ASSESMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT

2013-2014 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.

PROCUEDURES AND ISSUES ADDRESSED BY THE ASSESSMENT COMMMITTEE AY2013-14

I. Assessment Report Deadlines

Upcoming Deadlines for Schools to submit Assessment Reports

The Assessment Reports from programs in the School of Social Sciences and the School of Business are due November 1, 2014. Every major in the School is expected to provide an assessment report. For your programs, the next two reports are due on the 1st of November in 2014 and 2019.
For the 2013-2014 academic year, the School of Social Sciences and the Paul Merage School of Business are scheduled to conduct program assessments, with program reports due by November 1, 2014 in conjunction with the deadline for submitting departmental self-studies for the external review.

The Assessment Committee has asked each of the program majors housed in Social Sciences and Business majors to assess at least one of their learning outcomes, in addition to prior feedback on assessment reports provided by the Assessment Committee. Program Assessment Reports are expected to address and show evidence of how previous assessment work findings have been used to improve student learning. Programs are expected to describe their assessment evidence review process (learning outcome(s) assessment, faculty involvement, use of scoring guide (see Appendix A), the actual findings of the assessment, how the faculty in the program anticipate improving upon these findings.

Assessment Scoring Guide

The Assessment Committee retooled its scoring system for program Assessment Reports to improve reliability and validity (See Appendix A for updated scoring guide). AC is making plans to institute another assessment reporting step that has programs provide a report or update on how or whether the feedback was implemented. Although this information could be included in the five-year AC reports, if units do not use feedback, five years will have passed without the unit making progress in establishing correct assessment measures and tools.

Program Assessment Reports that were evaluated by AC during AY2013-2014

1. BA in Drama
2. BA in Music
3. BA in Dance
4. BA in Art
5. BS in Public Health
6. BS in Nursing
7. BS in Pharmaceutical Sciences

II. REVIEW OF GENERAL EDUCATION CATEGORIES

Schedule

Past: 2010-12: Policy Committee reviews courses in Categories V, VII and VIII. Conduct pilot student survey for Category VII
Year 0, 2012-13: Education phase, as previously discussed, and Policy Committee reviews courses in Cats II and VI
Year 1, 2013-14: Education phase continues. The Subcommittee on Policy will conduct its review of GE Categories III and IV to complete the multi-year GE review process. WASC wanted the Assessment Committee to hold off with beginning the Assessment cycle of GE review until after Policy had finished its reviews. GE I (Writing) is reviewed by CEP and WAG.
Year 2, 2014-15: Assessment of GE Categories II and III
Year 3, 2015-16: Assessment of GE Categories IV and VI
Year 4, 2016-17: Assessment of GE Categories Va and Vb
Year 5, 2017-18: Assessment of GE 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.

GE Assessment AY 2014-2015: Assessment of GE II (Science and Technology) and GE III (Social Sciences) will begin Fall, 2014.

AC members will ask instructors of GE II and GE III courses for assignment, quiz or exam questions that test for GE II or III course specific learning outcomes. Student grades for these particular questions (whatever the question type – essay, paragraph, multiple choice etc.) will be used as tools to determine whether GE course learning outcome was met by students. AC will not assess student work to determine whether course learning outcomes are being met. AC may ask for a memo from the instructor when the course is finished with his or view on degree to which entire class was able to meet course learning outcomes.

IV. Carry Forward Issues

1. AC will continue to evaluate charges put forth by WASC
2. GE II and III will be evaluated

3. AC will continue notify departments of any changes to Assessment Reporting schedules

Voting Members of the Assessment Committee:

Fillmore Freeman, CEP and Vice Chair (Physical Sciences)

