Academic Year 2019-2020 BDP Outcome Analysis: Summary Findings and Conclusions

BDP Outcomes Assessed = Integrative Thinking, Metacognitive Thinking, Information Literacy

We used rubrics this year that measured student performance according to the level of sophistication they demonstrated in achievement of each trait of the three Baccalaureate Degree Profile (BDP) outcomes we assessed. BDP outcomes specify what students are expected to achieve at the time they receive their baccalaureate degrees. Admittedly, the proportion of artifacts from 300/400 level courses in our sample was small this year, with only 15 artifacts aligning to *Information Literacy*, 14 to *Integrative Thinking*, and 30 to *Metacognitive Thinking*. However, we were pleased that 70% of students who submitted artifacts from 300/400 level courses received overall scores of 2.5 or higher in *Information Literacy*, with 38% receiving scores of 3.5 or 4.0. Although not as high, 53% and 45% of students who submitted artifacts from 300/400 level courses received overall scores of 2.5 or higher on *Metacognitive* and *Integrative Thinking*, respectively.   A score of 2.5 indicates that at least one rater assigned a score of Level 3 to the artifact, a score of 3 indicates that both raters assigned a score of Level 3.0, a score of 3.5 indicates that at least one rater assigned a score of Level 4, and a score of 4.0 indicates that both raters assigned a score of Level 4.

When examining mean performance across all artifacts, we noted that, for *Information Literacy,* assumptions and biases emerged as a relative weakness (*mean* = 1.42; *n* = 67) among the traits of this outcome. Only 14% of the 67 artifacts received scores between 2.5 and 4.0 (as compared to 78% for relevance of sources, 71% for integration of information, and 53% for citation).   For *Integrative Thinking*, we noted little variation among means scores, which ranged from 1.85 for relation among domains of thinking to 2.09 for transfer. Likewise, for *Metacognitive Thinking* (which had only two traits), mean scores were 1.85 for project management and 2.09 for self-evaluation.

Although most of the *Integrative Thinking* artifacts were drawn from 100/200 level courses, we argue that there is room to improve performance, especially given the emphasis placed on this outcome in Marshall's CT courses. We also note that the rubric level descriptions we used this assessment cycle may have been too general, and suggest studying the AAC&U's rubric for *Integrative Learning* to see if it might better capture student performance on this outcome.

For *Metacognitive Thinking*, two large categories of artifacts were included in this year's analysis. The first was a group of 40 artifacts from FYS that aligned to at least one trait (26 aligned to project management and 30 aligned to self-evaluation) and the second was a group of 22 artifacts from capstone courses aligned to both traits. While mean scores for capstone artifacts were significantly higher than those of FYS for project management (2.20 for capstone as compared to 1.60 for FYS), the mean difference for self-evaluation (2.11 for capstone and 1.88 for FYS) did not differ significantly.   We suggest there is room for improvement on this outcome for students about to graduate from Marshall University. We recommend that more emphasis be placed on these skills throughout the Marshall curriculum.

The Office of Assessment and Quality Initiatives is currently examining the mapping of degree program outcomes to traits of the BDP. We will continue to work with programs that have not yet completed this analysis.

Access full report at this link https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/files/2020/06/BDP-Outcomes-Assessment-2020.pdf