



Course Assessment Committee Report for Fall 2022 Data
Collection Period

May 12, 2023

Executive Summary

Key Findings

- Response rates continued their trend of a substantial increase, moving to 89% for Fall 2022, a 39-percentage point improvement from Fall 2021 and a 19-percentage point improvement from Spring 2022
- Previously identified gaps in response between different types of instructors (e.g. staff vs full-time faculty) or between campuses have largely disappeared. This indicates efforts to target segments of instructors with historically low response rates seem to be paying dividends.
- As with Spring 2022 data collection, an identical percentage of instructors (68%) report anchoring their course adjustments in specific quantitative data, which means roughly two-thirds are wedding the quantitative and qualitative portions of their course assessment data together appropriately, which is a high percentage. However, ideally this number should be as close to 100% as possible. Moving forward, the Course Assessment Committee plans to begin emphasizing the quality of the data instructors are providing rather than just making sure they are providing data period. It is expected that with this added emphasis, we will see an improvement from this 68% figure for Spring 2023 data.
- Instructors are making a wide variety of changes to their courses in response to their data, even among those who may not be able to cite a specific data point. Over 90% (93.4%) of the 198 instructors who responded to the questionnaire item about course adjustment provided an example of an adjustment they will be making to their course to improve student learning.
- There is a strong and growing awareness of the relationship between course competency data, course adjustments, and the assessment tools needed to collect that data. More than $\frac{3}{4}$ of respondents (n=155) responded to the questionnaire item about adjustments they needed to make to their assessment tools or assessment approach. While a plurality (44%) of those indicated no adjustments were needed, most instructors are thinking about not just how they need to adjust their courses, but what they need to do to assess as well as possible.

Introduction

The Course Assessment Committee was chartered in the Fall of 2019 as part of a concerted effort to make Barton's assessment infrastructure more robust and to continue to build on the culture of

assessment already in place at the college. As part of its charter, the overall goal of the committee was to support the establishment of a robust culture of course assessment across the college. To this end, the committee began establishing data collection procedures that facilitated a documentation process for the improvements to student learning instructors were making based on course assessment data each semester.

Following a pilot data collection project in 2020-21, the committee launched its biannual, college-wide course assessment reporting cycle in early in 2022. In this cycle, data are collected each January and February for courses completed during the prior Fall semester/sessions. Data are then collected again each August and September for the prior Spring semester/sessions.

This report will document the third data collection cycle which occurred in January and February of 2023 to document improvements instructors were making based on the results of their Fall 2022 course assessment data. As this is now the third cycle of college-wide data collection, results from this specific cycle will be the focus of the report, but quantitative data such as response rates and faculty characteristics will be compared over time as well. Additionally, because the course assessment approach requires looking back at a course after it has completed, data collection occurs after the fact. Even though the data for this report was collected in the Spring of 2023, all data collected during this period will be referred to as 'Fall 2022' hereafter.

Fall 2022 Data Collection

Instrument

The Fall 2022 data collection instrument was again a Microsoft Form and was mostly similar to the initial Form used for the Fall 2021 data collection period. Since that initial form minor alterations and improvements have been made, such as removing unnecessary items and refining response options on closed-ended questions. The resulting edits lead to a 14-item form for the Fall 2022 data collection period.

The Fall 2022 course assessment form contained a total of 14 items divided into four sections. The first section contained items allowing for identification of courses and information about the courses for which the data were being submitted. Typical items in section one included course CRN, campus location, instructor name, and number of students enrolled. The second section contained items in which respondents were asked to report specific data about which course competencies they were reporting on and their evidence for why a given competency needed to be addressed differently in the future. The third section asked respondents to describe the adjustments they planned on making to

their course or any adjustments they planned to make to their assessment tools themselves based on the data reported in section two. The fourth and final section solicited open-ended comments and suggestions for the committee to help improve the data collection process in the future.

Data Collection

To begin the Fall 2022 data collection process, the Fall 2022 Scheduling Matrix was pulled from PowerBI and all instructors who listed as an instructor on the matrix were combined into an initial pool of respondents to be asked to complete an assessment report this cycle. Instructors who were listed on the matrix for administrative purposes only, instructors who were no longer teaching for Barton by the data collection period, instructors for full-year courses, as well as any other instructors who were able to explain why they should be exempted on a case-by-case basis (e.g. course was more a practicum than a traditional college course) were exempted from the pool of instructors required to submit a course assessment report. That final roster of instructors was then used as the basis for a series of emails soliciting their course assessment reports.

