



Program Assessment Report

Program: Critical Thinking

Report Year: 2021-22

Drafted by David Monroe on Jan 11, 2023

Overall Introduction

In support of the mission of St. Petersburg College, faculty committees established several General Education Goals. These goals are to provide an open admission general education curriculum that results in students' achievement of several educational outcomes. This Assessment Report addresses the following educational outcome: "Students should be able to analyze, synthesize, reflect upon, and apply information to solve problems, and make decisions logically, ethically, and creatively."

It is the intent of St. Petersburg College to incorporate continuous improvement practices in all areas. Assessment reports provide comparisons of present and past results which are used to identify topics where improvement is possible. The following section illustrates how SPC has traditionally used past results as a vital tool in achieving its commitment to continuous improvement.

Program Learning Outcomes

#1: Students will: Analyze, synthesize, reflect upon, and apply information to solve problems, and make decisions logically, ethically, and creatively

I. Use of Past Results

Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Paper

During 1998-99 students in speech classes used an essay as prompt and through an assessment instrument purchased from the Foundation for Critical Thinking wrote a paper graded by a grader trained by the Foundation. The results indicated that student scores in critical thinking improved with the number of credits earned at SPC.

During 2003-04 Critical Thinking was assessed in Speech classes using a test based on the International Critical Thinking Test which was derived from the Paul and Elder critical thinking model developed by the Foundation for Critical Thinking. Comparative analysis was conducted on students who had completed just a few courses at SPC and those students who had completed over 49 credit hours. The results showed that students' critical thinking skills do rise. However, these results also indicated that faculty need to implement new ways to help students learn the skills of thinking critically.

From 2004-05 through 2007-08 Critical Thinking was assessed in general education Applied Ethics courses by administering the Critical Thinking & Application Paper (CTAP) to all students. This instrument did not provide the information necessary to determine the correlation between student hours and critical thinking abilities. It assessed students abilities to think logically by applying concepts and skills learned during their required Applied Ethics course.

Results of the CTAP indicated that a large percentage (80.0% to 86.4%) of SPC students in general education Applied Ethics courses were able to demonstrate the ability to utilize logical and critical thinking skills in a systematic way. This was especially encouraging in light of other findings that indicated that most students took a required Applied Ethics course in their first two semesters at the College.

As a result of these past assessments, the following actions were taken to *Improve Student Success, Enhance*

Curriculum and Faculty Development, and College-wide Enhancement: Greater emphasis is now placed on critical thinking in all ethics classes. The SPC-produced *Ethics Applied* textbook series was revised to include more emphasis on critical thinking skills and demonstrations of their implementation. Applied Ethics faculty members agreed to do more assessment of Critical Thinking in their classes. The faculty-initiated change from faculty-written ethics scenarios to ethics cases from the National Ethics Bowl has improved the instrument and the quality of student papers. Finally, the grading rubric has been revised and student instructions for completing the CTAP have been revised and clarified.

Method 2: Employer Survey

Prior to 2005-06 Employers ranked former St. Petersburg College students on a scale of (1) Poor to (7) Excellent on "acquires, interprets and uses information effectively." Results of the Employers' Survey indicate that, when asked to rank graduates from (1) Poor to (7) Excellent, employers of SPC graduates rank them above 5 as shown below.

| Employer Survey (years) | Mean |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| 1997-98 | 5.9 out of 7 |
| 1998-99 | 6.0 |
| 1999-00 | 5.7 |
| 2000-01 | 6.1 |
| 2001-02 | 6.0 |
| 2002-03 | 6.2 |
| 2003-04 | 6.3 |
| 2004-05 | 6.3 |

The new Employer Survey uses a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being the highest), and the prior single question was replaced by five more specific questions. The results for 2005-06 exceeded the criteria for success as shown below.

| Employer Survey questions | Mean 2005-06 |
|---|--------------|
| Gathers and assesses relevant information | 4.2 of 5 |
| Inquires and interprets information | 4.2 |
| Organizes and evaluates information | 4.2 |
| Analyzes and explains information to others | 4.1 |
| Uses information to solve problems | 4.2 |

2009-10 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Paper

Fall 2008 marked the introduction of the Critical Thinking Model which replaced the previous Ethics Model. The Applied Ethics Program's goal for 2009-2010 is to have at least 80% of students demonstrate competency by passing the CTAP. Faculty and students worked together to achieve and surpass this rate with an average passage rate of 84%.

