



CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT Fall 2021

General Information	
General Education Assessment Area	First-Year Focus
Department/ School	N/A
Number of students currently in the discipline	1568 (as of 2/7/2022; Data retrieved from Panther Analytics)
Contact Person	
Name (<i>Person coordinating assessment effort</i>)	Richard Ruppel, Director of General Education
E-mail address	ruppel@chapman.edu

OVERVIEW/DESCRIPTION

Since assignments in Chapman's FFC program were last assessed in 2012-13, the General Education office (Richard Ruppel and Kaela King) completed a two-part assessment of the unaffiliated (FFC 100A) sections from Fall, 2021.* The first was a survey, distributed November 2021. 216 students responded out of 847 enrolled in these sections (~25%). The responses are included with this report both as an Excel spreadsheet and as pie charts (in a Word document). Here are the questions:

1. Why did you choose the FFC section you enrolled in (choose the most important from the list below):
2. Please rate how your ability to critically analyze and communicate complex issues and ideas has improved based on your FFC experience:
3. Did you spend more, less, or about the same amount of time outside of class on your FFC class work as you did on other academic classes at Chapman?
4. Did your appreciation for and understanding of your FFC topic grow?
5. Did this course help you understand what is expected of you intellectually at Chapman University in your academic courses?
6. Would you recommend your FFC section to another incoming student?

Briefly, the responses suggest that over 80% of the students in these sections reported beneficial learning experiences, and there was a **significant** improvement in the responses over those from the 2016 survey. For example, ~65% of the students in the 2021 survey reported that their ability to critically analyze and communicate complex issues and ideas strongly improved (~15%) or improved (~50%), while the response from 2016 was 37% (strongly improved 10% and improved 27%).

The one caveat about this survey is that it included only the students in the 38 unaffiliated (FFC100A) sections. Students in the other 32 sections did not participate. So the significance of the comparison with the 2016 survey – which included all FFC students – is limited.

We also assessed end-of-semester assignments that required critical thinking, using the same rubric as the one used in 2013. 8 faculty members were asked to submit these assignments. (All 8 sections were assessed, but one sections' assignments were excluded because the prompt did not sufficiently require critical thinking.) 6 faculty members scored the results; each class was scored twice. Dissimilar scores were averaged. Unlike the results of the survey, these results showed a decline from the prior (2013) assessment.

*Grand Challenges Initiative FFC sections (FFC 100B) were assessed via the survey that accompanies this report.

Learning Outcome I. Process:	
Student Learning Outcome	Critically analyzes and communicates complex issues and ideas
<p>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>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Themes: <i>Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing</i> Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome 	<p>Personalized Education: Students may complete personalized research projects and/or presentations, which involve individualized feedback by faculty.</p> <p>Interdisciplinarity: From the catalog: "This course engages students in interdisciplinary, university-level critical inquiry and reflection."</p> <p>Student Writing: All FFC 100A sections include significant student writing and faculty assessment.</p> <p>FFC's student learning outcome, "students critically analyze and communicate complex issues and ideas," supports the student writing theme, especially, but also the general academic goal of the University.</p>
<p>Supports WASC Core Competency, For Undergraduate Programs Only (Please indicate whether this outcome supports any of WASC's core competencies)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral Communication Written communication Information Literacy Quantitative Reasoning Critical Thinking 	<p>FFC supports the following WASC Core Competencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oral communication: most sections require oral presentations, often in groups, that are assessed for grades. All require assessed writing assignments. All FFCs include an Information Literacy module. Once completed, the concepts are reinforced during a class with a Chapman librarian. Critical thinking is the one common student learning outcome of all FFCs.
<p>Where is the outcome published for students?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Syllabi (If syllabi, list course numbers) Website Handbook 	<p>The FFC Student Learning Outcome is published on all course syllabi. The learning outcome also is published on the GE web page: https://www.chapman.edu/academics/learning-at-chapman/general-education-outcomes/freshman-foundations-course-assessment.aspx</p>
<p>Evidence of Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> capstone project presentation performance course-embedded exam assignment standardized test portfolio 	<p>Eight FFC instructors provided end-of-term assignments which required students to demonstrate the FFC Learning Outcome. Six FFC instructors assessed the assignments using the rubric developed in 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GE FFC Assignment Prompts

<p>Collecting and Analyzing the Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How did you select the sample?</i> • <i>What was your sample size (number of students)?</i> • <i>Provide the percentage of the sample size as compared to the relevant population.</i> • <i>How did you assess the student work/data collected?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Possible Tools: rubric, exam questions, portfolio samples</i> • <i>Attach all assessment tools</i> 	<p>In Fall 2021, Chapman University offered 68 FFC sections, including 36 FFC 100A sections. There were a total of 1568 students enrolled, with 847 students enrolled in FFC 100A.</p> <p>We collected final assignments from 8 FFC 100A sections. 6 FFC instructors volunteered to score the assignments. (One needed to withdraw for health reasons; Richard scored that faculty member's assignments.)</p> <p>The overall sample size was 142 students (9% of students enrolled in FFC, 17% of students enrolled in FFC 100A).</p> <p>The GE FFC Learning Outcome Rubric has three assessment criteria: (1) Critical approach to material, (2) Consideration of evidence, and (3) recognition of contexts and assumptions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">GE FFC Rubric</p>
--	--