Fall 2022 course assessment reports were primarily solicited from December 2022 through February 5, 2023, via a series of reminder emails to all faculty with the Form link included. College-wide reminder emails were sent out before faculty departed for Winter Break in December and then again when faculty returned from Winter Break in the first week of January 2023. A formal request to all faculty to begin submitting reports was sent on Monday, January 9, 2023. After that, the Forms data were downloaded each Friday morning in January and all respondents who had submitted a report by that time were documented. Then, personalized reminder emails were sent individually to each non-respondent by a member of the course assessment committee on Friday mornings in January (January 13, 20, and 27). Final reminder emails were sent on both Monday, January 30th and Friday, February 3rd as the data collection deadline of February 5th approached.

Data Analysis

At the end of the data collection period, the course assessment committee downloaded all data from the Microsoft Form and established an Excel Spreadsheet to clean and analyze all data. After removing invalid (e.g., missing respondent data, reporting for a course taught outside the correct time frame) or duplicate data. In the event of duplicate responses, the most recently submitted response was included in the analysis. Within Excel, qualitative responses were de-identified, alphabetized,

and parceled out to individual members of the Course Assessment committee for multi-rater identification of common themes and trends expressed in instructor responses. Frequency counts were calculated for response rates, respondent characteristics, and non-respondent characteristics.

Results

Fall 2022 Data Collection

The Fall 2022 instructor pool included 221 names and a total of 198 valid responses were submitted by the deadline, resulting in a response rate of 89%. This increase represented the third straight increase in response rates and an increase of 19 percentage points from Spring 2022 (Table 1).

Table 1: Respondent Characteristics

	Responded (n)	Potential Respondents (n)	% Respondents
Fall 2022 Instructors	198	221	89%
Spring 2022 Instructors	159	228	70%
Fall 2021 Instructors	128	251	51%

Of the 221 instructors required to submit a report for Fall 2022, 213 respondents had ELCS, campus, and supervisor information available in the employee directory contained within PowerBI. 191 of the 198 respondents had information available in the employee directory. Unlike prior data collection periods, response rates were relatively uniform, as full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff who also instruct all responded at either 89% or 90% response rates (Table 2). The biggest changes from Spring to Fall 2022 were shown in staff response rates which improved 62 percentage points and adjunct faculty whose response rates improved 18 percentage points.

Faculty responses by primary campus designation weren't quite as uniform, but there were still consistent response rates at or above 79% regardless of campus location. Eighty-four percent (84%) of respondents from Great Bend provided an assessment report, while 97% of instructors from the military campuses at Grandview, Ft. Riley, and Ft. Leavenworth responded. 100% of Barton Online instructors responded. Barton Online and the military campuses all had at least 80% response rates for Spring 2022, but for Fall 2023 both the WTCE and academic divisions of the primary Barton

campus improved by over 20 percentage points to get to a 79% and 87% response rate respectively (Table 2)

Table 2: Respondent Characteristics by Barton Status

ECLS Code	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022
Full-time Faculty (30, 35, 36)	72% (n=159)	83% (n=47)	89% (n=52)
Adjunct or Part-time Faculty (40, 45)	53% (n=152)	72% (n=138)	90% (n=133)
Staff (20,50,51,55)	5% (n=19)	27% (n=19)	89% (n=28)
Campus Designation	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	
Great Bend - Total	47% (n=124)	58% (n=121)	84% (n=127)
Great Bend - WTCE	N/A	55% (n=55)	79% (n=56)
Great Bend - Academic	N/A	61% (n=66)	87% (n=71)
Barton Online	57% (n=67)	80% (n=51)	100% (n=53)
Other Campuses	N/A	87% (n=39)	97% (n=33)
Ft. Riley	89% (n=26)	85% (n=27)	96% (n=23)
Ft. Leavenworth	52% (n=12)	89% (n=9)	100% (n=7)
Grandview	N/A	100% (n=3)	100% (n=3)

With the increase in responses up to 198, the total number of students assessed had a corresponding increase to 3019. However, the mean number of students assessed remained near constant at 15.8 while the median course assessed dropped slightly from 12 to 10. (Table 3).

Table 3: Students Assessed

Total	N	Mean	Median
Fall 2021	2042	15.9	12
Spring 2022	2348	15.8	12
Fall 2022	3019	15.8	10

Course Competencies and Rationale

Nearly all respondents (98%, 193/197) were able to identify a specific competency they wanted to target in making a course adjustment. When it came to offering supporting evidence for why instructors were choosing to make an adjustment, 125 out of 193 (64.8%) pointed to specific, quantifiable data linked to a specific competency. Typical comments from these instructors included statements such as:

- *“Midterm and Final exams scores which had questions asking specifics about style and time period, were average to above average.”*
- *“12 of 30 students were unable to achieve a score of 75% on a written test question over the standard.”*
- *“Of 13 students, the average score was 80%. This is a major project and my expectations are high that all students will earn a 90% or above.”*
- *“5 of 13 students missed this question on the test”*
- *“ASCP certification exams dropped from an average of 75% to 50%.”*
- *“Approximately 45 of 50 students did not score proficient (between 100-80%) on the documentation portion of the final research essay rubric.”*
- *“Pass rate on the section test was much lower than that of the other sections.”*

