR9A		3	12	11
MW4B		5	19	7
Total:		105	182	119

LOGICAL REASONING FALL 2007				
CORE Section		Less Than Good	Good	Better
Political Science CC2.3 People, Power & Politics				
MR9		8	22	2
TF9 (9/07)	(No individual totals/tally of 29)			
MW1B (9/07)		26	7	10
MW1B (12/07)		6	5	30
TR3A (9/07)		8	15	11
TR3B (9/07)		8	13	21
TR3B (12/07)		4	6	20
MR9C (9/07)		0 7	18	2
MR10B (9/07)	Bad 4	11	14	9
MW1A (9/07)		6	30	20
T10D/T10C (9/07)		3	28	8
Totals:		4 87	158	133

Quantitative Reasoning FALL 2007					
Core Section		Less Than Good		Good	Better
Computer Information Service CC3.12					
EFV6		4		0	2
EM6		0		9	1
ER6		2		4	0
ET6		1		6	2
MR10A		3		6	12
MR10B		0		0	0
MR12A		2		6	4
MR12B		0		8	9
MR9A		3		4	5
MR9B		0		0	0
MR9F		6		2	8
MW1		0		0	0
MW12		3		2	4
MW1F		0		14	4
MW3A		4		11	1
MW3B		2		2	7
MW4		0		0	5
MZ1		6		11	2
NET1A		3		5	6
NET1B		3		2	5
RZ3		0		0	0
TF10A		0		0	2
TF10B		0		7	2
TF12		2		0	0
TF8A		0		0	0
TF9A		0		5	9
TF9B		0		5	6
TR4		0		7	4
TZ1A		0		0	0
TZ1B		0		5	6
U9		0		2	0
WZ1		1		2	6
WZ9A		0		6	4
Physic CC3.31 Simple Laws of Physics					
EWZ6A		7		11	6
MD10A & MD10B		5		19	6
TG9A & TG9B		8		16	8
EMZ6A & EMZ6B		5		16	10
No section specified		10		17	7
MD9A (could not understand					

scoring)				
Totals:	80		210	153

Introduction to Art Histories & Cultures of the Past Fall 2007				
CORE Section		Less Than Good	Good	Better
Art CC1.2 Introduction to Art				
TF10A (Comparison Essay)	26	40	24	
TF12 (Comparison Essay)	23	38	24	
TF10A (Museum Paper)	15	35	35	
TF12 (Museum Paper)	13	24	46	
MR10A	4	48	25	
MW1	17	34	24	
EW6	24	42	16	
*% EFV6	10%	60%	30%	
Totals:	122.1	261.6	194.3	

Appendix #2: Student Evaluation Question #20

College Faculty Evaluations-Fall-2006:

Question 20: How much ability to analyze and solve problems have you gained?

Course	A lot	A fair amount	Some	A Little	Hardly Anything	Not Applicable	# of answers
CC1.1- 679 registered- Response rate: 72.16%	27.54 %	38.92%	17.18%	5.80%	1.86%	8.70%	483
CC1.2 -1032 registered, Response rate: 61.82%	20.93 %	42.01%	17.09%	5.27%	1.44%	13.26%	626
CC1.3 -558 registered- Response rate: 77.78%	17.10 %	40.28%	18.74%	6.32%	2.81%	14.75%	427
CC 2.1- 1223 registered- Response rate: 64.35%	19.25 %	45.35%	22.22%	7.62%	2.20%	3.36%	774
CC 2.2 -1149 registered- Response rate:71.11%	25.12 %	45.62%	16.00%	5.50%	1.00%	6.75%	800
CC 2.3 -1285 registered- Response rate: 71.36%	22.11 %	44.56%	19.75%	5.50%	3.93%	4.15%	891
CC3.11 -363 registered- Response rate: 70.52%	30.12 %	40.16%	16.87%	8.43%	4.02%	0.40%	249
CC3.12 -632 registered- Response rate: 62.18%	20.10 %	43.86%	25.59%	6.01%	2.61%	1.83%	383
CC3.21 -54 registered – Response rate 70.37%	30.56 %	47.22%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	5.56%	36
CC 3.22-441- registered- Response rate: 66.21%	13.24 %	41.81%	32.06%	7.67%	2.79%	2.44%	287
CC3.32-462 registered- Response rate: 71.86%	17.59 %	45.37%	17.90%	9.26%	4.63%	5.25%	324
CC10.01- 180 registered- Response rate: 72.22%	44.80 %	40.00%	11.20%	1.60%	0.80%	1.60%	125
CC10.03- 11 registered- Response rate: 90.91%	20.00 %	70.00%	0.00%	10.00%	0.00%	0.00%	10
CC10.04-79 registered – Response rate: 60.76%	27.08 %	39.58%	8.33%	12.50%	6.25%	6.25%	48
CC10.05-27 registered – Response rate: 74.07%	10.00 %	40.00%	15.00%	5.00%	20.00%	10.00%	20
CC10.07- 16 registered- Response rate: 87.50%	21.43 %	35.71%	28.57%	14.29%	0.00%	0.00%	14
CC10.09-63 registered- Response rate: 63.49%	28.21 %	41.03%	17.95%	2.56%	2.56%	7.69%	39
CC10.11-12 registered- Response rate: 66.67%	62.50 %	12.50%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8
CC20.01-23 registered-	15.38	30.77%	30.77%	0.00%	0.00%	23.08%	13