In another demonstration of faculty working to improve assessment success, guidelines for the CTAP were rewritten and widely shared by faculty in Spring 2010. Perhaps use of the new, clearer guidelines resulted in a passage rate of 87%; this assumption awaits verification with the data for Summer 2010.

The topic of the Critical Thinking and Assessment Paper (CTAP) changes each semester but the passage rate appears to be fairly consistent from semester to semester. In Spring 2010 (0420) the Applied Ethics faculty began identifying the main issue of the given dilemma. Instead of a direction to "Find the main issue," the directions now indicate, "Here's the main issue, now find other issues in the story." This was done so students would not base their entire paper on the wrong issue and fail the opportunity to demonstrate critical thinking on the assignment. The Spring 2010 (0420) passage rate for students rose several percentage points, perhaps partly because of this change in the CTAP instructions.

Method 2: Employer Survey

The Employer Survey results for 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 exceeded the criteria for success.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

Students met the criteria for success during the first two administrations of the assessment (Spring and Summer 2010). The Online General Education Assessment outcomes appear to be consistent with the results of the CTAP.

2012-13 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Paper

The Applied Ethics department selected a target score of 70% as a demonstration of student competency on the Critical Thinking Application Paper (CTAP). The departmental goal was that 80% of students taking ethics courses for general education credit would meet that target. The data showed that the department had been largely successful in meeting that goal.

During the five terms in which data were collected and utilized for this report, the Applied Ethics Department exceeded the 80% goal. The method of data collection changed in 2012-2013, which resulted in the corruption of the more recent data. The resolution for this issue began during 2013.

Method 2: Employer Survey

The college set a score of 3 or above on a 5-point scale as the target score on employer surveys. Across three surveys, SPC graduates exceeded that target by at least 1.2 points in each of the measured areas. The results seemed to indicate that SPC students acquired the relevant critical thinking competencies during their time at the college. The results were remarkably stable in each area, showing almost no variation from year to year.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

SPC students taking the Online General Education Assessment also exceeded expectations. The college set a 70% average success rate for the critical thinking general education questions. Over three semesters, regardless of the three administered forms, participating students averaged scores greater than the 70% target. The mean scores showed more variation than the employer survey, but tended to demonstrate successful acquisition of critical thinking competencies.

2015-16 Assessment Report Results

Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Paper

The critical thinking and application paper data were encouraging for face to face and blended classes; students met or approached the 70% competency goal in almost every area. The weakest area was the application of ethical concepts, at 68% competency. The results for online students are similar, save for in the application of ethical concepts. Students in online classes performed significantly worse, with only 53.8% meeting the success targets. This is obviously an area for improvement.

Method 2: Employer Survey

Employers rated 2014-15 graduates the same or slightly better in each of the 5 competencies related to critical thinking, as compared to the prior year.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

SPC students fared slightly better in Spring 16 compared to 2015 comparative data, but not significantly enough to draw pedagogical conclusions.

Method 4: ETS Proficiency Profile

Comparison between SPC students' 2015-16 mean scores, and comparative students' mean scores of students assessed from July 2010 through June 2015 at domestic institutions across the nation indicated that SPC students scored higher on each of the seven skill areas assessed.

Method 5: Health Science Reasoning Test

The HSRT data depict improvement in most categories, as well as a 1 to 3 point increase in the overall scores, which seems to indicate that students' critical thinking skills are enhanced, improved, or developed as a result of the BASDH and BASVT curriculum, respectively.