Fourteen instructors (7.2%) did not have specific quantifiable data to point to as rationale for why they needed to address their selected competency differently, nearly all still reported more general reasoning, that while not quantifiable per se, still rested on some degree of measurement. These respondents simply had less specific data such as terms like ‘most,’ or ‘some.’ Typical comments from these instructors included statements such as:

- *“A few of my students did not grasp the proper lifting technique. I plan to explain and demonstrate better forms this semester.”*
- *“In the few students I had I noticed that a fair number did not understand the larger question being asked: that is, that the assignment is looking for a total ethical framework, not just one moral issue.”*
- *“Multiple students had difficulty being able to provide proof (right or wrong) of the effectiveness of a plan. They struggled to find a way to justify their assessment whether positive or negative.”*
- *“Some students need to better understand the difference in pre-warmup and post workout exercise benefits.”*

Others (33/193, 16.6%) didn't quantify their rationale but knew from observation or experience what competencies needed adjusting. Typical responses from this category of responses included:

- *“Student had difficulty interpreting map distances and related questions.”*
- *“Students have had trouble determining central theme and setting in the past.”*
- *Thesis statements are an area that students regularly struggle with and admit to struggling with. Students in the course voiced their concerns with drafting appropriate thesis statements, so we spent extra time evaluating effective thesis statements and drafting practice statements.”*

Other responses (13/193, 6.7%) described challenges assessing the competency due to a variety of factors including class delivery format and textbook and changes that need to be made. Several responses in this category were included in one of the above categories. Typical responses from this category of responses included:

- *“I felt like I needed to provide a better understanding for a specific assignment, providing better guidance for expectations and inclusion of information.”*
- *“I identified this as needing improvement because with my class being all online, I do not get to see how my student are handling collecting and processing samples besides what they log on their weekly time logs so I would like to improve that by adding more hands-on videos in my course, walking them through step by step how to collect certain procedures. For example, how to collect blood cultures.”*

- *“In an online course it is difficult to find unique ways to have your students read so you can assess their skills.”*
- *“Textbook used with some students did not include a variety of music styles, particularly that of spiritual field.”*

Eleven instructors provided explanations as to why the competency was important. One response in this category was included in another category. Typical responses from this category of responses included:

- *“Because it is important to have members working at roles that best suit them.”*
- *“Doesn’t necessarily need improvement but is a great way to start the class. Gives me an opportunity to assess the current knowledge of the students in this area.”*
- *“It is the most important skill of the course.”*

Course Adjustments

Overall, the types of adjustment instructors planned on making to their courses based on their assessment data fell into four broad categories. First, instructors reported making improvements or adjustment to existing course materials. Secondly, instructors indicated a desire to add new materials or assignments to their course. Third, instructors discussed new approaches to the manner in which they provide instruction overall. Lastly, some instructors detailed plans centered on the order, pacing, or relative emphasis given to some topics in their course relative to others. In some instances, instructors described changes that fell into all four of these categories, while others only fell into one category, or none of these categories at all. Therefore, total responses for each category will not total 100%. Of the 198 respondents, overall, 196 completed this portion of the questionnaire.

For improvements or adjustments existing materials or components already present in the course itself, a total of 61 respondents (31%) submitted information about making an adjustment to the current assignments or materials already included in their course. Typical responses of this type are included below:

- *“Adjust the assignment to include concepts of philosophy as it relates to teaching techniques.”*
- *“I adjusted an activity to include a small essay where students are required to describe the relationship between blood lipids and some diseases.”*
- *“I am going to redo parts of my lecture on this topic to be more detailed and offer more examples. I only offered one example of each style in my lecture, and I think I need more explanation as well as more examples for them to really grasp these differences in language usage.”*

- *“I have adjusted the course materials to include a more detailed study of these tasks along with accompanying simulations and demonstrations using tools available through the vendor that is used for the labs and simulations.”*
- *“I plan on making edits to the lab assignment instructions so that the students can clearly understand what is being asked of them.”*
- *“I plan to create a better example of the expectation with the addition of a performance rubric for grading.”*
- *“Modify existing spatial activities and or stress spatial distribution and map skills in the course.”*

Even more instructors indicated that were planning on adding something new to their course (n=75, 38%). Examples of materials instructors indicated they would be adding to improve student learning included finding new or updated videos most commonly, but adding new exercise, quizzes, or student resources were also frequently featured in instructor responses. Typical comments from this category of responses are show below:

