

Assessment of General Education Goal 8.1: Humanities
 Results of the rating of artifacts from May 2009
 Josh Welker
 Institutional Researcher
 November 6, 2009

General Education Goal 8: Demonstrate awareness of humanities and fine arts.
 Outcome 8.1: Demonstrate awareness of humanities.

Four teams of two faculty readers scored the artifacts based on four categories: ability to follow instructions, presentation of appropriate information, grammar, and use of own words. The readers scored each category on a scale from 1-3 (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and good, respectively).

The artifacts scored included two components for a total of 82 artifacts. Students responded to an event related to the humanities, a work of art, a speaker’s presentation about an area of humanities, or a section from the text for component one. The response was supposed to reflect the students’ appreciation, like or dislike and specify why. Component one contained 37 artifacts.

For component two, students demonstrated basic technical understanding of a particular area, era, or person involved in the arts or humanities by using correct evaluative terminology or by describing accurately the historical development of one of the individuals or one of the areas of humanities. Component two contained 45 artifacts.

The ratings for the artifacts in component one are shown in Table 1. A measure of inter-rater reliability was computed in Table 2. This measure shows the percentage that each reader and his/her partner scored artifacts the same (Agree), one point apart (Differ by 1), and two points apart (Differ by 2).

Table 1
 Component One Artifact Scores, n=37

	Inst	App	Gram	Own
1	3%	13%	19%	3%
2	54%	57%	62%	81%
3	43%	30%	19%	16%
Mean	2.41	2.16	2.00	2.14

Table 2
 Component One Inter-Rater Reliability, n=37

	Inst	App	Gram	Own
Agree	70%	59%	62%	65%
Differ by 1	27%	38%	35%	30%
Differ by 2	3%	3%	3%	5%

The scoring results and inter-rater reliability for component two can be seen in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3
Component Two Artifact Scores, n=45

	Inst	App	Gram	Own
1	2%	0%	9%	0%
2	36%	53%	60%	60%
3	62%	47%	31%	40%
Mean	2.60	2.47	2.22	2.40

Table 4
Component Two Inter-Rater Reliability, n=45

	Inst	App	Gram	Own
Agree	73%	64%	64%	71%
Differ by 1	27%	36%	36%	29%
Differ by 2	0%	0%	0%	0%

An independent-samples t-test was used to compare the results of component one to component two – were the ratings of component one consistent with the ratings of component two? The results showed that the use of own words and presentation of appropriate information categories differed from component one to component two. In both cases these categories had higher scores on average in component two. The remaining two categories showed no statistical differences in ratings.

A similar independent-samples t-test was used to compare the consistency of the scoring of component one to component two. These results showed no difference in the consistency, or inter-rater reliability, between the two components.

To summarize, students scored reasonably high in all categories for both component one and component two. Students showed the highest scores in the ability to follow instructions category with mean scores of 2.41 and 2.60 out of three in component one and component two, respectively. The lowest scores were in the grammar category. The mean grammar scores were 2.00 and 2.22 out of three for component one and component two, respectively.

An independent-samples t-test showed that the results of component one were statistically similar in rating for the ability to follow instructions and use of own words categories. However, the ratings for the presentation of appropriate information and grammar categories were higher for component two than component one.

The inter-rater reliability for both component one and component two showed statistically similar results. These results also show similar inter-rater reliability ratings as past assessments. These inter-rater reliability ratings should be considered adequate.

Both components were also analyzed with the corresponding student demographic sheets. This analysis looked for student demographics that affected the artifact ratings. The following demographic factors were considered: number of semesters at JWCC, number of credit hours currently enrolled in, age, gender, course delivery method, language, number of hours per week spent at work, total credit hours earned, previous enrollment in a humanities course, mother's education, father's education, siblings' education (where applicable), marital status (with dependents or not), and if the student transferred from another college.

For this analysis, components one and two were considered together. Most demographic factors had no affect on how the students scored. Also, analysis wasn't useful for a few demographic factors, such as language, due to the fact that most of the students fell into one category. Only three demographic factors were found that affected artifact ratings.

The data showed that the number of semesters the student had completed affected the student's score for the grammar category (see Graph 1). Also, total hours earned and if the student had previously taken a humanities course affected the student's grammar rating. Students who had completed 48 or more credit hours had a mean grammar score of 2.41 (n=17). Students who had completed less than 6 hours had a mean grammar score of 1.75 (n=16). Similarly, student who had previously taken a humanities course had an average grammar score of 2.39 (n=18), whereas students who had not had a humanities course had an average score 2.00 (n=44). Students who transferred to JWCC from another college also showed statistically different scores in the grammar, as well as ability to follow instructions, categories. Students that transferred to JWCC had mean grammar and instruction scores of 1.88 and 2.13 (n=8), respectively. Students that had not transferred to JWCC had average grammar and instruction scores of 2.14 and 2.55 (n=55), respectively.

Graph 1

