5. Results, Planned Actions, and/or Actions Taken

Preliminary note: Some of the F1 faculty expressed a preference for being informed with greater advance notice that the F1 assessment cycle was approaching. Some faculty collect written hard copy assignments that get thrown away before they realize that they should have held onto those assignments/artifacts.

Scores were generally high, ranging between 3 and 4. Students did especially well with F1.1 Basic Norms, although the different kinds of artifacts provided varying reflections of defining basic-regarding norms (F1.1 and F1.2). For instance, some artifacts were multiple choice in which students simply identified other-regarding norms while other kinds of artifacts asked students to discuss those norms. Both reflected an ability to define them.

Most of the reflection session revolved around F1.4 comparing and contrasting basic theories of moral reasoning by evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. While the artifact did well, case-based assignments seemed to correlate with higher F1.4 scores. Our discussion raised questions about which kinds of cases (short, long, hypothetical, real, personal, 1st-person, 3rd-person) work best in this regard.

Overall, although the scores were very good, we agreed that we must be more intentional in crafting teaching modules in assignments that are specifically tied to the F1 learning outcomes. One suggestion, is that all F1 courses uniformly insert certain questions and assignments that guarantee that artifacts speak to learning outcomes in the most measurable way. This way, we may be able to guarantee that all F1 courses address all the outcomes. With greater intentionality about this we want to teach to these outcomes.