- *“I added a video and created a basic plotting practical exercise.”*
- *“I added additional information regarding the word "Flow" in its corresponding module.”*
- *“Add additional enrichment activities.”*
- *“I added an activity for students to look at the tax documentation from someone who owns real estate to see the division of taxes that go to the school. Many don't see the connection between taxes and funding for schools.”*
- *“I have one assignment that I have them read aloud. I also do several other video assignments. I think I am going to add in a component where they need to read a couple of paragraphs from their chosen book.”*
- *“I plan to add a video lecture and one-on-one discussion about different examples of applying the process of order of operations. There are many small steps and things for the students to remember so better notes, presentation of the materials, and practice exercise variety will help provide enough coverage of the process.”*
- *“I plan to include references to self-portraits executed by both old masters and contemporary artists. A ppt presentation and lecture/discussion would broaden the student's idea of what a self-portrait looks like. In addition, they will realize the enormous spectrum of both the tools and in the expression of the subject matter.”*
- *“We added comprehensive exams to each section of the clinical practicum.”*
- *“We completed activities in the book and an enrichment activity this semester, but they need more work on understanding bias in real-world settings. I plan to add more enrichment activities that will probably happen twice per month until the end of the semester. These can blend together well with the other reading and writing competencies.”*

The third broad category of course adjustments instructors indicated they planned to make or had made to improve student learning centered on a new or additional approach to presenting or assessing their material. Often these types of changes did occur hand-in-hand with new materials, but just as frequently instructors indicated a change such as moving to more activities, more interaction, etc. or other adjustments that spoke to the 'how' they class was being taught rather than the 'what.' A total of 48 instructor comments (25%) fell into this category. Typical responses of this type are shown below:

- *“Additional labs and possibly require a paper from all students.”*
- *“I feel there is a real need to have more group discussion on this topic or a group activity. The class seemed to respond really well when we had group discussions on certain topics.”*
- *“I have reworked the class using a new text book and added a Mind tap interactivity to the class to make it more hands on learning.”*
- *“I plan to add more in-class discussion and practice to remediate the skill, knowing that it is one student shy away from.”*
- *“I plan to adjust my delivery method and class discussions to ensure those students are grasping the different concepts as they evolve throughout political history and how they stand today.”*
- *“I'd like to incorporate an interactive activity where students go out into the real world and measure a piece of furniture, like a table, and then they give me a bill of materials that is associated with that piece of furniture. This will include them taking physical measurements of the furniture and submitting that to me, along with images, and a drawing.”*
- *“Instead of just doing it, I plan to incorporate real life scenarios to run the steel pipe.”*

The fourth broad category of adjustments instructors reported they had made or planned to make to their courses included more subtle adjustment than adding or adjust materials. This fourth category covered things like timing, order lessons were taught, pacing, and overall emphasis or deemphasis within an existing course. Adjustments such as these were mentioned by 74 instructors (38%). Typical course adjustments from this category are listed below:

- *“Allow more time for hands on training and continue to teach in steps.”*
- *“I am going to add additional material and activities to spend more time covering this concept.”*
- *“I am going to highlight this concept more thoroughly in the lecture and remind the students the importance of reading through the text assigned for the unit.”*
- *I believe that I need to spend more time in class specifically addressing what separates and defines the various genres.”*
- *“I have allotted more time to perfect skills.”*

- *“I intend to dedicate one more class meeting on this competency. I think more time on the concept will improve student understanding.”*
- *“I have rearranged my class schedule to allow for more class time at the end of the semester of focus on Reconstruction. I have worked to better align my course content with outcomes which will allow for more time at the end of the semester. I will also include additional assessments to gauge learning on Reconstruction before the final exam is given.”*
- *“I plan to add a mini lesson to this unit.”*
- *“Language and Sapir-Whorf are introduced early in class, but it might be beneficial to revisit as we start diving into specific cultural groups later in class. I feel that this one gets 'lost' a bit as class moves along.”*

While many instructors did provide good data or responses to their courses that were relatively easy to categorize, some responses either answered a different question (such as an adjustment to the assessment tool) or didn't actually offer a course adjustment. While this was the smallest category of responses, 13 instructors (7%) provided a response to what adjustment they planned to make to their course that wasn't actually an adjustment to the course itself or not an adjustment of any type.

Because course assessment is all encompassing, including not just the course competencies, the course content, but also the manner in which instructors attempt to assess student learning themselves, the last question on the instrument asked instructors to reflect back on their assessment tool itself and share any concerns or adjustments that might need to be made to their assessment tool itself.