Response rate: 60.87%	%						
CC20.02-63 registered-Response rate: 92.06%	17.24%	36.21%	20.69%	13.79%	3.45%	8.62%	58

College Faculty Evaluations-Fall-2006:

Question 20: How much ability to analyze and solve problems have you gained?

Course	A lot	A fair amount	Some	A Little	Hardly Anything	Not Applicable	# of answers
CC20.03-72 registered-Response rate: 75.00%	52.94%	33.33%	5.88%	1.96%	0.00%	5.88%	51
CC20.04-30 registered-Response rate: 80.00%	20.83%	50.00%	16.67%	4.17%	0.00%	8.33%	24
CC20.05-32 registered-Response rate: 81.25%	26.92%	42.31%	23.08%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	26
CC30.01-67 registered-Response rate: 65.67%	12.50%	25.00%	30.00%	5.00%	27.50%	0.00%	40
CC30.02-65 registered-Response rate: 73.85%	18.75%	41.67%	29.17%	0.00%	10.42%	0.00%	48
CC30.03-91 registered-Response rate: 65.93%	31.03%	55.17%	10.34%	3.45%	0.00%	0.00%	58
CC30.04-18 registered-Response rate: 61.11%	9.09%	0.00%	27.27%	45.45%	18.18%	0.00%	11
CC30.05-19 registered-Response rate: 63.16%	8.33%	41.67%	16.67%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	12
CC30.06- 20 registered-Response rate: 90.00%	16.67%	55.56%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	11.11%	18
CC30.07- 79 registered-Response rate: 55.70%	17.07%	46.34%	19.51%	12.20%	2.44%	2.44%	41
CC30.08-24 registered-Response rate: 0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0
CC30.09-25 registered-Response rate: 68.00%	37.50%	18.75%	18.75%	12.50%	6.25%	6.25%	16

College Faculty Evaluations-Spring 2007:

Question 20: How much ability to analyze and solve problems have you gained?

Course	A lot	A fair amount	Some	A Little	Hardly Anything	Not Applicable	# of answers
CC 1.3 - 45 registered- Response rate: 77.78%	23.53%	44.12%	11.76%	11.76%	0.00%	8.82%	34
CC 2.1 – 481 registered Response rate: 64.66%	18.63%	43.79%	20.92%	6.54%	4.25%	5.88%	306
CC 3.12 – 52 registered –Response rate: 71.15%	10.81%	24.32%	24.32%	24.32%	10.81%	5.41%	37
CC3.22- 34 registered- Response rate:70.59%	12.50%	45.83%	29.17%	8.33%	4.17%	0.00	24
CC20.02- 40 registered- Response rate: 55.00%	22.73%	36.36%	22.73%	4.55%	9.09%	4.55%	22
CC30.03- 22 registered Response rate: 72.73%	33.33%	40.00%	20.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	15

College Faculty Evaluations-Fall-2007:

Question 20: How much ability to analyze and solve problems have you gained?

