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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 re-accreditation review, and promote the use of assessment results in planning activities.

I. Review of Assessment Reports on Learning Outcomes in the major.
   Each year AC evaluates Assessment Reports from each of the majors in two or three UCI Schools. The review of Assessment Reports is based on specific criteria developed by the Assessment Committee. For AY15-16, majors in the School of Social Ecology and majors in the School of Engineering were scheduled to provide assessment reports to AC. AC received assessment reports from three of the five majors in Social Ecology. Assessment reports from a few of the Engineering majors were received late in the academic year. Actual scores in the evaluation matrix will be provided to AC members in the fall. AC did not receive summaries or scores on the evaluation matrix for the assessment reports from Engineering that were submitted late. This information will be provided to AC in the fall.

II. Upcoming Deadlines for Schools to submit Assessment Reports

The Assessment Reports from majors in the School of Physical Sciences and the School of Information and Computer Sciences are due November 1, 2016. These reports along with assessment reports for the majors in the School of Engineering will be scored by the assessment coordinator.
• B.S. in Aerospace Engineering
• B.S. in Biomedical Engineering/B.S. in Biomedical Engineering for premeds
• B.S. in Chemical Engineering
• B.S. in Civil Engineering
• B.S. in Computer Engineering
• B.S. in Computer Science and Engineering
• B.S. in Engineering
• B.S. in Environmental Engineering
• B.S. in Materials Science Engineering
• B.S. in Mechanical Engineering
• B.S. in Software Engineering
• B.A. in Policy, Planning and Design? (report not submitted this past year in the Social Ecology Assessment Reports dossier)
• B.S. in Chemistry
• B.S. in Earth System Science
• B.S. in Environmental Science
• B.S. in Physics
• B.S. in Applied Physics (new major, may not submit report)
• B.S. in Informatics
• B.S. in Computer Science
• B.S. in Computer Science and Engineering
• B.S. in Software Engineering
• B.S. in Computer Game Science
• B.S. in Data Science (new major, may not submit report)

The Assessment Committee has asked each program listed above to assess at least one of the learning outcomes in the major. Programs have been asked to incorporate prior feedback AC provided for previous assessment report submissions. Assessment Reports are expected to address and show evidence of how previous assessment work findings have been used to improve student learning, to describe the process for reviewing previous assessment evidence and the role of the faculty.

III. GE Assessment AY 2015-2016: Assessment of GE IV (Arts and Humanities) and GE VI (Social and Behavioral Sciences)

Review materials from GE IV and VI instructors were requested by the assessment coordinator in April. The deadline for instructors to submit materials (i.e., GE assessment reports) was June 16, 2016. Instructors teaching GE IV and VI courses during spring quarter, 2016 were contacted early in the quarter and were provided with instructions on the GE assessment process. Specifically, instructors were asked to review whether the learning outcomes in the category by students. GE IV instructors were asked to review the GE IV course learning outcomes:

After completing a Category IV GE course, successful students will be able to do three of the following:
1. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how different forms of art engage multiple sensory experiences.
2. Communicate a recognition and understanding of diverse forms of expression across the globe, past and present.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the research and creative methods used in the construction of knowledge in the arts and humanities.
4. Demonstrate a critical recognition of the historical and philosophical approaches to the formation of culture, including the impact of technology on aesthetic experience.
5. Identify how different theories and practices, over time, shape our interpretation of cultural and creative expression.

and the GE VI instructors were asked to review the GE VI course learning outcomes:

After completing this General Education requirement, successful students should be able to do the following:
1. Demonstrate competency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening in a non-English language.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of another (non-English speaking) culture through its language.
3. Demonstrate an understanding of one's own language through the investigation of another, non-English linguistic system.

Instructors were told the assessment of the course learning outcomes is not the same as a review of the final grades. Rather, instructors are expected to identify assignments, activities, exercises and other learning in the course that are a reflection of the course specific learning outcomes. Scores on student performance for these exercises would reflect student the extent to which students learned the outcomes. Instructors were provided with guidelines on how to conduct an assessment for a general education course along with “best practice” examples--

IV. Folding the Council on Educational Policy General Education (GE) and Assessment Committee GE reviews into one GE review.

AC and CEP conduct annual reviews of one or two GE categories. AC and CEP GE reviews are always of the same category (ies) and are similar in many respects. CEP’s GE review entails review of all categories’ GE courses and each of the sections of the GE course. The CEP review evaluates whether instructors for each of section of each GE course teaches and evaluates the course specific learning outcomes for the category. AC, on the other hand, goes deeper than CEP but reviews only a subset of the categories’ GE courses/sections—those taught for one of the quarters during the academic year. AC’s review evaluates actual data on student performance of the course specific learning outcomes. Because the AC review of GE courses includes what is required of the CEP GE review, CEP does not require instructors for those particular courses reviewed by AC to submit reports.