Not surprisingly as this the end of the second full year of qualitative data collection for course assessment (in addition to long-standing quantitative course assessment data collection), the most common category of responses to this question was that no change was needed. Of the 155 instructors who responded to this question, 68 (44%) indicated that no change was needed to their assessment tool. However, a sizeable minority (n=44, 28%) indicated they needed to make a change to lessons, scheduling, curriculum, chapter (unit) assessments or other such materials that required an adjustment to the adjustment tool before the course could be properly assessed. Responses typical of this type are listed below:

- *“The questions are drawn from a test bank, and I think are a good reflection. I would like to adjust the activities first and then reevaluate the need to adjust the assessment method.”*
- *“Midterm and final exam questions related to period style characteristics and time period will reflect the information in the H5P games.”*

- *“I use a rubric to let students know that they must include three or more supporting details within a college-level paragraph. So now I need to help them locate those supporting details in daily assignments. Thus, assisting them to use the rubric to their advantage. Thus, helping them make connection between the material and the assessment.”*
- *“I believe that if I add a discussion question regarding the competency identified, I will be able to determine in real time (instead of on the Post-Test) how many students are unable to understand the idea of collective security and why it failed to prevent World War II.”*

The other broad category of responses regarding assessment adjustments centered on adding or clarifying instructions to students in order to help better assess student competency scores as an outcome of true learning rather than a perceived deficiency in the instructions, process, or manner in which that data was collected. A total of 25 respondents (16%) made mention of changes in this area. While not as common, 8% of respondents reported needing to make a change to the rubric or grading requirements, 2% indicated a to-be-determined change to their assessment tool needed to be made, and another 2% made miscellaneous comments or suggestion to this response that were not germane to the topic. Responses typical of changes to grading requirements or instructions are listed below:

- *“The assessment tool for this course needs to be changed. I plan to begin using a rubric based approach to better assess how learners are mastering particular concepts.”*
- *“The assessment tool is the study guide and I have made adjustments to the frequently missed questions.”*
- *“Rather than just a quiz and discussion, an additional short project where they can actually experiment to see which method is best will help them form a better opinion of the EC and allow them to determine if it is working as intended.”*

Conclusion

Compared to both the Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 Course Assessment reporting period, the most salient outcome continues to be the growth in response rates as Course Assessment reporting becomes more institutionalized at Barton County. Response rates have grown from roughly 50% to 70% to 90% indicating that the procedure and reasoning behind the course assessment data collection are starting to set in. With another cycle of high response rates anticipated for Spring 2023

data, the time for a pivot away from just response rates as the primary focus of the Course Assessment committee and adding more education on quality data and providing a scaffolding of best practices instructors can use in the future to help improve their courses based on the adjustment their fellow instructors have made.

In looking at the responses themselves and adjustments instructors are making to course, the breadth of adjustments being made stands out most prominently. One of the hallmarks of course assessment is a degree of academic freedom and tailoring of assessment to meet the instructor's unique needs rather than a one-size-fits-all approach. Accordingly, instructors collectively have plans to add activities, add videos, update content, change lesson emphasis, reconsider assessment tools and a myriad of other ideas to improve student learning. There is no dearth of creativity or willingness to try new things to improve student learning as reported by instructors. All that being said, some adjustments instructors are planning to make are more generic or general than others, some are not really attached to quantifiable data, and a small percentage are still more of a classroom adjustment than a course adjustment. Channeling the creative energy of the instructors in the most constructive way possible and reinforcing the connection between quantitative assessment data and the qualitative adjustments being made to courses represent a strong potential growth area for the Course Assessment Committee as it grows and develops into the next stage of its development.



Course Assessment Committee Report for Spring 2023 Data
Collection Period

December 1, 2023

Executive Summary

- The prior progress in increasing response rates has leveled off, but the course assessment reporting process has now posted response rates above 85% for two consecutive data collection cycles following two prior cycles with response rates of 51% and 70%. While there is still room for improvement, these response rate trends indicate an increasing awareness of course reporting requirements and processes.
- Gaps in response rates by different campuses or type of faculty members (e.g. staff, adjunct) have largely disintegrated which indicates the overall awareness of course reporting appears to be taking hold across all of the various facets of Barton's instruction.
- Despite the successes in responses, more can still be done to improve these rates. Spring 2023 data collection saw slight dips compared to Fall 2022 data collection and Spring data collection has been collected with a long lag due to the summer break. In order to help potentially reduce some data loss due the intervening summer months between the completion of Spring semester instruction and Spring semester data collection, data will be collected as each semester concludes moving forward.
- Analysis of the qualitative data responses show several areas where employee education opportunities exist in the future, including better data to support course adjustments, better focus on higher-level competencies, and strategies to improve how instructors collect their assessment data.
- 72% of respondents could identify hard empirical data that lead them to identify which course competency needed improvement moving forward, but, ideally, this number should be as close to 100% as possible, making this a potential target area for improvement in the future.
- Most respondents who planned on altering their assessment tool (58%) still rely on traditional projects, pre- and post-exams, and other types of assessments. While this percentage is neither inherently good or bad, it represents an opportunity to provide employee education on different types of assessment strategies that may be useful for employees.
- Few employees (14%) are making improvements to competencies with higher-level Bloom's verbs. This represents an opportunity for improvement if instructors are encouraged and given tools to tackle harder or higher-level competencies.

