



CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

General Education Learning Outcomes Assessment Report
Values and Ethical Inquiry (VI)
July 2016

Degree Program Information	
Academic Degree Program (<i>Major</i>)	Values and Ethical Inquiry (VI)
Degree (<i>BS, BA, BFA, MFA, MBA, etc.</i>)	
Department/ School	General Education
Number of students currently enrolled (as majors) in the program:	
Contact Person	
Name <i>(Person coordinating program's assessment effort)</i>	Nina LeNoir
Title	Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education
E-mail address	lenoir@chapman.edu

Learning Outcome #1	
I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	Articulates how values and ethics inform human understanding, structures, and behavior
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 	Personalized education: GE VI allows students to select courses from among several disciplines according to their GE interests and/or to integrate with their majors.
Supports WASC Core Competency <i>(Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral Communication Written communication Information Literacy Quantitative Reasoning Critical Thinking 	
Where is the outcome published for students? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syllabi <i>(If syllabi, list course numbers)</i> Website Handbook 	<p>The outcome is published on the GE website and will be updated in VI designated GE course syllabi, and on the Learning at Chapman website.</p> <p>As a result of this assessment, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs will send the VI learning outcome statement and evaluation rubric with specific criteria to faculty and chairs supporting VI approved courses. Faculty will be required to place the learning outcome statement in course syllabi.</p>
Evidence of Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> capstone project presentation performance course-embedded exam assignment standardized test portfolio 	Student assignments from VI courses were collected during the 2015-16 academic year according to the process described below (Collecting and Analyzing the Data). Particular assignments from randomly selected students were selected by their professor of record. The project, presentation, performance or exam that should demonstrate the student's accomplishments according to the outcome statement and rubric criteria.
Collecting and Analyzing the Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How did you select the sample? 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples Attach all assessment tools 	<p>Throughout AY 2015-16, randomized student work samples along with the corresponding prompt were requested from faculty members teaching across all sections of courses which had been approved for the GE VI category (see attached letter). Faculty members were asked to select an assignment, project, presentation, performance or exam for the selected student(s) that would demonstrate the student's accomplishments according to the outcome statement.</p> <p>The following table shows the participation rates for VI work sample requests for AY 2015-2016</p>

	VI Enrolled Students	Samples Requested	Samples Collected	Samples Evaluated
Fall 2015	1,603	114	62	58

A VI Assessment Working Group was assembled by the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education. The Assessment Working Group, consisting of Jan Osborn (English), Stephanie Takaragawa (Sociology and Anthropology), Morgan Read-Davidson (English) and Michael Wood (Languages and World Cultures), met on 07/08/2016 (see attached agenda) to redesign the VI the rubric and evaluation. The meeting was facilitated by Nina LeNoir, who served as an ex officio committee member. A norming session was conducted using the redesigned rubric and 5 student work samples. The norming of faculty evaluators continued until consensus was reached and inter-rater reliability scoring differentials did not exceed one degree of separation on the rubric.

Following this meeting, the 58 student work samples that were collected in 2015-16 were distributed among the Assessment Working Group members for review (see assignments below).

Jan	Students: 1-30
Michael	Students: 1-30
Stephanie	Students: 31-58
Morgan	Students: 31-58

Each student work sample was blindly evaluated by two Working Group members.

After the Working Group members completed their independent reviews, a second meeting was held on 07/21/2016 (agenda attached); results were tallied and reviewer scores were averaged. Work samples that received evaluation scores from two reviewers differing by more than one point were reevaluated. In all of these cases, the reviewers were able to reconcile their differences and agree upon a consensus score. At this point, the results for the 58 samples were tallied and analyzed. This report and the following recommendations were subsequently created following the Working Group's analysis of the data.

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.)

To establish an initial target and benchmark, the 7VI Assessment team concluded that at least 75% of students should score two or above as an average of all three categories.

The team recommends that future assessment using the redesigned rubric should target the same.

II. Progress

How have previous years' findings been used to improve learning, courses and program in relation to this outcome? Specify.

Because this is the first time the VI requirement of the new General Education program has been assessed, there is no basis for comparison or progress report to make in regard to student learning. Instead, this assessment will

<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>serve as a benchmark for future years and a launching point for conceptual conversations regarding the VI requirement.</p> <p>The VI Assessment Team wishes to make the following recommendations regarding the future of the VI requirement and assessment process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. We have redesigned the rubric for evaluation of VI student work samples according to the outcome statement and recommend adoption of the revised rubric criteria for future assessment. (see attached)2. Courses for VI should be recertified by the GE Committee or a task force in light of the new rubric3. The new rubric criteria should be widely distributed and explained to fulltime and part-time faculty members who teach within this category. Workshops should be held for this purpose.4. Call for assessment samples that should explicitly ask for assignments that could potentially demonstrate the benchmark for this outcome.5. Overall, the VI Assessment Team recommends that a point person be made available to facilitate continuity among courses and faculty within each GE category.
---	--