Rudi Berkelhamer, Biological Sciences

Monica Majoli, Arts

Bonnie Nardi, ICS

Martin Huang, Humanities

Valerie Olson, Social Sciences

Christopher Schwarz, Business

Larry Jamner, Social Ecology

Lisa Grant Ludwig, Public Health

Alison Holman, Nursing Science

Ex Officio

Venette Van Duyn, Assessment Coordinator

Academic Senate

Michelle AuCoin, Academic Senate Principal Analyst

APPENDIX A

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Type of Evidence Collected	The program has not specified which learning outcome was assessed <u>and/or</u> the program relies heavily on indirect evidence of student learning.	Program has attempted to collect some direct evidence of student learning for one or more of its learning outcomes.	The program identifies when and how each outcome was assessed. Program assesses direct evidence of student learning. Program demonstrates a clear effort at using valid and reliable assessment methods.	The program has a fully articulated, sustainable assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome was assessed. Assessment methods use direct evidence of student learning and are valid and reliable (e.g. have adequate sample size, minimize scoring errors and biases, are tied to a curriculum map, etc.).
Faculty Involvement	Minimal faculty participation and/or it is unclear which faculty were responsible for the implementation of the assessment plan.	Program is inconsistently implementing assessment plans. Lack of widespread faculty involvement and consensus on defining expectations for student learning.	Relevant faculty regularly participate in implementing assessment plans. Efforts are made to achieve consensus on defining expectations for student learning.	Relevant faculty consistently participate in implementing assessment plans. There is formal oversight for the assessment of the program. Program has consensus in expectations of student learning.
Use of Systematic Criteria for Assessment of Student Work	It is not clear that valid evidence for each outcome was collected <u>and/or</u> individual faculty use	Appropriate evidence is collected and faculty have discussed relevant criteria for	Appropriate evidence is collected and faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics, systematic	Assessment criteria, such as rubrics, systematic qualitative analysis, or other scoring guides, have been pilot-tested and refined over time. Faculty have identified examples of student performance at varying levels for each outcome.

idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work.	assessing each outcome.	qualitative analysis, or other scoring guides, to assess attainment of each outcome.	Reviewers of student work are calibrated, and faculty routinely check for and find high reliability (e.g. inter-rater or internal consistency, etc).

Evidence Review Process:

Findings:

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Presentation of Findings	Minimal and/or unclear discussion of assessment findings.	Findings are described, but may lack sufficient detail to lead to decision-making discussions.	Findings are clearly described and sensible to an external audience. Findings are summarized to facilitate areas for further discussion and review.	Findings are clearly described and sensible to an external audience. Findings are presented in ways consistent with the needs, style, and culture of the program. Findings are summarized to facilitate decision-making discussions.
Standard for Performance/Benchmark Established	No standard for performance/benchmark established.	The program has set a benchmark, but has not described the rationale for setting that particular standard.	The program uses some form of comparative data, such as previous findings, external criteria, or aspirational goals.	Clear benchmarks based on previous findings, external criteria, or aspirational goals are established. Faculty take comparative data into account when interpreting results and deciding on changes to improve learning.

Use of Findings:

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Action Plan for Improving Student Learning	Little or no collective use by faculty of assessment findings. The program has not described any plans <u>and/or</u> undertaken any meaningful actions to improve student learning.	Results for outcomes are collected and discussed by relevant faculty. Action plans are in place but no actions have been taken <u>and/or</u> results have been used only occasionally to improve the program.	Results for outcomes are collected, discussed by relevant faculty and others, and regularly used to improve the program.	Relevant faculty routinely discuss results, plan improvements, secure necessary resources, and implement changes. They may collaborate with others to improve the program.
Prior Action Plans Evaluated	The program has not addressed previous feedback by the Assessment Committee <u>and/or</u> has not evaluated previous actions taken to improve student learning.	Program addresses feedback from Assessment Committee. Minimal or no evaluation of previous actions taken to improve student learning.	Program addresses feedback from Assessment Committee and monitors prior changes implemented.	The program addresses feedback from Assessment Committee and performs ongoing follow-up studies to confirm that changes have improved student learning.

☐ Student Learning Outcomes Revised

☐ Curriculum Map Revised

*Partially adapted from Western Association of Schools and Colleges Assessment Rubrics