Introduction

Following its initialization in the Fall of 2019 to help expand Barton's assessment infrastructure, the Course assessment committee began undertaking a project to collect and document adjustments instructors are making to their courses to improve student learning. Following a pilot data collection project during the 2020-21 academic year, the course assessment committee launched its biannual, college-wide course assessment reporting cycle in 2021-22 academic year. During both the 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic year, data were collected each January and February for courses completed during the prior Fall semester/sessions and then data were collected again each August and September for the prior Spring semester/sessions.

This report documents the fourth data collection cycle which occurred in August and September of 2023 and marks the end of the second full academic year of data collection which allows for year-to-year and semester-to-semester comparisons. Even though the data for this report was collected in during the Fall of 2023, because all data collected during this period was designed to be a retrospective review after the conclusion of classes taught during the Spring of 2023, all data in this report will be referred to as 'Spring 2023' hereafter.

Spring 2023 Data Collection

Instrument

The Spring 2023 data collection instrument was an updated version of the Microsoft Form that the Course Assessment Committee has used to collect data since the initial data collection period in Fall 2021. Based on feedback from respondents and discussions among the Course Assessment committee, minor alterations are made to the form at the start of each academic year, but Form adjustments are not typically made during the same academic calendar year. Therefore, the data collection instrument included the same 14 items that were included on the Fall 2022 data collection instrument. The 14 items divided into four sections which will be described in more detail below:

- The first section contained items allowing for identification of courses for which the data were being submitted. These items included course CRN, campus location, instructor name, and number of students enrolled.
- The second section contained items in which respondents were asked to report specific data about which course competencies they were reporting on and their evidence for why a given competency needed to be addressed differently in the future.

- The third section asked respondents to describe the adjustments they planned on making to their course or any adjustments they planned to make to their assessment tools themselves based on the data reported in section two.
- The fourth and final section solicited open-ended comments and suggestions for the committee to help improve the data collection process in the future.

Data Collection

To begin the Spring 2023 data collection process, the Spring 2023 Scheduling Matrix was pulled from PowerBI and all instructors who listed as an instructor on the matrix were combined into an initial pool of respondents to be asked to complete an assessment report this cycle. Instructors who were listed on the matrix for administrative purposes only, instructors who were no longer teaching for Barton by the data collection period, instructors for full-year courses, as well as any other instructors who were able to explain why they should be exempted on a case-by-case basis (e.g. course was more a practicum than a traditional college course) were exempted from the pool of instructors required to submit a course assessment report. That final roster of instructors was then used as the basis for a series of emails soliciting their course assessment reports.

Spring 2023 course assessment reports were primarily solicited from August 2023 through September 4, 2023, via a series of emails to faculty who taught a class during the Spring of 2023. An initial form email was sent to all faculty to kick off the data collection period in mid-August and then the last two Fridays in August as well as the first Friday in September, individualized email reminders were sent to all faculty who still needed to complete their course assessment report. Using this approach any faculty member who chose not to complete a course assessment report, at a minimum, would have received one generic email and three personalized email reminders to complete there with the Form link included.

Data Analysis

At the end of the data collection period, the course assessment committee downloaded all data from the Microsoft Form and established an Excel Spreadsheet to clean and analyze all data. After removing invalid (e.g., missing respondent data, reporting for a course taught outside the correct time frame) or duplicate data (some instructors provided multiple reports). The course assessment chair compiled all descriptive data of the faculty completers and non-respondents. For the qualitative

responses, those responses were de-identified and alphabetized within an Excel spreadsheet and then parceled out to individual teams of the Course Assessment committee for multi-rater identification of common themes and trends expressed in instructor responses. Teams of four to five committee members were each asked to analyze a single set of qualitative responses on their own before providing them to the committee chair in order to aggregate all of those responses into a common report.

Results

Spring 2023 Data Collection

The Spring 2023 instructor pool included 204 names and a total of 175 valid responses were submitted by the collection deadline, resulting in an effective response rate of 86%. While this response rate was a three-percentage point decline from the Fall 2022 data collection period, it was a 16 percentage point increase year-to-year when compared to Spring 2022 data collection (Table 1).

Table 1: Respondent Characteristics

	Responded (n)	Potential Respondents (n)	% Respondents
Spring 2023 Instructors	175	204	86%
Fall 2022 Instructors	198	221	89%
Spring 2022 Instructors	159	228	70%

Response rates across campuses and employee designations were relatively uniform for the second straight data collection period. While instructors with a 'staff' designation remained the lowest employee group in terms of response rate (76%), this still represented a nearly three-fold increase from the 27% response rate seen from this group just one year ago in Spring 2022. Full-time faculty responded at an over 90% response rate, a slight improvement from both Fall 2022 as well as the prior Spring data collection period. Adjunct faculty dipped slightly to an 85% response rate in Spring 2023 from the 90% response rate in the Fall of 2022, but that rate was still 13 percentage points higher than the Spring 2022 response rate (Table 2).

