Annual Assessment Report 2020-2021

Interdisciplinary General Education

Interdisciplinary General Education

College of Education and Integrative Studies

CONTACT
Name of Program Assessment Lead Dennis Quinn
Name of Person Completing Report Kenneth Stahl

DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION No

DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)
  o   We do not have disciplinary accreditation but drew from our disciplinary/professional organizations, and developed our SLOs as a program/department.

Other than the CPP Catalog and the Office of Assessment and Program Review website, where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.
- Department Website - provide URL:_____
- Student Handbook - provide URL: _____
- Course Syllabi
- Brochures or other printed material

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2020-2021

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2020-2021.** This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?

- 8

How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2020-2021?

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2020-2021.

Please list the SLOs examined

- SLO #1: Students will write effectively to various audiences in various contexts

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 1: Students will write effectively to various audiences in various contexts

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)		
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning	• Assignment/paper/exam as part of regular coursework	• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
15	Percentage at a certain level	Yes	The rubric included 4 categories of evaluation: Purpose for Writing; Organization and Development; Evidence and Sources; and Grammar and Mechanics. Each category was worth 3 points, to correspond to I, D, and M. What is interesting, if not exactly eye-opening, is that the students did consistently best with categories 1 and 4. Perhaps their overall success with the first category can in part be attributed to the topics (or rather a choice of topics) were included in the assignment. Thus, the purpose for writing was in a way built-in to each essay. Nonetheless, the most successful were quite personally engaged to the chosen topic, and made the purpose their own. As for the fourth category, we hoped that we would see few problems, and were relieved. We hoped that with as much writing as IGE requires, third-year students would exhibit few issues. There was more variation among the scores for categories 2 and 3. We were not too surprised by this, but it was somewhat eye-opening to be able to see the scores all together in one place, demonstrating that we do have some work to do regarding those categories. The most consistent issue with Category 3, Evidence and Sources, was the lack of seamless transitions between the quoted material and the student's prose, as well as explicit demonstrations of the relevance of the quoted or paraphrased material to the point(s) the student was making in the paragraph. This is not an uncommon problem even among third- and fourth-year students. Still, we want our students to do better.

IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2020-2021? Select all that apply.
- Use is pending (typical reasons: insufficient number of students in population, evidence not evaluated or interpreted yet, faculty discussions are ongoing, etc.)

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2020-2021? Select all that apply.
- A committee of program/department faculty
- Program/department assessment committee

The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2020-2021 so that others may learn from your experiences.

Surprisingly, we did not see much evidence of the problems posed to students by the year reflected in the quality of the writing. I can speak more specifically about the challenges posed to the faculty, and not just by the pandemic. Mainly, the issues were time and personnel. The pandemic certainly contributed to the work overload and the life-juggling issues responsible for the lack of time, The course in which the assignment was assessed is a spring course, and the essay due date was in April. Thus, even under ordinary circumstances we would not have had much time for the evaluation. Further, two of our four tenure-line faculty began maternity leaves almost at the same time toward the end of the semester. That left the remaining three faculty who have service obligations to carry all the service of the department. We were certainly joyous for our colleagues on maternity leave. It just meant that we simply did not have the time or personnel to complete the evaluation and close the loop before the end of the semester. One of our colleagues just returned and the other is still out. Our group conversations haven't really begun. This explains my responses to the previous questions about post-evaluation activities, such as suggestions for intervention and closing the loop. We do have some ideas but we haven't been able to discuss them as a group yet.

CPP's GI2025 goals focus on eliminating equity gaps. What plans do you already implement, or would implement to support the campus' diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts? (e.g., planned or current disaggregation of assessment data by race/ethnicity, etc.)

Partly because of what I explain above we have only just begun to address this. Also a factor is that the assessment I describe in this report is our first SLO assessed in semesters. Thus, we have little assessment data to evaluate. That, in turn, as I have explained in previous assessment reports is because IGE is a cohort program. The cohort that began IGE in the first fall of semesters in 2018 advanced to the class in which SLO #1 is assessed last spring. From that point on, IGE will gradually acquire more assessment data. IGE is not a degree-granting program (why I responded that IGE does not have a disciplinary credential) but we can nonetheless contribute to the 2025 goal. Qualitatively we believe that we are, but we need the assessment data to support that qualitative judgment.

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found <u>here</u>. To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

Assessment Plan Yes

Curriculum Matrix Yes