

Core Outcomes and Student Success Report

Academic Year 2015

I. Integrated Core Learning Outcomes Assessment

Summary

As part of an Integrated Core Learning Outcomes (ICLO) assessment project, two graduate students with experience teaching and assessing undergraduate writing reviewed student artifacts and scored them based on the established rubric for Core Outcome #2 (written communication) which covers communication in modes appropriate to various subjects and diverse audiences. All data was compiled into an Excel spreadsheet.

Results and Recommendations

The rubric for Core Outcome #2 (written communication) assumes a research-related assignment. When the assignment aligned well with the rubric, scoring was relatively consistent between the two assessment coders. However, when assignments did not align well with the rubric (e.g., take-home finals, lesson plans), application of the criteria became more open to individual interpretation. In these cases artifacts tended to receive more divergent scores from the assessment coders.

Aligning the assignments with the assessment criteria, clarifying the language of the rubric, and attaching the assignment prompt to the artifacts would likely improve scores and consistency in the assessment of ICLO Core Outcome #2 for written communication.

Observations

- Process-related observations
 - One assessment coder consistently rated artifacts lower than the other. Scores were usually within one (1) point of each other for any given category.
 - The rubric assumes a research assignment. When the artifacts diverged from that format, the assessment coders generally had greater differences in interpreting how to apply the criteria to the artifact.
- Rubric-related observations
 - “Context of and Purpose for Writing” — This criterion refers to the “assigned task.” In most cases the assignment prompt was not included with the artifacts and the coders did not know what the assigned tasks were. This led them to make their own inferences. Including the assignment prompt with the artifacts might mitigate the problem.

- “Content Development” — This criterion asks coders to judge whether the content is comprehensive. The coders did not have content knowledge, so this was difficult to assess. Dropping this language in favor of language that focuses on the development and clarity of main points within the project would likely help.
- “Organization” — The language for this criterion focuses on transitions. However, many assignments prescribed a set of headings that removed the need for writing transitions. Perhaps the criterion should or could be expanded to focus on organization more broadly.
- “Sources and Evidence” — This criterion was the source of the greatest difference in interpretation between the two assessment coders. The language for this criterion focuses on “sources,” but some of the assignments did not require the use of specific sources. If the goal is to accommodate flexibility in assignments, then changing the language to focus on “evidence” might clarify that intention. If the goal is to assess the use of outside sources, then assignments need to be adjusted to align with the desired outcome.
- “Control of Syntax and Mechanics” — This criterion focuses not only on grammar, but “proper formatting (including citations).” It consistently received the lowest scores, in large part because of citation formatting issues. Proper citation format did not appear to be emphasized in many assignments, nor was it always apparent to the assessment coders what format was intended. It might be helpful to include the assignment prompt and citation style requirement with the artifacts.
- Assignment-related observations
 - Some assignments did not seem to align easily with the rubric. Three of the five rubric criteria apply to research. For any assignment that did not require research, all three of those scores were low.
 - Specific examples of assignment-related issues are discussed below:
 - CRLS 3100 was, in part, a reflection assignment and did not encourage the same kind of content development, research, and evidence that the rubric seems designed to assess.
 - HIST 4271 was a take-home final that did not require sources beyond the textbook and class notes. As a result, specific sources were not always identified, citation was inconsistent, and writing mechanics were rough. The divergent “Sources and Evidence” scores for this class reflect different assumptions made by the two coders. The genre of take-home final led one coder to consider the use of supporting historical detail as evidence. The other coder interpreted sources and evidence more narrowly.
 - ENGL 4997 included several different types of assignment. Some of the artifacts were lesson plans, while another was a website. These were perceived differently by the two coders, especially with regard to “Context of and Purpose for Writing” and “Content Development.” As a result, there were divergent scores. This was the first course that was assessed and differences were discussed and adjusted as part of the calibration process.

Core Curriculum Review Committee discussion and recommendation of assessment results

During two meetings in spring 2016, the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC) reviewed the observations and recommendations from the assessment coders identified above. The CCRC felt that the results were reasonable, but identified a set of recommendations to improve the rigor and usefulness of the ICLO assessment process. These recommendations include:

1. Multiple norming sessions to ensure higher into coder reliability. In previous years, the single initial norming session appeared sufficient.

