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Overview

- GE assessment: A challenge
- GE Faculty Learning Community: Our solution
- Faculty perspectives
- Small group exercise
Institutional Context: Assessment

- Area for improvement per 2012 WSCUC reaccreditation
- Faculty skepticism about assessment
- The beginning of a culture of assessment on campus
Institutional Context: GE

- Over 500 GE course in multiple disciplines “on the books”; In Fall 2017:
  - 367 GE courses or 1,796 sections
  - 27,086 students or 13,425 FTES

- A large percentage taught by part-time faculty

- Diverse opinions about GE goals:
  
  Started with 265 GE Learning Goals  
  Concluded with 5 GE Learning Goals in 2015
Institutional Context: **CSU**

- **EO 1100**: Requires GE assessment

### 6.2.5 General Education Review and Assessment

In accordance with WASC Senior College and University Commission accreditation requirements, campuses shall:

- Develop an assessment plan that: (1) aligns the GE curriculum with campus GE outcomes; (2) specifies explicit criteria for assessing the stated outcomes; (3) identifies when and how each outcome shall be assessed; (4) organizes and analyzes the collection of evidence; (5) and uses the assessment results to make improvements to the GE program, courses and pedagogy.

- Provide for regular periodic reviews of GE program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should include a statement of the Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the campus GE program and the ongoing assessment of GE student learning outcomes.
Institutional Context: **Initial Attempt**

- **GE curriculum mapping**: Courses — Learning Goals
- Active involvement of the **GE faculty senate**
- Direct assessment: Four courses using **embedded assignment**
- Indirect assessment: Student **survey**

**Mixed Results**
What do you think?

In order to develop a successful GE assessment model, what **critical features** does it need to have?
Our Solution:
GE Faculty Learning Community
A Year-long Working Group

1. Oct. Assignment review and revision
2. Nov. Rubric development
3. Dec. Rubric calibration
4. Jan. Course-level instructor training
5. Spring Data collection
   - Faculty: Assignment
   - Student: Survey

Summer Data analysis & Closing the loop

Faculty Learning Community
Participants from 2016-2017

• **15** courses from 8 colleges out of 224 upper-division GE courses offered in Spring 2017

• **42** faculty:
  • 15 course coordinators/leads
  • 27 instructors
  • 3 instructors declined to participate

• **2,251** students

GE Learning Goal of focus:
CRITICAL THINKING
## Comparable Assignment Common Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A INFORMATION ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>No communication of information from sources. The use of information is inconsistent or inappropriate so the intended purpose is not achieved.</td>
<td>Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not well synthesized.</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved, but would benefit from improved clarity.</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose with exceptional clarity.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B SOURCE SELECTION</td>
<td>Information taken from questionable and/or irrelevant sources.</td>
<td>Information taken from somewhat adequate and reasonable sources.</td>
<td>Information taken from adequate and reasonable sources.</td>
<td>Information taken from high quality and relevant sources.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ARTICULATION PROCESS</td>
<td>Poor evaluation or interpretation of the information.</td>
<td>Limited evaluation or interpretation of the information.</td>
<td>Proficient evaluation or interpretation of the information.</td>
<td>Sophisticated evaluation or interpretation of the information.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D VALIDITY AND RELEVANCE OF ARGUMENT/CONCLUSION</td>
<td>Arguments are unsupported or irrelevant (to the assignment). Conclusions are unsupported, non-existent, or unrelated to the information presented.</td>
<td>Arguments are weakly supported. Conclusions are somewhat logical, but incomplete, flawed or irrelevant.</td>
<td>Arguments are relevant (to the assignment) and supported for relevant patterns to emerge. Conclusions adequately follow from the information presented.</td>
<td>Arguments are relevant (to the assignment) and highly supported in a sophisticated manner allowing for important patterns to emerge. Innovative conclusions follow from the information presented.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E CREATIVE APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>No application of prior learning or existing knowledge to a new context</td>
<td>Limited or simplistic application of prior learning or existing knowledge to a new context</td>
<td>Appropriate application of prior learning or existing knowledge to a new context</td>
<td>Thoughtful or innovative application of prior learning or existing knowledge to a new context that reflects integration and synthesis of information, and complexity of the issue.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Assignment scores

Percentage of scores

- Info organization: 7.5% Below Basic, 19.1% Basic, 29.9% Proficient, 43.5% Advanced
- Source selection: 5.3% Below Basic, 16.7% Basic, 30.1% Proficient, 48.0% Advanced
- Articulation: 6.7% Below Basic, 22.1% Basic, 33.0% Proficient, 38.2% Advanced
- Validity & Relevance: 6.2% Below Basic, 23.6% Basic, 32.6% Proficient, 37.6% Advanced
- Knowledge application: 7.9% Below Basic, 17.5% Basic, 31.7% Proficient, 42.9% Advanced
Results: Student survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info organization</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source selection</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity &amp; Relevance</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge application</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of ratings

57% response rate
“Closing the loop”: Faculty recommendations

• Get baseline data in lower division GE courses

• Incorporate the rubric criteria into GE requirements

• Refine assessment process (e.g. timing of assignment; online vs. F2F)
Faculty reflection

What worked well:
- Collegiality
- Collaboration
- Diversity/Cross-discipline
- Open discussion
- Engaged/Vested
- Food

What was challenging:
- Involve/train other instructors
- Alignment b/w assignment & rubric

Cost: $10,000 - 15,000 per year
Insights from Participating Faculty: Part-time Faculty

• **Challenges:**
  • Not knowing the rules and policies as a part-timer
  • Not used to be heard by full-time faculty
  • Training fellow faculties

• **Achievements:**
  • Part of “the big league”
  • Involvement in more department activities
  • Heard my voice and became more involved in assessment
Insights from Participating Faculty: Tenured Faculty

• **Challenges:**
  • Getting acceptance
  • Getting a sincere commitment
  • Stealing time

• **Advice:**
  • Be both informed and empathetic in recruiting fellow colleagues
  • Be flexible in the embedded assignment
  • Be focused in assessment exercise
Small Group Brainstorm

How would you adapt this model of GE assessment on your campus?

What challenges would you encounter? How would you resolve them?
Thank you!

Contact: data@fullerton.edu