Course	A lot	A fair amount	Some	A Little	Hardly Anything	Not Applicable	# of answers
CC1.1- 689 registered- Response rate: 74.89%	25.40%	42.86%	19.25%	3.17%	2.58%	6.75%	504
CC1.2 -1137 registered, Response rate: 64.56%	19.35%	42.78%	19.21%	5.05%	2.81%	10.80%	713
CC1.3 -983 registered- Response rate: 75.33%	27.85%	36.55%	15.22%	3.40%	2.17%	14.81%	736`
CC 2.1- 1388 registered- Response rate: 61.24%	23.52%	45.84%	21.62%	3.92%	1.43%	3.68%	842
CC 2.2 -1651 registered- Response rate:68.13%	27.55%	40.32%	17.93%	4.16%	2.44%	7.60%	697
CC 2.3 -1114 registered- Response rate: 71.10%	28.63%	40.05%	18.61%	4.49%	4.24%	3.98%	779
CC3.11 -511 registered- Response rate: 69.08%	35.34%	39.37%	15.23%	5.17%	4.89%	0.00%	348
CC3.12 -557 registered- Response rate: 66.61%	21.37%	42.74%	22.74%	6.58%	4.38%	2.19%	365

CC3.21 -99 registered – Response rate: 56.57%	10.71%	48.21%	19.64%	8.93%	8.93%	3.57%	56
CC 3.22-560- registered- Response rate: 61.79%	20.88%	51.18%	22.94%	2.94%	1.47%	0.59%	340
CC 3.31 – 267 registered- Response rate: 79.03%	21.26%	44.44%	19.32%	9.66%	3.38%	1.93%	207
CC3.32- 737 registered- Response rate: 68.25%	14.72%	35.99%	28.43%	9.61%	8.38%	2.86%	489
CC10.01- 54 registered- Response rate: 66.67%	8.57%	57.14%	20.00%	5.71%	0.00%	8.57%	35
CC10.02 – 25 registered – Response rate: 88.00%	31.82%	45.45%	13.64%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%	22
CC10.03- 37 registered- Response rate: 67.57%	8.00%	60.00%	24.00%	4.00%	0.00%	4.00%	25
CC10.04- 78 registered – Response rate: 69.23%	18.52%	38.89%	18.52%	14.81%	5.56%	3.70%	54
CC10.05- 79 registered – Response rate: 65.82%	46.15%	34.62%	17.31%	0.00%	0.00%	1.92%	52
CC10.06 – 24 registered Response rate: 100.00%	25.00%	29.17%	41.67%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%	24
CC10.07- 728 registered- Response rate: 64.06%	31.71%	32.93%	21.95%	6.10%	3.66%	3.66%	82
CC10.09- 60 registered- Response rate: 70.00%	35.71%	50.00%	4.76%	2.38%	0.00%	7.14%	42

College Faculty Evaluations-Fall-2007:

Question 20: How much ability to analyze and solve problems have you gained?

Course	A lot	A fair amount	Some	A Little	Hardly Anything	Not Applicable	# of answers
CC10.11- 34 registered- Response rate: 73.53%	17.39%	52.17%	8.70%	8.70%	13.04%	0.00%	23
CC20.01- 23 registered- Response rate: 78.26%	35.29%	52.94%	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	17
CC20.02- 177 registered- Response rate: 67.23%	25.21%	31.93%	15.13%	9.24%	7.56%	10.92%	119
CC20.03- 91 registered- Response rate: 70.33%	50.79%	28.57%	15.87%	0.00%	0.00%	4.76%	63
CC20.04- 27 registered- Response rate: 62.96%	47.06%	47.06%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	17
CC20.05- 52 registered- Response rate: 71.15%	35.14%	37.84%	8.11%	0.00%	8.11%	10.81%	37

CC20:07 – 31 registered – Response rate: 80.65%	25.00%	29.17%	29.17%	8.33%	0.00%	8.33%	24
CC30.01- 47 registered- Response rate: 74.47%	20.59%	32.35%	35.29%	5.88%	2.94%	2.94%	34
CC30.02- 56 registered- Response rate: 62.50%	12.12%	24.24%	36.36%	12.12%	9.09%	6.06%	33
CC30.03- 115 registered- Response rate: 76.52%	31.03%	45.98%	17.24%	3.45%	1.15%	1.15%	87
CC30.05- 54 registered- Response rate: 72.22%	20.51%	64.10%	5.13%	0.00%	2.56%	7.69%	38
CC30.06- 45 registered- Response rate: 62.22%	32.14%	53.57%	10.71%	3.57%	0.00%	0.00%	28
CC30.08- 31 registered- Response rate: 77.42%	41.67%	41.67%	12.50%	0.00%	0.00%	4.17%	24
CC30.09- 29 registered- Response rate: 51.72%	0.00%	42.06%	35.71%	7.14%	0.00%	14.29%	14