2. Requesting individual instructors to submit their own assignment and rubric (if utilized) to compare to the ICLO rubric utilized by the assessment coders.
3. To continue to explore other ways of identifying longitudinal assessment artifacts, particularly if it is feasible to mine data from D2L.

The CCRC strongly recommends that the methodological challenges of the current process inform the new assessment structure to be utilized with the revised Core.

Table 1: Average Course Ratings by Coder and Criterion

Course Name	Context/Purpose		Content Development		Organization		Sources/Evidence		Syntax/Mechanics	
	CODER 1	CODER 2	CODER 1	CODER 2	CODER 1	CODER 2	CODER 1	CODER 2	CODER 1	CODER 2
ENGL 4997	2.91	3.45	2.82	3.27	2.91	3.27	2.82	3.09	2.45	2.64
HIST 4271	2.77	2.96	2.62	2.04	2.50	2.46	2.58	1.23	2.54	1.73
ANTH 4997	3.00	3.00	2.71	2.86	2.57	2.43	3.14	3.14	2.71	2.00
NURS 4301	3.07	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.60	3.00	2.53	2.13	2.40	2.07
SOCI 4997	2.62	2.54	2.46	2.23	2.62	2.00	2.38	2.08	2.00	1.15
SPPA 4931	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.83	3.00	3.33	2.33	2.83	2.00
CCOM 4700	3.04	2.50	2.58	2.23	2.42	2.50	2.50	2.27	2.50	1.73
CRLS 3100	2.70	2.20	2.70	2.30	2.40	2.40	2.30	1.40	2.20	1.90
BISC 4930	3.75	3.13	3.50	3.00	3.50	2.75	3.38	2.63	3.25	2.00
BISC 4931	3.56	2.89	3.56	2.78	3.44	2.89	3.00	2.11	3.00	2.44
MATH 4630	3.00		2.96		2.78		2.56		2.67	

1 = Low 4 = High

II. Standardized Licensure and Certification Exam Results

Standardized licensure and certification exams offer the opportunity to monitor student achievement of learning outcomes and benchmark results against external data. Table 2 shows the past five years of pass rates on certification exams with national or state benchmark comparison

Table 2: Pass Rates on Certification Exams

Program, Name of Test	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
Accounting, Certified Public Account Exam	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
Undergraduate (first-time test-takers)	71%	50%	68%	54%	74%	55%	74%	55%	71%	55%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	80	n/a	96	n/a	95	n/a	113	n/a	135	n/a
Graduate (first-time test-takers)	47%	56% (WI)	59%	65% (WI)	65%	69% (WI)	46%	73% (WI)	52%	66% (WI)
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	11	n/a	14	n/a	17	n/a	13	n/a	23	n/a
Program, Name of Test	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
Finance, Certified Financial Analyst Exam	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
Level 1	87%	38%	75%	38%	65%	38%	76%	43%	67%	42%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	16	n/a	16	n/a	17	n/a	17	n/a	12	n/a
Program, Name of Test	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
Education	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
Undergraduate – Praxis II Content Area Knowledge Test	100%	100% (WI)	100%	100% (WI)	100%	100% (WI)	100%	100% (WI)	100%	98% (WI)
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	106	n/a	99	n/a	113	n/a	108	n/a	119	n/a
School Counseling – Praxis II School Counseling and Guidance Exam	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a	100%	n/a
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	6	n/a	8	n/a	6	n/a	5	n/a	7	n/a
Community Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling, National Certification Exam	96%	83%	96%	83%	96%	84%	100%	84%	100%	89%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	19	n/a	24	n/a	27	n/a	15	n/a	18	n/a

Program, Name of Test	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
Clinical Laboratory Sciences, Board of Certification Exam	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
	90%	77%	100%	77%	100%	84%	92%	86%		
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	10	n/a	15	n/a	13	n/a	13	n/a		
Physical Therapy, PES National Licensure Exam (first-time test-takers)	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
	95%	91%	93%	90%	93%	91%	98%	93%	98%	93%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	n/a	n/a	61	n/a	61	n/a	59	n/a	59	n/a
Athletic Training, National Athletic Trainers' Association (first-time test-takers)	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
	100%	82%	92%	81%	100%	75%	100%	86%	100%	83%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	12	n/a	12	n/a	11	n/a	10	n/a	11	n/a
Physician Assistant Studies, National Certification Exam (first-time test-takers)	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
	100%	91%	100%	93%	100%	94%	100%	96%	100%	95%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	50	n/a	47	n/a	48	n/a	48	n/a	48	n/a
Speech-Language Pathology, Praxis Exam (first-time test-takers) ***	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
	100%	86%	100%	86%	100%	90%	100%	90%	100%	
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	28	n/a	21	n/a	32	n/a	25	n/a	25	