<p>Expected Level of Achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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.)</i> 	<p>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</p>
---	---

II. Performance

<p>Have expected levels of achievement been met for this outcome? Explain.</p>	<p>The expected levels of achievement were not met. ~62% of students achieved "Proficient" or "Advanced" for 1) "Critical approach to material," ~65% for 2) "Consideration of evidence, and ~47% for 3) "Recognition of contexts and assumptions." The graph below shows that the average scores were all below "Proficient."</p>
--	--

<p>Please provide a summary of the assessment data in a table, along with a brief analysis of the results.</p>	<p>The GE LC assessment data is as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>N</th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Below 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Criterion 1</td> <td>142</td> <td>1.92</td> <td>.57</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criterion 2</td> <td>142</td> <td>1.97</td> <td>.52</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criterion 3</td> <td>142</td> <td>1.81</td> <td>.56</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For criterion 1 (Critical approach to material), 88 students (62%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 54 students who did not score 2 or above, 51 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 3 students received a score of .99 and below.</p> <p>For criterion 2 (Consideration of evidence), 94 students (66%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 48 students who did not score 2 or above, 48 students received a score between 1-1.99 and no student received a score of .99 and below.</p> <p>For criterion 3 (Recognition of contexts and assumptions), 67 students (47%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 75 students who did not score 2 or above, 73 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 2 students received a score of .99 and below.</p> <p>Below is a link to the complete assessment data table:</p>		N	Mean	SD	Below 2	Criterion 1	142	1.92	.57	54	Criterion 2	142	1.97	.52	48	Criterion 3	142	1.81	.56	75
	N	Mean	SD	Below 2																	
Criterion 1	142	1.92	.57	54																	
Criterion 2	142	1.97	.52	48																	
Criterion 3	142	1.81	.56	75																	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2021 GE FFC Assessment Data
How will results be shared and evidence used to make decisions? Was it shared with faculty (full time and adjunct) and students?	The results will be shared with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness, Director of General Education, and General Education Faculty Committee for their review and feedback. The results will also be shared with all the departments and faculty who teach FFC courses.

III. Progress

<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"> Refer to previous years' assessment reports/responses for this section. How did this year's achievement level compare to past years? Show year-to-year progress, preferably in a data table. 	<p>The results from this year's assessment were mixed. Students themselves expressed significantly greater satisfaction in the 2021 survey over the 2016 survey, but there was a decline in the assignment scores from the 2013 assessment to the 2021 assessment.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2016</th> <th>2022</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1) Critical approach to material</td> <td>76%*</td> <td>~62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Consideration of evidence</td> <td>76%*</td> <td>~65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Recognition of contexts and assumptions</td> <td>76%*</td> <td>~47%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*This is the aggregate percentage; the scores for each of the three categories are missing from the 2013 report.</p>		2016	2022	1) Critical approach to material	76%*	~62%	2) Consideration of evidence	76%*	~65%	3) Recognition of contexts and assumptions	76%*	~47%
	2016	2022											
1) Critical approach to material	76%*	~62%											
2) Consideration of evidence	76%*	~65%											
3) Recognition of contexts and assumptions	76%*	~47%											

<p>2. Based on your analysis and review, what improvements (if any) will the program initiate in the coming academic year?</p>	<p>After discussions with Nina Lenoir, Brad Petifils, and the FFC assessors, here are some possible reasons for subpar results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> COVID undoubtedly had some effect on the student responses. Students were not quite as prepared as past students since they spent the prior two years isolated at home working online, and, though Chapman classes met in-person, students in the fall of 2021 were distracted by the pandemic. Chapman has made the SAT and ACT optional admission requirements, and we do not know what effect this has had on the preparedness of incoming students. The assignment prompts did not uniformly require critical thinking. In some cases, students might have been able to respond more-or-less successfully to the prompts without engaging critically with the material. <p>Initiatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All FFC teachers will see this report, attached to an email that draws attention to the encouraging response to the survey and the somewhat disappointing results from the scored assessment. This summer (2022), the GE Director will ask FFC teachers to make sure their syllabi and assignments stress engagement with critical thinking, and this will be stressed again at the late-summer meetings with all FFC teachers. Other responses will be considered, including 1) workshops, 2) stipends to encourage faculty to reconsider and redesign syllabi and, especially, assignments to engage more self-consciously with critical thinking, and 3) mentoring options. <p>Ongoing Assessment:</p> <p>The assessment detailed in this report includes only the unaffiliated (FFC100A) sections. Assessment of the Grand Challenge Initiative</p>
--	--

(FFC100B) sections is attached. **Both Dodge College “Story” sections (FFC100C) and Wilkinson College Engaging the World (FFC100D) will need to assess their sections Fall, 2022.**

We will consider another assessment of the unaffiliated sections Fall, 2023.