Memo

To: Academic Senate Chair
         Curriculum Committee Chair
         Department Chairs
         Provost and VPAA
         Academic Deans
         Library Dean

From: Institution-Wide Assessment Council
Re: IWAC Summer Session 2019
Date: May 16th, 2019

Colleagues,

The Institution-Wide Assessment Council (IWAC) concluded its annual week-long summer session in May of 2019. The session was held very close to the end of the semester in order to capitalize on assessment momentum from the last weeks of the spring term. While Prof. Shackman and Prof. Sammler are members of the Council, they were unable to participate in the summer session this year.

Although there was only one ILO in Year 2 of the Assessment Plan this year which required the production of a report, there were many other actions undertaken which should vastly improve our assessment efforts moving forward.

In the Academic Year 2018-2019, the IWAC conducted an assessment of Institutional Learning Outcome A (ILO-A), Communication. Assessment was divided into two fields, written and oral (which correspond to two distinct WASC Core Competencies). Each was assessed at the introductory and mastery level. Assessment scores were disaggregated by major, ethnicity and gender when possible. On the introductory level, written communication artifacts were gathered from multiple sections of EGL 100: English Composition and for oral communication artifacts were gathered from EGL 110: Speech Communication. On the mastery level, artifacts were gathered from multiple major-specific upper division courses. Supplementary data were collected from the Graduate Writing Exam which was administered in fall and spring across all majors as a challenge to the required course EGL 300 Advanced Writing.

On the introductory level, all written communication artifacts were assessed using the AAC&U Leap VALUE Rubric. Overall on this level the benchmark for was met for four of five dimensions: "Context & Purpose" (74.7%), "Content Development" (70.5%), "Sources & Evidence" (76.6%), and "Syntax & Mechanics" (72.6%). The benchmark was missed for Genre & Discipline, with only 61.1% of students scoring a 3 or above.   Further breakdown by gender, major, and under-represented minority status can be found in the full report.

At the mastery level Written Communication assessment was complicated because different programs used different rubrics. , GSMA used a 5 point rubric and assessed three dimensions: "Content," "Sources," and "Mechanics." ME used a 4 point rubric and assessed two dimensions: "content" and "syntax." IBL used the recommended AAC&U Leap VALUE rubrics. MT provided data on artifacts

that were discovered to be inappropriate for IWAC assessment. The STCW matrices used to assess MT student work are "single variable scores for the achievement of programmatic outcomes which leads to the reporting of results that are not actionable" (WASC Report, 2019).   No mastery level artifacts were assessed from the Department of Engineering Technology.

At the introductory level in Oral Communication, five dimensions were assessed: "Organization," "Language," "Delivery," "Supporting Material," and "Message/Overall Clarity." the benchmark for Oral Communication was 70% achieving a score of 3 or greater on a 4 point scale for all five dimensions.   The benchmark was met for four of five dimensions: "Language" (78.4%), "Delivery" (77.6%), "Supporting Material" (83.6%) and "Message/Overall Clarity" (77.6%). The benchmark was missed for Genre & Discipline, with only 65.5% of students scoring a 3 or above.   At the mastery level, the same rubric and benchmark were used. ME assessed two of the five dimensions ("Organization" and "Delivery"). GSMA and IBL assessed all five dimensions. The benchmark was met for all dimensions for the three majors (GSMA, IBL, and ME) from which data were gathered, except IBL did not meet the benchmark in "Clarity" (59.3%).

A more detailed analysis of methodology, results, and recommendations – including figurative representation of findings and examples of rubrics used – can be found at on the IWAC webpage

Beside the assessment of ILO (A), several other actions were taken:

- The IWAC Committee met with the Director of Academic Technologies to develop a plan to embed rubrics directly into the course shells in the Learning Management System so that future scoring of rubrics will be as efficient as possible. After exploring several different possibilities, the committee settled on one method; we are eager to implement this in the fall and gauge its effectiveness.

- Relatedly, in our Action Plan for the academic year 2019-2020, more workshops for faculty training – both in "norming sessions" for quality assurance of assessment as well as in Brightspace management – have been planned. This will align with the WASC Report's recommendation that more faculty be involved in professional development opportunities regarding the assessment of student learning.

- The value and efficacy of other Institutional Learning Outcomes were discussed. It was decided that ILO (D) Lifelong Learning – besides being a notoriously difficult outcome to assess accurately – was perhaps not an institutional outcome but a General Education outcome. The motion to remove this as an ILO will be brought to the Curriculum Committee in the Fall.

- Action plans for Global Learning and Critical and Creative Thinking – those student learning outcomes in Year 2 of the Assessment Calendar – were developed. Rubrics were created, courses and even instructors for the fall term were identified as participants in assessment.

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
Sarah Senk   Aparna Sinha
Wil Tsai   Amber Janssen
Valerie McGowan