

**ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE****ANNUAL REPORT****2011-2012 Academic Year****CEP Assessment Subcommittee**

The responsibilities of the Assessment Committee are to:

1. Provide guidance on all matters related to student learning assessment, including policy development around assessment of student learning at the classroom, course, program, general education, and institutional levels.
2. Provide counsel to departments, schools, and Academic Senate committees on matters relating to student learning assessment. Review program assessment plans and reports and make recommendations to improve student learning. Prepare periodic reports on the status of student learning assessment within academic programs.
3. Make recommendations to CEP regarding the assessment of the general education program, including recommendations based on the review of general education courses and categories.
  - a. Develop and maintain guidelines and procedures for both periodic comprehensive assessment and continual ongoing assessment of learning outcomes for each general education category.
  - b. Evaluate the results of these assessments and make recommendations to CEP based on these results.
4. Monitor the University's progress in implementing its assessment plans, including those resulting from regional reaccreditation review, and promote the use of assessment results in planning activities.

**I. Program Related Actions*****A. Assessing Student Learning Outcomes in the Major***

During AY2011-2012, the Assessment Committee (AC) reviewed assessment reports from nearly all UCI departments. AC evaluated how well departments measured student learning outcomes for UCI's some 80 undergraduate majors.

**Guidelines for assessing SLOs in the major:** Assessment Committee members were referred to guidelines for assessing Assessment reports. Guidelines stated that departments needed to articulate outcomes of student learning, gather evidence about how well students are achieving the outcomes, evaluate evidence, interpret findings, and then use the findings for programmatic and curricular improvements.

Reports were grouped based on whether they were good, good enough, or in need of improvement. Most of the reports were good. About six were in need of improvement.

**“Grading” of departmental assessment reports:** The assessment reports were all considered “in process” in that they are not as refined as they will be in coming years. Many departments are not yet sure about what they will do with learning outcome findings. Reviewers of reports tried to determine whether departments have thought about the process and have gone through the steps of thinking about how they will identify and measure learning outcomes and then revise curriculums based on learning outcome findings. Reviewers did not evaluate validity and reliability in measuring learning outcomes.

**Timeline for departmental assessment reports:** The Assessment Committee also integrated Assessment Reporting from departments with the Academic Program Review of Schools and their departments. AC harmonized the ten year APRB review cycle with the Assessment Committee’s five year cycle. Departments will now be required to submit assessment reports as part of their APRB review.

### ***B. Assessment of General Education Learning Outcomes***

**WASC’s Charge:** The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) would also like UCI to assess General Education learning outcomes. The Council on Educational Policy (CEP) charged that its subcommittee, the Assessment Committee, would function as the faculty senate body to oversee assessment as UCI. One goal for the Assessment Committee is to determine how learning outcomes can be identified, assessed and measured. The GE assessment would entail finding methods to assess how well students and faculty believe learning outcomes are being met in courses with a GE component.

The Assessment Committee reviews one or two GE outcomes a year. The review of the GE outcomes must align with WASC requirements (which is to have some sort of GE review in place) but the methods and timeline for assessing GE are determined by the Assessment Committee.

**GE VII and VIII:** This year AC was charged with assessing GE VII student learning outcomes. GE Category VII (multicultural issues) “develops students’ awareness and appreciation of the history, society, and/or culture of one or more underrepresented groups in California and the United states.” GE VIII (international and global issues) focuses on significant cultural, economic, geographical, historical, political, and/or sociological aspects of one or more countries other than the United States.

**GE Survey:** The Assessment Committee conducted a EEE survey to determine what students believed they had learned in a GE VII or GE VIII course during fall quarter, 2011. The survey was done to help determine how well students were meeting GE VII and VIII Student Learning Outcomes. The response rate for the survey was 34% (370/1137). Half of the responders reported more knowledge or understanding of the SLOs than before they had taken the course; the other half reported no change.

AC members discussed whether the survey should be continued. Members generally agreed that the survey content is somewhat valuable for determining whether students thought GE SLOs were met after the course, which is the AC's mandate. So, the survey will continue.