2018-19 Assessment Report Results**Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Paper**

Ethics students across modalities clearly reached the targets in ethical issue recognition, evaluation of different ethical concepts, and self-awareness. The results are less clear in their ability to understand and to apply core ethical concepts. Online students met the target in those areas, whereas face-to-face and blended students were narrowly below. One reason for the difference may be increased focus on those areas in the newest edition of SPC's ethics textbook, as well as the development of an array of online learning objects, in response to a perceived deficiency in the previous reporting cycle.

Method 2: Employer Survey

Students very clearly met the performance targets in the Employer Surveys, scoring an average of at least 4 out of 5 in all categories.

Method 3: Online General Education Assessment

There are two areas of interest in the online general education assessment results. The most obvious is that students did not meet the target for recognizing assumptions on either Form 3 or Form 5. Students taking the assessment on Form 5 also failed to achieve the 70% competency rate for distinguishing fallacious forms of argument. The samples in both cases are small, but these results suggest that increased pedagogical focus on recognizing assumptions, as well as revisiting the form questions, may be in order.

Method 4: ETS Proficiency Profile

The goal of reporting scores higher than the national average on the ETS assessment has been met.

Method 5: Health Science Reasoning Test

The aim of reaching a 1 point or higher increase in the HSRT was not met, but narrowly missed. Fourth year vet tech students showed a .7 increase. The highest jump was in the ability to make inferential judgments.

II. Methodology

Means of Assessment: This Major Learning Outcome was evaluated using the following five methods. In Method 1, a Critical Thinking and Application Assignment was administered in select SPC general education Applied Ethics courses. In this assignment, students are provided with a ethics case study or scenario, and are required to apply a variety of course concepts and skills to determine and defend a best course of action. In Method 2, SPC's Employer Survey, employers were asked to rate the ability of former SPC students in five areas related to Critical Thinking. In Method 3, the results of a national standardized Critical Thinking assessment were utilized.

Date(s) of Administration: 2019, 2020, 2021

Method 1: Critical Thinking and Application Assignment

Students in SPC general education Applied Ethics courses were given an ethical issue and required to complete an 'Applied Ethics Critical Thinking and Application Assignment.' Students are required to apply the SPC Critical Thinking Model to the assigned ethical issue to reach, and be able to justify, a reasonable, morally appropriate, decision. Instructors are given latitude regarding the type of assignment (a diachronic assessment or single paper), but the steps in the model are tightly prescribed. The central purpose of this type of assessment is to assess students' ability to use critical thinking skills to solve a problem ethically.

Assessment Instrument: In this measure, a hypothetical ethical scenario is presented to students in SPC general education Applied Ethics courses. The Applied Ethics program utilizes cases written for the National Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl (sponsored by the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics), revising them as needed to fit the assignment. This assessment is a part of regular class activities in these courses. Students are required to utilize the model for critical thinking and ethical decision-making to do the following:

1. Identify the ethical issues involved,
2. Research the central ethical issue to gain a better understanding of the problem,
3. Analyze the problem by recognizing possible solutions and stakeholders, while considering the implications of those

solutions,

4. Resolve the central ethical issue through the application of classical and contemporary ethical theories,
5. Select and defend the most ethical resolutions to the central ethical issue using all relevant data from the previous sections,
6. Identify counter arguments against the option the student selected as being ethically best,
7. Reflect on the thought process the student used and what might be done differently to improve problem solving in the future.

The critical thinking and ethical decision making model used in the assignment was designed by SPC Applied Ethics faculty and is based on major learning outcomes for the course. In lieu of developing a standardized scoring rubric, the Applied Ethics Faculty agreed to use the AAC&U Value Rubric for Ethical Reasoning as a standard competencies metric. The Value Rubric aligns seamlessly with the areas in the SPC critical thinking model, so it can be used in conjunction with that model without requiring modification. Faculty are free to grade the assignment as they see fit, but must use the Value Rubric to assess student critical thinking competencies in at least one course section per term. The Value Rubric Assessment is distinct from, and additional to, regular grading.