Faculty responses by primary campus designation were also very similar. While the Great Bend campus had the lowest response rate (82%), it was just slightly below the overall response rate of 86%. Barton Online, Ft. Riley, Ft. Leavenworth, and Grandview instructors all had response rates in excess of 90% (Table 2).

Table 2: Respondent Characteristics by Barton Status

ECLS Code	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Full-time Faculty (30, 35, 36)	83%	89%	91%
Adjunct or Part-time Faculty (40, 45)	72%	90%	85%
Staff (20,50,51,55)	27%	89%	76%
Campus Designation	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Great Bend - Total	58%	84%	82%
Great Bend - WTCE	55%	79%	78%
Great Bend - Academic	61%	87%	85%
Barton Online	80%	100%	90%
Other Campuses	87%	97%	91%
<i>Ft. Riley</i>	85%	96%	91%
<i>Ft. Leavenworth</i>	89%	100%	90%
<i>Grandview</i>	100%	100%	100%

The total number of students assessed decreased from 3019 in Fall 2022 to 2498 in Spring 2023. However, when comparing Spring to Spring, the total number of students assessed were roughly equivalent with 2348 in Spring 2022. However, the mean number of students assessed did

decrease from 15.8 in Spring 2022 to 14.1 in Spring 2023 and the median number of students assessed per class decreased from 12 to 10 (Table 3).

Table 3: Students Assessed

Total	N	Mean	Median
Spring 2022	2348	15.8	12
Fall 2022	3019	15.8	10
Spring 2023	2498	14.1	10

Course Competencies Addressed

As the culture of assessment has been steadily increasing across the Barton community and awareness of the need to document and report the adjustments to student learning instructors have been making, the Course assessment committee decided to shift its focus on getting better quality assessments submitted. To that end, special attention was paid this year to the types of competencies instructors were identifying for improvement and the degree to which they were backing these adjustments with strong empirical data. Therefore, the course assessment report items of which competency did the instructor adjust and what data did they base that adjustment on were of special focus this year.

When assessing the competencies instructors had identified as being in need of improvement an analysis using Bloom's taxonomy was conducted this year. Most respondents (87%) provided enough information to determine what the Bloom's level of competency they were choosing to address. For simplicity of analysis, the lowest two levels of Bloom's taxonomy (knowledge and comprehension) and the two highest levels of Bloom's taxonomy (synthesis and evaluation) were combined into a single level, resulting in four levels total. Respondents were most likely (34%) to report addressing an application-level competency, followed by knowledge/comprehension-level of competency (29%). Just 15% of respondents were making adjustments to competencies at the synthesis or evaluation level of assessment. Examples of lower-level Bloom's competencies are included below:

- *Discuss the care and treatment of life-threatening terminal illnesses.*
- *Identify characteristics of different network protocols*

- *Identify the elements of music that shape the rock style, including rhythm, melody, harmony, tonality, timbre, texture, volume, form and lyrics.*
- *Explain and relate how chemical structures affect the boiling points, melting points, and freezing points of different substances.*

Examples of higher-level Bloom's competencies are included below:

- *Evaluate serial killers and their victims within a psychological viewpoint. Summarize common background and development of a serial killer Summarize clinical diagnoses and serial killer traits.*
- *Create, modify, save, and output professional looking documents*
- *Determine the potential severity of electrical current on the human body with respect to the amount of current flow, current path, and duration of exposure; employ personal protective standards to achieve proper stand-off distances.*
- *Choose and restrict a topic according to the purpose and the audience, recognizing main ideas, and supporting details.*

Most respondents (72%) were able to point to empirical data for why they had identified a competency as being in need of improvement. An additional 20% of respondents were able to point to some other method of identifying a competency in need of improvement, such as direct observation. Just 8% of respondents provided no evidence of any type to support how they had identified a competency as being in need of improvement. In terms of the type of assessment data used, most respondents (58%) reported using some sort of demonstration of the competency that the instructor could observe first-hand. Traditional pre- and post-course assessments were commonly used as well (21%). Examples of precise empirical data are included below:

- *12/14 (86%) students scored 90% or better when it came to verbal citations in Informative Speech.*
- *17 out of 38 students successfully graphed a function using 1st and 2nd derivatives*
- *8 out of 25 students who completed the assignment scored below a 65 percentile in this activity.*
- *67% of students answered correctly on a question asking about the oldest form of cancer treatment.*

Examples of evidence for why instructors were making an adjustment that lacked specific data are included below:

- *I've been wanting to work on this competency for a while. I have done some extra reading on the subject since teaching this course and I want to include it.*
- *Statistics have shown the need for improvement in serve receive*
- *Student Input*
- *There were emails from class regarding this topic.*