**Other Review of GE SLOs:** Other aspects of GE assessment besides the survey will include reviewing course assignments in GE courses. For now, AC will not directly evaluate student work from GE courses. For future GE assessment, AC will also convene faculty who are teaching the GE being reviewed for guidance writing survey questions.

***Timeline for GE Assessment by the Assessment Committee***

The Assessment Committee voted in favor of the proposed schedule for GE Assessment:

Past: 2010-12: Policy Committee reviews courses in Categories V, VII and VIII. Conduct pilot student survey for Category VII

Years 0, 2012-14: Education phase, as previously discussed, and Policy Committee reviews courses in Cats II and VI

Year 1, 2014-15: Assessment of Category II, and Policy Committee reviews courses in Cats III and IV

Year 2, 2015-16: Assessment of Category III

Year 3, 2016-17: Assessment of Category IV

Year 4, 2017-18: Assessment of Category V

Year 5, 2018-19: Assessment of Categories VII and VIII

Years 6 to 10, 11 to 15, etc.: Repeat reviews in same cycle as above, so each category is reviewed every 5 years.

Detailed plan for the reviews - in the year a category is being reviewed, the following will happen (for both categories when VII and VIII have their year):

*Late summer, Nov and Feb:* Send an email/letter to all instructors who will be teaching a course in the GE category in the upcoming quarter, reminding them of the GE course-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) and asking that they include them in the syllabus.

*Late summer:* Choose a stratified random sample of upcoming Fall courses in the category. Contact instructors for those courses. Tell them they will be asked to identify an assignment that assesses the SLOs, and that they will be asked to provide us with a copy of that assignment as well as a report on how students did on it relative to meeting the SLOs.

*Early in Fall Quarter:* Convene a small (3 to 4 people) ad hoc committee of faculty (Senate members) who teach in the GE category to be reviewed. They have two jobs,

both of which will be done in consultation with the Assessment Committee (AC): (1) During Fall Quarter, construct the student survey\* that will be administered in Winter Quarter, to all (or a random sample of?) students who took a course in that GE category in the Fall quarter, and (2) During Winter Quarter, assist the AC to review the assignments turned in by the random sample of instructors, to make sure they adequately assess the SLOs.

*End of Fall Quarter/early Winter Quarter:* Receive reports from the random sample of instructors who were identified to submit assignments and results

*Winter Quarter:* Review the reports from the random sample of instructors who submitted assignments, and prepare a report on the results.

*Winter Quarter:* Administer the student survey

*Spring Quarter:* Prepare a report on the results of the student survey, and prepare a general report on the outcomes of the two kinds of assessment for the category. Recommend any needed changes in SLOs and/or delivery of courses for the category.

### III. Carry Forward Issues

1. AC will finalize decision to implement stratified random sampling of GE courses by school and class size and assignments as part of its GE review: each fall, AC members will sample 5% of a GE category each year or a minimum of 10 GE courses in that year's category. Once GE courses have been identified, AC will ask the instructor to provide assignment or questions to first five or ten students on the roster. One looming question raised is: Should AC compare SLOs in the GE category for the same courses that are being taught by different instructors.
2. AC will follow the guidelines to educate faculty on future GE review by AC.
3. AC will continue to follow up with departments on Assessment reports on SLOs in the major.

#### Members:

Jessica Utts, CEP and Chair

Rudi Berkelhamer, Biological Sciences

Lisa Naugle, Arts

Daniel Gillen, ICS

Jonathan Alexander, Humanities

Louis Desipio, Social Sciences

Christopher Schwarz, Business

Donna Scheuele, Social Ecology

Lisa Grant Ludwig, Public Health

Alison Holman, Nursing Science

Mahtab Jafari, Pharm Sciences

Phil Collins, Physical Sciences

Alison Holman, Nursing Sciences

Ex Officio

Chris Procello, Assessment Coordinator

Academic Senate

Michelle AuCoin, Academic Senate Principal Analyst