Program, Name of Test	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l	MU	Nat'l
Nursing										
NCLEX-RN (all first-time test takers)	90%	87%	84%	88%	92%	90%	82%	82%	81%	85%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	126	n/a	133	n/a	133	n/a	122	n/a	158	n/a
American Nurses Credentialing Center (ANCC) – Adult Primary Care NP Certification Exam (*Adult Gerontology Primary Care NP Certification Exam) or American Academy of Nurse Practitioners Certification Program (AANPCP) Adult Primary Care NP Certification Exam	94%	82% (ANCC)	100%	91% (ANCC)	100%	85% (ANCC)	*92%	*84% (ANCC)	100% (ANCC) 100% (AANCP)	81% (ANCC) 83% (AANCP)
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	17	n/a	14	n/a	26	n/a	26	n/a	*25 (ANCC) 5 (AANCP)	n/a n/a
ANCC – Adult Acute Care NP Certification Exam (** Adult Gerontology Acute Care NP Certification Exam)	95%	92% (ANCC)	95%	92% (ANCC)	100%	87% (ANCC)	**82%	**85% (ANCC)	**87%	**84% (ANCC)
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	19	n/a	12	n/a	16	n/a	17	n/a	**23	n/a
ANCC – Pediatric Primary Care NP Certification Exam or Pediatric Nursing Certification Board (PNCB) Pediatric Primary Care NP Certification Exam or ANCC Pediatric CNS Certification Exam	88%	90% (PNCB)	100%	90% (PNCB)	86%	91% (PNCB)	91%	89% (PNCB)	100%	88% (PNCB)
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	8	n/a	15	n/a	7	n/a	11	n/a	13	n/a
PNCB Pediatric Acute Care NP Certification Exam	86%	81%	80%	81%	75%	84%	88%	86%	83%	74%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	7	n/a	5	n/a	4	n/a	8	n/a	6	n/a

ANCC Gerontology NP Certification Exam or AANPCP Gerontology NP Certification Exam	100%	86% (ANCC)	100%	96% (ANCC)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	2	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
American Midwifery Certification Board (AMCB) Nurse Midwifery Certification Exam	100%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	100%	92%	100%	92%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	7	n/a	8	n/a	8	n/a	7	n/a	7	n/a
Commission on Nurse Certification (CNC) Clinical Nurse Leader Certification Exam	100%	70%	n/a	75%	100%	75%	100%	92%	n/a	65%
<i>Number of MU students participating</i>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a

* **In 2013-14, the ANCC exams for both the Adult Primary Care NP and the Adult Acute Care NP were changed to incorporate more gerontology (older adult) content and the names of the certification exam were changed to reflect this. So the new name of the ANCC primary care NP exam is (*) Adult Gerontology Primary Care NP Certification Exam, and the ANCC acute care NP exam is now (*) Adult Gerontology Acute Care NP Certification Exam. All the (*) students listed in 2013-14 took the (*) exams, whereas students in prior years took the former (unasterisked) exam.

*** Numbers on the ASHA website do not represent “first time pass rates”. Rather they include all test administrations for a given interval.

III. Institutional Undergraduate Learning Outcomes Assessment

Marquette has defined six Institutional Undergraduate Learning Outcomes (IULOs):

1. Pursue an integration of knowledge into a comprehensive, transcendent vision of life.
2. Apply the knowledge and skills of an academic discipline, program, or profession to a career or graduate study.
3. Utilize critical thinking and reflection to effect positive change in themselves, others and their communities.
4. Communicate in modes appropriate to various subjects and diverse audiences.
5. Exercise just, responsible and competent leadership in professional, intellectual, and social contexts.
6. Act for social justice within the diverse global human family.

Assessment of these outcomes relies on student self-reports, primarily through the annual Graduating Senior Survey (GSS), and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE is administered every three years. The most recent administration was in Spring, 2016; results are expected in August.

Student responses to relevant items on the GSS are used to assess both core and institutional outcomes. The first set of items in Table 3 includes student self-assessment on progress in achieving knowledge area outcomes. The second set relates to IULO assessment.

