



GE Learning Outcomes Assessment Report  
2012-2013

GE Area Information	
General Education Shared Inquiry	Freshman Foundations Course (FFC)
Contact Person	
Name <i>(Person coordinating program's assessment effort)</i>	Joe Slowensky
Title	Vice Chancellor for Institutional Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs, ALO
E-mail address and phone	<a href="mailto:slowensky@chapman.edu">slowensky@chapman.edu</a>

Learning Outcome #1 I. Process:																					
Outcome Description	The student critically analyzes and communicates complex issues and ideas.																				
Supports University Theme <i>(describe how, if any)</i> <i>(Globalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing)</i>	Personalized education: FFC allows students to select from course topics and from among several disciplines according to their individual GE interests and/or to integrate with their majors.																				
Where is the outcome published for students? <i>(If syllabi, list course numbers)</i>	The outcome is published on the GE website, the Learning at Chapman website, and it will soon be updated in FFC course syllabi.  Each fall, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs will now send the FFC learning outcome statement and evaluation criteria/rubric to all faculty teaching FFC courses. New faculty will be encouraged to place the learning outcome statement in course syllabi. We recommend that department chairs and associate deans reinforce the inclusion of GE outcome statements in FFC course syllabi.																				
Expected Level of Achievement <i>(What are your targets or expectations?)</i>	For the sake of establishing a target, the FFC Assessment team concluded that at least 75% of students should score “proficient” or “advanced” in at least 2 of the 3 criteria according to the rubric used in this evaluation (see attached).																				
Evidence of Learning <i>(Describe the evidence that will be collected, e.g. capstone project, presentation, performance, course-embedded exam or assignment, standardized test..., how and if students will be sampled, and sample size)</i>	Beginning in Fall 2010, student work samples were randomly requested from faculty members teaching across all sections of freshman foundations course category (see attached letter). Each faculty member was asked to select an assignment, project, presentation, performance or exam for a randomly selected student(s) which would demonstrate the student’s accomplishments according to the outcome statement and rubric criteria.  The following table shows the participation rates for FFC work sample requests. <table border="1" data-bbox="646 1583 1432 1803"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFC Enrolled Students</th> <th>Samples Requested</th> <th>Samples Collected</th> <th>Samples Evaluated</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fall 2010</td> <td>1178</td> <td>60</td> <td>30</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 2011</td> <td>1283</td> <td>60</td> <td>51</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fall 2012</td> <td>1361</td> <td>90</td> <td>89</td> <td>89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*As assignment prompts were not requested in the sampling</p>		FFC Enrolled Students	Samples Requested	Samples Collected	Samples Evaluated	Fall 2010	1178	60	30	0	Fall 2011	1283	60	51	0	Fall 2012	1361	90	89	89
	FFC Enrolled Students	Samples Requested	Samples Collected	Samples Evaluated																	
Fall 2010	1178	60	30	0																	
Fall 2011	1283	60	51	0																	
Fall 2012	1361	90	89	89																	

process until the beginning of 2011-12, the FFC Assessment Team decided that it would be impossible to evaluate student projects according to the newly designed rubric because the context and intent of the assignment would not be clear. Therefore, the Team agreed to evaluate only the 89 samples with assignment prompts which were collected in Fall 2012 to use as the basis for the first iteration of the FFC assessment.

**Means of Scoring**  
*(Describe how you will score the assessment. For example, will you use a rubric or answer key, or will it be scored by testing company? Who will do the scoring? One or more people?)*

The attached rubric and GE FFC outcome statement (above) were used to evaluate student work.

The FFC Assessment Team met on 02/08/13 (see attached agenda) to refine the FFC outcome statement and design the rubric and criteria. A norming session was then conducted using the newly designed rubric and 6 student work samples. Faculty evaluators read the samples and discussed their responses, reaching consensus on the evaluation and scoring for each of the samples.

Following this meeting, the assessment team reviewed the student work samples independently (see assignments below).

Gordon	Fall 2012 Students: 1-5, 7-20, 22-26
Jim	Fall 2012 Students: 27-38, 40-47, 49-52
Kent	Fall 2012 Students: 53-70, 72-77
Eileen	Fall 2012 Students: 1-5, 7-14, 78-86, 88-89
Julye	Fall 2012 Students: 15-20, 22-38, 40
Jessica	Fall 2012 Students: 41-47, 49-64
Jeanne	Fall 2012 Students: 65-70, 72-86, 88-89

Each student work sample was blindly evaluated by two FFC faculty members. Gordon Babst, Julye Bidmead, Eileen Jankowski, Kent Lehnhof, Jim Brown, Jessica Sternfeld and Jeanne Gunner served as evaluators. The meeting was facilitated by Joe Slowensky, Vice Chancellor for Institutional Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs, ALO.

At the next meeting on 02/22/13 (agenda attached), results were tallied and shared with the group. Work samples that received evaluation scores differing by more than one point from the two evaluators were reexamined until consensus could be reached.

Split decisions (papers receiving 1s vs. 2s) were reevaluated. The committee collectively reread these projects, recalibrating values for the minimal and proficient categories, and adjusting scores accordingly. Of the 89 samples, it was decided that 3 would be

	<p>removed from the group as the assignment did not demonstrate evidence of whether the work was ever intended to speak to the rubric criteria. 6 were removed due to inter-rater reliability issues. At this point, the results for the remaining 79 samples were tallied and this report and the following recommendations were created.</p>
--	--