



CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT Spring 2019

General Information	
General Education Assessment Area	Artistic Inquiry
Department/ School	N/A
Number of students currently in the discipline	2794 (as of 7/9/19; Data retrieved from Panther Analytics)
Contact Person	
Name (<i>Person coordinating assessment effort</i>)	Richard Ruppel, Director of General Education Paul Kang, Director of Accreditation and Assessment
E-mail address	ruppel@chapman.edu pkang@chapman.edu

OVERVIEW/DESCRIPTION

Students are required to take one 3-credit course in Artistic Inquiry, designed to provide students an opportunity to explore artistic media, performance and/or creative expression. (The GE code is AI). The learning outcome: Students compose critical or creative works that embody or analyze conceptually an artistic form at a baccalaureate/pre-professional level.

In Spring, 2019, six faculty members in Dance, Music, and Film were asked to find an assignment, preferably at the end of the term, that would measure how well the students achieved the learning outcome. Altogether, eight courses, including 302 students, were assessed, approximately 10% of the total students enrolled in AI courses that semester.

Learning Outcome I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	Composes critical or creative works that embody or analyze conceptually an artistic form at a baccalaureate/pre-professional level.
Supports University Theme (<i>Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome 	The courses that fulfill AI are in approximately 25 different departments. Those in the Humanities always include a significant writing component. Those that involve the creation of an art form always include significant personalized education. Most include interdisciplinarity.
Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only (Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral Communication Written communication Information Literacy Quantitative Reasoning Critical Thinking 	Humanities AI courses always require written communication and often oral communication as well as critical thinking. Upper-level AI courses in the Humanities most often require work with references; students must find authoritative outside sources. Courses in art creation also often require oral and written communication as well as critical thinking about the art form.
Where is the outcome published for students? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers) Website Handbook 	The GE AI Learning Outcome is published on all courses that fulfill the GE AI requirement. The learning outcome also is published in the GE web page: https://www.chapman.edu/academics/learning-at-chapman/general-education-outcomes/index.aspx
Evidence of Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> capstone project presentation performance course-embedded exam assignment standardized test portfolio 	GE Artistic Inquiry (AI) instructors were instructed to choose an assignment from their courses that would address the AI Learning Outcome sufficiently (see assessment instructions below). Given the variety of courses in different programs that meet the GE AI requirement, it was not possible to assign a common assignment. This challenge and requirements for choosing an appropriate assignment were discussed and agreed to during the initial assessment meeting on 2/4/19 with the instructors. As such, there were a variety of assignments chosen for this assessment (see assignment prompts folder). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GE AI Instructions for Instructors GE AI Assignment Prompts <p>When instructors decide to use the final exams to assess the AI Learning Outcome, it is not included in the assignment prompt folder in order to protect the exam from unauthorized distribution.</p>
Collecting and Analyzing the Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you select the sample? 	In spring 2018, Chapman University offered 103 GE AI courses (some with multiple sections) across 16 programs. These also include study abroad courses. There were a total of 2794 students enrolled in these courses.

- *What was your sample size (number of students)?*
- *Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.*
- *How did you assess the student work/data collected?*
 - *Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples*
 - *Attach all assessment tools*

- [GE AI Course List](#)

In order to get a representative sample across the programs, we employed a stratified sampling design. From each program, we randomly selected instructors and asked if they would be interested in participating in the GE assessment. Six instructors teaching 13 sections volunteered to participate in the GE assessment. The enrollment for these course sections are as follows:

Course	Sample
Dance 353	66
Doc Film 321	14
Film and Media 140	100
Film Studies 445	18
Music 101	34
Music 128	23
Music 203	32
Music 230	15

The overall sample size was 302 students (10.8% of students enrolled for GE AI).

Instructors assessed their chosen assignment (see an explanation for prompt #5 above) using the GE AI Learning Outcome Rubric (see below). They were instructed to choose an assignment toward the end of the course in order to appropriately assess their knowledge and skills in this GE area. The GE AI Learning Outcome Rubric has three assessment criteria: (a) Express informed viewpoint; (b) Interpret forms of creative expression; (c) Understand cultural contexts.

- [GE AI Rubric](#)

- Expected Level of Achievement
- *What was your target(s) for student performance for this outcome? (This should tie to the methods in which you assessed the students and collected and analyzed data in the section above.)*

For each of the three criteria, our target was to achieve a mean score of 2 (from score range of 1-3) or greater across all participants, indicating basic levels of proficiency.

II. Performance

Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.

Students met the expected levels of achievement. Ten percent did not

Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results.

The GE AI assessment data is as follows:

	N	Mean	SD	Below 2
Criteria 1	302	2.20	0.62	34
Criteria 2	302	2.23	0.61	30
Criteria 3	302	2.25	0.62	30

For criterion 1 (i.e., express informed viewpoint), 268 students (89%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 34 students who did not score 2 or above, 34 students received a score of 1 and no students received a score of 0.

	<p>For criteria 2 (i.e., interpret forms of creative expression), 272 students (90%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 30 students who did not score 2 or above, 30 students received a score of 1 and no students received a score of 0.</p> <p>For criteria 3 (i.e., understand cultural contexts), 272 students (90%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 30 students who did not score 2 or above, 30 students received a score of 1 and no students received a score of 0.</p> <p>Below is a link to the complete assessment data table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2019 GE AI Assessment Data
<p>How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?</p>	<p>The results will be shared with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness, and General Education Faculty Committee for their review and feedback.</p>
<p>III. Progress</p>	
<p>1. How have previous years' findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Refer to previous years' assessment reports/responses for this section.</i> • <i>How did this year's achievement level compare to past years?</i> • <i>Show year-to-year progress, preferably in a data table.</i> 	<p>The previous GE AI assessment was conducted under different conditions and has issues relating to sample size, incomplete or inadequate submissions, and other logistical issues. Thus prior findings were not deemed sufficient for comparison with the current assessment strategy. Going forward, future assessments will be somewhat consistent with this year's process and more effective longitudinal comparisons may be drawn.</p> <p>Two changes will be made to the process: Faculty will no longer assess their own students, and the assessment rubric will reflect the bifurcated nature of the requirement. We will develop one rubric for arts analysis and a second for arts creation.</p>
<p>2. Based on your analysis and review, what improvements (if any) will the program initiate in the coming academic year?</p>	<p>Within the next two years, the GE Director hopes to meet with AI faculty to discuss the assessment process and results in the hope of increasing the faculty's awareness that all AI courses share a common designation and learning outcome.</p>