While CEP and AC had planned to fold these reviews into one review this past year, the merging of the reviews did not take place due to the difference in CEP and AC priorities and timelines based on these priorities. It is difficult to coordinate the two reviews given the staff work demands for the CEP analyst and the AC coordinator. After AC reviews GE IV and VI assessment reports in the fall of 2016, the subcommittee will have the necessary information to determine whether the AC review might be revamped (should the response rate be as low as last year) and how a revamping would bear on future CEP GE reviews.
V. Annual Schedule for CEP/AC General Education Reviews

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 continued. GE course learning outcomes were included on instructors’ learning management system (i.e., EEE) course sites. Letters were sent to GE instructors informing them of the upcoming review.

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 Category VII (review will be different based on revisions of course specific learning outcomes in the category).

Year 5, 2017-18: Assessment of GE Category VIII

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

VI. Core Competencies

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the agency that accredits UCI every ten years, will soon require universities and colleges to assess students’ core competencies around the time of graduation. The core competencies are:

1. **Written communication**: communication using written language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. Written communication may appear in many forms or genres. Successfully written communication depends on mastery of the conventions of the written language, facility with culturally accepted structures for presentation and argument, awareness of audience, and other situation-specific factors.

2. **Oral communication**: communication using spoken language for informational, persuasive, and expressive purposes. In addition to speech, oral communication may employ visual aids, body language, intonation, and other non-verbal elements to support the conveyance of meaning and connection with the audience. Oral communication may include speeches, presentations, discussions, dialog, and other forms of interpersonal communication, either delivered face to face or mediated technologically.

3. **Quantitative reasoning**: the ability to apply mathematical concepts to the interpretation and analysis of quantitative information in order to solve a wide range of problems, from those arising in pure and applied research to everyday issues and questions. It may include such dimensions as the ability to apply math skills, judge reasonableness, communicate quantitative information, and recognize the limits of mathematical or statistical methods.

4. **Information literacy**: according the Association of College and Research Libraries, the ability to “recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use the needed information” for a wide range of purposes. An information-literate individual can determine the extent of information needed, access it, evaluate it and its sources, use the information effectively, and do so ethically and legally.

5. **Critical thinking**: the ability to think in a way that is clear, reasoned, reflective, informed by evidence, and aimed at deciding what to believe or do. Dispositions supporting critical thinking include open-mindedness and motivation to seek the truth.
AC members generally agreed that most of the core competencies can be met by all of the majors. AC members noted that each School has one or two core competencies that are not fulfilled by upper division courses required for the majors. AC members will have to make a decision about whether core competencies not covered in upper division required courses in majors should be evaluated. If AC votes to comply with WASC’s core competency assessment requirements, the subcommittee, CEP and Cabinet/Divisional Assembly may have to vote on whether such assessment requirements should be mandatory for departments given the lack of resources and training provided by WASC to fulfill it requirements.

1. Biological Sciences majors, there are a lot of electives that cover the core competencies. An AC member would like to know that whether the opportunity for students to take such electives would suffice as actual evidence of meeting core competencies.

   • Public Health offers a capstone course with writing and oral presentations, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking. The only core competency missing from the capstone course is possibly information literacy.

   • Engineering majors are already achieving all five of the core competencies due to ABET requirements.

   • Social Ecology majors must take a field studies and field research course. The course fulfills the writing, information literacy, and critical thinking competencies. It depends on site and mentor whether the quantitative reasoning and oral competencies are met.

   • Humanities majors are required to take courses that cover writing, oral and critical thinking competencies. Some majors may require a course involving information literacy. No Humanities courses cover the quantitative reasoning competency.

   • Anthropology majors are required to take upper division courses involving all five competencies. Other majors in Social Sciences probably have similar requirements.

   • Physical Sciences majors are required to take courses that cover all of the competencies except for oral presentation.

VII. Carry Forward Issues

1. AC will continue to evaluate charges put forth by WASC.
2. AC will review Assessment Reports from majors in Engineering, ICS, and Physical Sciences
3. AC will discuss the scope and possible review of GE VII course learning outcomes that are included the GE VII revisions.
4. AC will receive mapping exercises of upper division required courses onto core competencies. Mapping data will provide AC with necessary data on core competency gaps in majors. Once gaps are identified, AC will discuss whether it would be feasible to introduce additional mandates on students and faculty to fill these gaps.
5. AC will consider adding a slot to its membership roster for the Assessment specialist in the Academic Planning office.

VIII. AC membership AY2015-2016

Tesha Sengupta-Irving (Education) Chair of AC
Martin Huang, Humanities
Justin Shaffer, Biological Sciences
Monica Majoli, Arts
Stacy Hancock, ICS
Valerie Olson, Social Sciences
Devin Shanthikumar, Business
Larry Jamner, Social Ecology
Scott Bartell, Public Health
Mu-Chun Chen, Physical Sciences
Russel Detwiler, Engineering

ASUC representative
Jenny Truong

Ex Officio
Venette Van Duyn, Assessment Coordinator

Academic Senate
Michelle AuCoin, Academic Senate Principal Analyst