In 2019/2020, the ethics department temporarily changed the focus and distribution of the assessment. SPC received a grant from the AAC&U VALUE Institute to conduct a specific study using the Ethical Reasoning VALUE rubric; for purposes of the grant, the assessment was more rigorously standardized. The aim of the grant was to track knowledge retention and portability of ethical reasoning/critical thinking skills outside of the classroom. To that end, each instructor was asked to require students to attend the Keith Goree Memorial Ethics Lecture by Prof. Todd May. The students would then use the critical thinking model to evaluate his presentation. The lecture was scheduled for March 16th, 2020—the very day that the US began wide shutdowns due to COVID-19. As a result of the shift to online-only education, we substituted an event hosted by SPC's Institute for Strategic Policy Solutions on the crisis of sea level rise and its policy implications. Unlike the Goree Lecture, which would have taken place closely following students' learning ethical theories, the ISPS event was held at the end of term. This may explain some of the difference in those data.

Gathering the data: Faculty scored the student assignments using the Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric from the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

| Value Rubric Competency | SPC CT Model Area |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | Reflection |
| Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts | Application of Ethical Theories |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | Identifying Moral Issues |
| Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts | Application of Ethical Theories |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts | Evaluation |

Population: The normal sample population consisted of 2,894 students in general education Applied Ethics courses from Fall 2019-Spring 2021. The students were sampled from sections taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty members. The sampled sections were in various modalities, including face-to-face, online, live online, and blended formats. An additional 387 students were part of the anomalous Spring 2020 cohort measured on the common, out-of-class assignment.

Method 2: Employer Survey Employers of students, who completed their course work at St. Petersburg College in 2018-19, 2019-20, and 2020-21, gave SPC permission to contact their employer, were surveyed. Employers ranked these former students on a scale of 1 – 5 (with 5 being the highest), in the following areas of Critical Thinking:

- Gathers and assesses relevant information
- Inquires and Interprets Information
- Organizes and Evaluates Information
- Analyzes and Explains Information to Others
- Uses Information to Solve Problems

Method 3: Health Science Reasoning Test

The results of the Health Sciences Reasoning Test (HSRT), which measures high-stakes reasoning and decision-making processes were utilized. The HSRT is specifically calibrated for trainees in health sciences educational programs (undergraduate and graduate) and for professional health science practitioners. Scores on this instrument have been found to predict successful professional licensure and high clinical performance ratings.

Assessment Instrument: The HSRT is designed to provide both an overall score for critical thinking and a selection of scale scores to assist the trainer or instructor to focus curricula and training opportunities to address particular weaknesses in both individuals and groups. The HSRT Overall Reasoning Skills score targets the strength or weakness of one's skill in making reflective, reasoned judgments about what to believe or what to do. Scores are also reported for: Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Induction and Deduction.

Population: BAS Veterinary Technology students enrolled in their first semester between Spring 2020 and Fall 2022 were evaluated. Due to budget constraints, graduating students were not re-tested.

III. Criteria for Success

Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Assignment

The Applied Ethics Program sets achievement of milestone 3 or capstone 4 on the AACU Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric as competency targets for individual students. The Applied Ethics Program's goal is to have at least 70% of students meet this target in each rubric area.

Method 2: Employer Survey

Goal: Above average (3 out of 5) mean on the items listed below.

