

Memo

To: Academic Senate Senate Chair
Chair, Curriculum Committee
Department Chairs
Provost and VPAA
Vice-President for Student Affairs
Academic Dean
Library Dean

From: Institution-Wide Assessment Council
Re: IWAC Summer Session 2017
Date: Feb 15th, 2018

Colleagues,

The IWAC council concluded its annual week-long summer session in May of 2017. The committee apologizes for the delay in releasing this Executive Summary; our assessment work spilled deep into the fall term and we also waited on data from the most recent National Survey of Student Engagement to help in our assessment of a particular learning outcome.

The past summer session was productive. Per the powers and responsibilities granted to this committee, a week was spent reviewing the Institution Learning Outcomes, mapping the assessment calendar, conducting assessments on three of the outcomes, and strategizing future assessment processes.

The bulk of the work done this summer was devoted to the analysis and interpretation of the ILOs under review in Year 3 of the assessment calendar. This term, those included ILO(H): Ethical Awareness and ILO(D): Lifelong Learning and ILO(F): Information Fluency. In addition, ILO(A) Communication, was assessed for the oral communication component of the outcome – last year, the written component was assessed. The reports for all four outcomes will be uploaded to the IWAC webpage for public availability.

In brief, for the Ethical Awareness assessment, a benchmark was set for 70% of students to receive a score of 4 or above on a six-point rubric which was modified from the “Liberal Education and America’s Promise VALUE rubric “Ethical Reasoning: Ethical Issue Recognition and Application of Ethical Perspectives and Concepts.” When aggregated by major, all majors met the goal. (Please see the report for a fuller explanation.) When aggregated by class (graduation year) all classes met desired outcome. When aggregated by gender, both genders met the desired outcome with little difference. Despite a seemingly positive outcome, there are concerns – addressed in the report – about the validity of some of these findings because of the small sample size. Five recommendations were made, and these are included in the report. For the outcome (D) on Lifelong Learning it was decided to utilize data collected from the NSSE report, particularly that information organized under the Engagement Indicators of “Higher

Order Learning” and “Reflective Learning” as these align with the outcome. No benchmark was set, but the results were analyzed against three different cohort groups. Unfortunately, Cal Maritime students underperformed in many categories. Several recommendations were set by the IWAC Committee, including a need for campus-wide understanding of the entirety of the NSSE survey with a comprehensive action plan to address deficiencies. A recommendation was also made for a better comprehension of the outcome itself, and to have a reconciliation of its meaning for Cal Maritime, for the CSU, and for ABET before the next assessment cycle.

ILO(F): Information Fluency was also examined this year and assessed using the same rubric as in the 2013 cycle with the addition of one new dimension. The rubric uses a four point scale and the two dimensions assessed in the 2013 cycle were Dimension 1 “Location and Evaluation of Sources” and Dimension 2: “Citation/Attribution.” The new dimension added in this assessment cycle was Dimension 3: “Topic Selection.” The benchmark was set for 70% of students to score 3 (Satisfactory) or better for each dimension. Broken down by major, this benchmark was nearly met by some majors for each of the dimensions. For Dimension 1: Location and Evaluation of Sources, 68% of GMSA student artifacts, 69% of FET/MET student artifacts, and 65% of MT student artifacts met or exceeded a score of 3 (Satisfactory) on the rubric. For Dimension 2: Citation/Attributions, 64% of GMSA student artifacts and 67% of FET/MET student artifacts met or exceeded a score of 3 (Satisfactory) on the rubric. For Dimension 3: Topic Selection, 74% of IBL student artifacts, 67% of ME student artifacts, and 67% of MT student artifacts met or exceeded a score of 3 (Satisfactory) on the rubric. This is an improvement over the last cycle of assessment for Information Fluency (2013), when the benchmark was only met by GSMA students, and in only Dimension 1. Four very particular recommendations were articulated in the report. Two additional recommendation were made on behalf of the Information Fluency program as it’s developed and maintained by Library Faculty.

Finally, ILO(A) was assessed this year using a a rubric approved by IWAC in 2016 to assess *oral* communication in five dimensions addressing “Organization,” “Language,” “Delivery,” “Supporting Material” and “Overall Clarity.” Two thirds passed the benchmark: 34.78% (24) exceeded expectations and 31.88% (22) met expectations. The remaining third of students failed to meet the expectations: 10.14% (7) partially met and 23.19% (16) students failed to meet expectations. Our goal was for 70% of students to meet expectations, so we fell slightly short with 66.66% of students doing so. As with all other assessment reports, recommendations are included – a significant one for this particular outcome is to identify upper-division courses where oral communication should be mastered so as to attain more data points and to better adhere to WASC’s request for the assessment of oral communication as one of the five “Core Competencies.”

Besides the review of data and scoring rubrics for those IW-SLOs in Year 3 of the assessment calendar, the other work accomplished by the committee includes:

- A decision to simplify some of the terminology used. “IWAC” will remain, as “The Institution-Wide Assessment Council,” but the outcomes themselves will be labeled as “ILOs” (Institution Learning Outcomes) instead of the more cumbersome IW-SLOs. This also conforms to usage across most universities.

- The use of the “Outcomes” module by Campus Labs has proved to be more unfriendly and difficult than initially expected. There are ways in which it does not communicate effectively with Moodle and with Peoplesoft, and it is unable to disaggregate some of our assessment data to the granular level we desire. There was not a lot of traction by the faculty as a whole since this platform was an “add-on” and not fully integrated into Moodle. It is expected that with the adoption of a new LMS, such assessment tools will be better integrated and easier to use. In the meantime, IWAC can get by on its own data collection and distribution means, with assistance from the Director of Institutional Research.

Again, the committee worked very hard this year to achieve our stated objectives, and we look forward to continued progress and improvement in the semesters to come.

Graham Benton; Chair,
Steve Runyon
Colin Dewey
Nipoli Kamdar
Sarah Senk

Michele van Hoeck
Amber Janssen
Tamara Burback
Wil Tsai
Kate Sammler