Course Adjustments

Open-ended descriptions of the adjustments instructors planned to make to their courses were sorted for similar themes and ultimately coded into four different categories of types of adjustments. These categories were 1) identifying or included new or different resources, 2) extra practices or drills, 3) changing how materials are presented, or 4) changing how the competency was assessed. Using these categories, respondents were most likely (46%) to indicate they planned on changing the way material was presented. Roughly a quarter of respondents (24.6%) and (24.0%) indicated a plan to add extra practice or drills or find or provide additional resources, respectively. Examples of some of the adjustments coded as changes to how materials are presented are included below:

- *Be more clear and do more activities like this on a more regular basis*
- *Give them realistic salaries and play money with real life problems to have to spend their money for a tangible approach instead of verbal*
- *I have built into my schedule additional time for reinstruction based on a class having so much trouble understanding the application. The class had never seen or used the database and needed to have more time for instruction.*
- *I plan to add extra videos and a small activity for the students, so they have more time to cover the concept of differentiated instruction.*

Examples of course adjustments that were coded as adding additional drills or more practice time are included below.

- *Added some practice assignments and videos for assignments*

- *I have added 2 class periods of APA lecture and workshopping as well as 1 homework assignment which requires them to view "How to" videos regarding APA citation and then create a correct citation- using what they learned from the videos and the lectures.*
- *I plan to add different slides to update what the military is considering a secondary load to help students better understand the new differences.*
- *I plan to review and add additional practice problems to practice this concept.*

Assessment Tool Adjustments

The final open-ended question on the assessment report asks instructors to indicate what adjustments, if any, they plan to make to their assessment tool. Because of the incredible variety of course taught, as well as the need for instructors to have flexibility in how they assess their courses, easy categorization of assessment tool adjustments is not as possible for this report item. Nonetheless, three broad categories of adjustments were identified. These broad categories were 1) changes to assessments/projects/test, 2) relying on direct student feedback, and 3) improving data or rubrics. Of the 179 respondents who answered the item about changes to their assessment tool, a total of 133 (74%) indicated that they would be making or considering some kind of change. Of those 133, the majority (59%) indicated that they were using either an end-class or in-class project, exam, quiz, or assessment to assess student learning. An additional 11% indicated they make changes to their rubrics or some other data-driven adjustment. Four percent (4%) planned to rely on student surveys or feedback as their form of assessment to identify which competencies to improve upon. The remaining 26% of respondents described an adjustment to their assessment plans that did not fit into any category, but included items such as being unsure of what changes they planned to make or having too vague a plan to allow for proper categorization. Sample comments of instructors planning to rely on projects, final exams, or in-class assignment to assess student learning are included below:

- *I would like to get away from multiple choice test and move toward discussion answers be it oral or written.*
- *I plan to implement assessments and outcomes feature within Canvas using final exam questions to better assess student learning.*
- *I need to add in more assignments and projects throughout the semester and use assignment/project rubrics to better assess how well my students are understanding the information that I am teaching them.*

- *I am introducing a "mid-term" assessment of a project instead of just a final, this way I have more of an opportunity to assess and adjust instead of merely looking back after the class has finished.*

Other comments from instructors who planned to alter rubrics or other data-centered adjustments are included in below:

- *The rubrics need to be more specific to separate different skills that better align to each competency and outcome,*
- *Rubrics accompany almost all of my assignments and every semester I review those rubrics to make improving adjustments. I am continuing to attach rubrics to any assigned work that I feel requires it.*
- *My goal is to move towards a rubric for the course to assess student learning. That is currently a work in progress.*
- *I need to look at the current rubric again and determine if more emphasis should be given to the area of source integration.*

Conclusion

As the course assessment committee has worked to gain an institutional foothold within Barton, there had been a steady increase in response rates that now appears to be leveling off between 85% and 90%. While getting as close to 100% compliance remains the goal, the result of this semester's course assessment reporting indicates a shift in focus to improving the quality of the reports is warranted. While 87% of respondents provided enough detail about the competency, they were improving to categorize it using Bloom's taxonomy, 13% did not. Because every competency should contain a Bloom's verb in it, it should be clear in 100% of responses which Bloom's level they are planning to address. Additionally, the results indicate that the majority of improvements are being made to lower-level Bloom's competencies and very few (15%) are being made to the highest two levels of Bloom's taxonomy. While the percentage of competencies across the college may not necessarily be spread across all six Bloom levels equally, it still might be worth making a concerted effort as a committee to provide support to instructors wanting to make adjustments being to the higher-level Bloom's competencies whenever possible. Lastly, while most instructors (72%) were able to provide empirical data to back up their planned course adjustments, this percentage too

should be as close to 100% as possible. To that end, employee education, such as Cougar TALES presentations should be developed by the committee over the coming semesters to help address these areas for improvement.

Despite these areas for improvement and opportunities for growing the Barton culture of assessment, it appears these adjustment are the types that will allow our course-level of assessment to grow from merely 'good' to 'great' as the committee continues to support its instructors and their efforts to improve student learning.