- Gathers and assesses relevant information
- Inquires and Interprets Information
- Organizes and Evaluates Information
- Analyzes and Explains Information to Others
- Uses Information to Solve Problems

Method 3: Health Science Reasoning Test

Goal: Overall Score remains consistent

IV. Summary of Assessment Findings

Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Paper

2019-2020 Academic Year

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 264 | 69 | 34 | 31 | 19 | 79.9% |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 176 | 115 | 51 | 59 | 26 | 69.8% |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 241 | 98 | 44 | 18 | 20 | 81.3% |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 193 | 97 | 61 | 32 | 26 | 69.5% |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical | 222 | 68 | 72 | 28 | 27 | 69.5% |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Concepts | | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Face to Face and Blended Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2019
N = 417

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 41 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 73.4% |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 32 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 67.1% |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 38 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 76.6% |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 41 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 78.1% |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 28 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 57.8% |

Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2019
N = 64

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 201 | 80 | 42 | 36 | 28 | 72.6% |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 147 | 98 | 75 | 36 | 26 | 63.3% |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 223 | 82 | 55 | 17 | 13 | 78.8% |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 156 | 102 | 63 | 45 | 26 | 66.6% |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 182 | 85 | 65 | 26 | 33 | 68.9% |

Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Spring 2020

N = 387

This is the semester during which we conducted the “Resilience Gap” activity as our assessment as part of the AAC&U Grant Project. Coincidentally, this is the COVID outbreak semester, as well, which makes two variables that may account for differences against normal success frequency.

2020-2021 Academic Year

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 21 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 82.8 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 17 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 71.4 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 11 | 13 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 68.5 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 14 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 65.7 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 14 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 71.4 |

Face to Face and Blended Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2020**N = 35**

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 96 | 24 | 11 | 4 | 13 | 81 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 97 | 16 | 17 | 7 | 10 | 76.3 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 92 | 21 | 16 | 9 | 10 | 76.3 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 84 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 76.3 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 94 | 19 | 19 | 4 | 12 | 76.3 |

Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2020**N = 148**

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 74 | 23 | 21 | 3 | 7 | 75.7 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 67 | 32 | 23 | 11 | 3 | 77.3 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 89 | 30 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 92.9 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 67 | 34 | 21 | 7 | 9 | 78.9 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 75 | 32 | 19 | 6 | 6 | 75.2 |

Live Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2020**N = 128**

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 18 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 72.7 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 17 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 72.7 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 21 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 75.7 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 16 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 69.6 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 19 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 69.6 |

Face to Face and Blended Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Spring 2021**N = 33**

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 82 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 17 | 79.6 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 53 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 7 | 66.1 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 78 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 78.1 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 50 | 29 | 21 | 4 | 12 | 66.9 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 75 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 19 | 72.8 |

Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Spring 2021

N = 118

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 45 | 30 | 10 | 8 | 16 | 68.8 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 47 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 65.1 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 70 | 21 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 70.1 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 47 | 27 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 67.8 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 46 | 29 | 10 | 5 | 17 | 68.8 |

Live Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Spring 2021

N = 109

2021-2022 Academic Year

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 28 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 83.7 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 19 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 74.4 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 30 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 79 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 17 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 65.1 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 19 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 58.1 |

Face to Face and Blended Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2021

N = 43

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 44 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 82.5 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 31 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 71.4 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 28 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 4 | 65 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 33 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 68.2 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 45 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 84.1 |

Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2021

N = 63

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency |
|------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
|------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|----|---|---|---|----------|
| | | | | | | (3 or 4) |
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 8 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 4 | .6 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 8 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 56.6 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 8 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 4 | .6 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 8 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 53.3 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 8 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 56.6 |

Live Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2021

N = 30

NB: Data skewed overall by small sample size. We had planned to change assessment method this term, which caused confusion for faculty.