Table 3: 2015 Graduating Senior Survey

How much did your Marquette education contribute to your ability to: (n=790)	A great deal	Somewhat	A little	Not at all
Write clearly and logically	53%	37%	9%	1%
Analyze quantitative information	55%	35%	8%	1%
Appropriately use the technology and tools of your field	56%	34%	8%	2%
Locate, evaluate and effectively use research and information resources	50%	38%	11%	1%
Give effective oral presentations	48%	40%	10%	2%
Use knowledge from the social sciences to understand individual and social behavior	46%	37%	14%	3%
Use scientific inquiry to understand problems and evaluate information	45%	36%	16%	3%
Appreciate the value of history in understanding the past and present	31%	39%	25%	6%
Interpret works of literature	28%	38%	27%	6%
Appreciate great works of art, music and drama	21%	32%	31%	17%

Compared to when you entered Marquette, how much have you grown in your ability to: (n=790)	A great deal	Somewhat	A little	Not at all
Assume leadership responsibilities in your professional and community life	69%	24%	6%	1%
Apply what you have learned in class to personal, professional or societal challenges	63%	32%	4%	1%
Take responsibility for your own behavior	72%	22%	5%	2%
Contribute effectively to a group or team	61%	32%	5%	1%
Practice ethical decision-making	60%	32%	6%	2%
Identify your own core beliefs	57%	33%	7%	3%
Recognize injustice in society	59%	29%	9%	2%
Act in accordance with your core beliefs	56%	35%	6%	3%
Understand the value of community involvement and contributing to the greater good	58%	30%	10%	3%
Understand and appreciate different cultures	59%	28%	11%	2%
Exhibit compassion toward others in your actions	53%	36%	9%	3%
Work for a more just society	46%	36%	14%	4%
Align your daily activities with principles of your faith	33%	33%	19%	16%
Cultivate a life of prayer and reflection	25%	26%	25%	25%

Graduating seniors are most likely to credit their Marquette education with contributing to their ability to write, analyze quantitative information, and use technology. They perceive personal growth in many areas, most notably in their abilities to assume leadership responsibilities, apply their learning, take responsibility for their own behavior and contribute effectively to a team.

The Core Curriculum and associated knowledge area learning outcomes, ICLOs and IULO are currently undergoing review and revision, with implementation expected in 2017-18. As a part of that review, learning outcomes will be more closely associated with specific opportunities for students to achieve them, and better measures of results will be developed.

IV. Data Indicators of Student Success

Data indicators for retention, graduation, employment and enrollment in further education are also evaluated for evidence of success.

On average, 90% of freshmen are retained and about 80% of an entering cohort graduates within 6 years. These rates compare very favorably to other selective universities.

Table 4: Fall to subsequent fall retention rates of cohorts

	2010 to 2011	2011 to 2012	2012 to 2013	2013 to 2014	2014 to 2015
Percent retained	90%	88%	91%	89%	90%
Initial cohort	1,928	2,056	1,927	1,989	1,989
Number retained	1,731	1,809	1,748	1,763	1,790

Table 5: Graduation rates of entering freshmen cohorts

Cohort	Size	Total Percentage Graduating Within:		
		4 years	5 years	6 years
2003	1,882	59.8%	78.7%	79.9%
2004	1,802	62.0%	79.8%	81.0%
2005	1,775	61.0%	80.2%	81.4%
2006	1,842	59.5%	78.4%	80.2%
2007	1,811	57.3%	76.8%	78.2%
2008	1,950	59.0%	77.4%	79.3%
2009	1,946	53.8%	78.4%	79.7%

IULO #2 addresses the ability to apply discipline knowledge to a career or to graduate study. Achievement of this outcome is verified in part by employment data, and information indicating successful admission to and completion of graduate programs.

The 2015 Undergraduate Post-Graduation Outcomes Survey reports that six months following graduation, 57% are employed full time; 24% are enrolled in graduate or professional school full-time; 3% are engaged in full-time post-graduation service, such as the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps or the Jesuit Volunteer Corps; 2% are in the activity military; 8% are still seeking employment; and 6% report another activity or are not seeking employment.

Follow-up information from the Student Clearinghouse verifies that after one year, 26% of baccalaureate recipients have enrolled at a four-year college or university. After eight years, about 49% of a given graduation cohort will have pursued additional postsecondary education, and 39% will have graduated with another degree.

Assessment Office

June, 2016