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 51 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 86.3 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 42 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 75.3 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 50 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 83.5 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 35 | 19 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 73.9 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 43 | 14 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 78.1 |

Face to Face and Blended Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Spring 2022

N = 73

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 | 1 | 0 (does not | Success |
|------------|-------------|--------------|---|---|-------------|---------|
|------------|-------------|--------------|---|---|-------------|---------|

| | | | (Milestone) | (Benchmark) | meet bench) | Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-----|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 134 | 26 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 76.9 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 115 | 35 | 27 | 10 | 21 | 72.1 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 121 | 39 | 23 | 9 | 25 | 76.9 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 107 | 41 | 33 | 7 | 23 | 71.1 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 127 | 34 | 17 | 6 | 26 | 77.4 |

Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Spring 2022

N = 208

| Competency | 4(Capstone) | 3(Milestone) | 2 (Milestone) | 1 (Benchmark) | 0 (does not meet bench) | Success Frequency (3 or 4) |
|--|-------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | 40 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 73.1 |
| Understanding Different Ethical Concepts | 36 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 71.6 |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | 45 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 85 |
| Application of Ethical Concepts | 32 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 13 | 70.1 |
| Evaluation of Different Ethical Concepts | 34 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 73.1 |

Live Online Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric Data & Success Rate Fall 2021

N = 67

NB: Data skewed overall by small sample size. We had planned to change assessment method in the fall, which caused confusion for faculty.

Method 2: Employer Survey

| Employer Survey Results | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Gathers and assesses relevant information | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.1 |
| Inquires and interprets information | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| Organizes and evaluates information | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.0 |
| Analyzes and explains information to others | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.0 |
| Uses information to solve problems | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.1 |

Method 3: Health Science Reasoning Test

| Insight Assessment data for Entering Students between Spring 2020 and Fall 2022 | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Skill/Attribute Name | N | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | SE Mean |
| OVERALL | 141 | 20.9 | 21 | 4.3 | 0.4 |
| Induction | 141 | 7.6 | 8 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Deduction | 141 | 5.9 | 6 | 2.3 | 0.2 |
| Analysis | 141 | 4.0 | 4 | 1.5 | 0.1 |
| Inference | 141 | 4.0 | 4 | 1.2 | 0.1 |
| Evaluation | 141 | 4.9 | 5 | 1.1 | 0.1 |

| Insight Assessment data for Entering Students between Spring 2017 and Fall 2018 | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Skill/Attribute Name | N | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | SE Mean |
| OVERALL | 103 | 21.3 | 22 | 4.2 | 0.4 |
| Induction | 103 | 7.6 | 8 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Deduction | 103 | 6.3 | 7 | 2.2 | 0.2 |
| Analysis | 103 | 4.1 | 4 | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| Inference | 103 | 3.9 | 4 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Evaluation | 103 | 4.9 | 5 | 1.2 | 0.1 |

V. Discussion and Analysis of Assessment Findings

Method 1: Critical Thinking & Application Paper

This assessment period was difficult for both faculty and students, given the introduction of two (now three) variables. First, obviously, was the outbreak of COVID-19, which changed the mode of instruction for most students. The shift from in-person to Live Online classes appeared to have an impact on student outcomes (c.f., Fall 2021 data), but it's equally true that during the semesters referred to as the "COVID semesters," when most instruction was remote, that student performances dipped. This was especially true in the areas of understanding and applying different ethical concepts. Note, though, that those areas have traditionally been where students have fared relatively worse, generally hovering around (and usually meeting) our target of .7 or better.

The second variable was the disruption caused by modifying assessment practices to meet the requirements of the AAC&U VALUE Institute grant in 19-20, which, of course, co-incided with the pandemic's outbreak. The grant focused on assessing critical thinking and ethical reasoning in out-of-class co-curricular activities--the point being to see if students carried their skills to other contexts. It's difficult to say whether the assessment was fair and representative. Student performance was understandably worse (see data for Spring 2020) for two reasons. First, the initial event for which instructors prepared, which would have fallen around the time of normal assessment, was canceled for COVID. Second, the replacement event was held at the end of term, about seven weeks after primary instruction on key concepts would have occurred; in other words, the material wasn't as fresh in student minds. Finally, because the intervening weeks were stressful and difficult given the shift to online learning, many instructors were loathe to weight the assignment as heavily and most students were struggling generally. So it is unlikely that they performed at a normal level. It would be interesting to repeat the experiment in a "normal" term.

Coming into Fall 2021, we had planned to change our data collection and assessment strategies. This was poorly communicated to faculty, which resulted in a low-yield data crop for that term. However, the change to collection and assessment has moved forward; see the action plan below.

Method 2: Employer Survey

The employer survey results have remained above the targets set by the college. However, the half-point decrease over the past three years raises questions. Is the decline due to a dropoff in instruction or student retention? Is it related to the pandemic's disruption of instructional modalities? Is it down to the general tensions between employers and employees since the pandemic? It will be worth watching what happens with the survey over the next couple of years.

Method 3: Health Science Reasoning Test

Not much change here; the numbers only show a noticeable decline in "Deduction" over the periods of assessment; again, that decline is during the main COVID terms. Other items were not impacted, though, so perhaps deductive inferences ought to be a point of emphasis going forward.

VI. Action Plan and Timetable for Implementation

Based on the analysis of the results the following Action Plan Items have been selected for implementation:

- Instead of relying on each individual faculty member to score one of their sections using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Ethical Reasoning, we have opted to randomly sample five sections of PHI 1600, collect the student critical thinking work from those classes, redact student information, break the papers into the parts covered by the Rubric, and then have objective scorers re-mark the anonymized work using the AAC&U Assessment. Our belief is that this will give us more accurate scoring according to the rubric itself. The assessment workshop (our first), will be held on February 10th, 2023.
- Dave Monroe / Feb 2023

Budget / Planning Implications:

There may be some small budget impact going forward; the assessment will rely upon faculty work more heavily; for fewer instructors it will be more time-consuming and we will request a small compensation for their time in the next budget cycle.

Action Plan

| Category | Action Plan Detail / Implications | For PLO | Responsible Party / Due Date |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| D. | Improve Assessment Methodology | | |

D4. Improve method of data collection & analysis

Instead of relying on each individual faculty member to score one of their sections using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Ethical Reasoning, we have opted to randomly sample five sections of PHI 1600, collect the student critical thinking work from those classes, redact student information, break the papers into the parts covered by the Rubric, and then have objective scorers re-mark the anonymized work using the AAC&U Assessment. Our belief is that this will give us more accurate scoring according to the rubric itself. The assessment workshop (our first), will be held on February 10th, 2023.

#1

Dave Monroe
Feb 2023**Budget / Planning Implications:**

There may be some small budget impact going forward; the assessment will rely upon faculty work more heavily; for fewer instructors it will be more time-consuming and we will request a small compensation for their time in the next budget cycle.

Approvals

Program Administrator:

David Monroe - Faculty

*Approved by David Monroe - Faculty on Jan 11, 2023***Educational Outcomes Coordinators:**

Amy Eggers - Coord, Accredtn&BaccAssessment

Magaly Tymms - Assessment Director

*Approved by Magaly Tymms - Assessment Director on Jan 11, 2023***Dean:**

Susan Demers - Dean, College of Policy Ethics and Legal Studies

*Approved by Susan Demers - Dean, College of Policy Ethics and Legal Studies on Jan 11, 2023***Senior Vice President:**

Sabrina Crawford - AVP, Institutional Eff Acad Srv

Approved by Sabrina Crawford - AVP, Institutional Eff Acad Srv on Jan 11, 2023

St. Petersburg College
P.O. Box 13489
St. Petersburg FL 33733-3489

Having technical difficulties? [Contact us](#)© 2023 St. Petersburg College | [Legal Notices](#)

St. Petersburg College is committed to equal access/equal opportunity in its programs, activities, and employment. For additional information visit www.spcollege.edu/eaao/. St. Petersburg College is an Equal Opportunity Employer.
[Privacy Policy](#) | [Social Security Number usage](#) | [Site Disclaimer](#) | [Crime Reports](#) | [Campus Safety](#) | [Emergency Preparedness](#)

Use this link to report accessibility issues on this page.