



CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT July 2020

General Information	
General Education Assessment Area	Community, Citizenship, Service Inquiry
Department/ School	N/A
Number of students currently in the discipline	1403 (as of 6/5/2020; 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

Students may fulfill the three-credit Community, Citizenship, Service Inquiry general education requirement by taking a course in one of these three categories. Each category includes a different student learning outcome.

In January 2020 Paul Kang and I asked seven teachers of these courses to choose an assignment from their spring courses appropriate to measure how well their students achieved the relevant student learning outcome. Six teachers completed the assessment; a total of 229 assessments were completed, which represents 16% of the 1403 students enrolled in these courses. Though Paul and I stressed in our initial meeting that faculty should assess only the student learning outcome relevant to their course, one faculty member used the rubrics for two different categories to assess assignments.

As noted below, the previous GE CC assessment was conducted under different conditions and raised concerns 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. This year's assessment yielded more reliable results, but we may alter the process the next time CCS is assessed. To avoid confusion, each of the three categories (Community, Citizenship, Service) should be assessed independently, and it would be best if students all responded to the same assessment instrument. Combining results from responses to varying assignments, even when scored with the same rubric questions, does not yield especially valid data. We should also avoid having faculty score responses from their own students.

Learning Outcome

I. Process:

Student Learning Outcome

Citizenship Learning Outcome:

- Student demonstrates through analysis and/or personal engagement an understanding of the emergence, development, operations, and/or consequences of political systems in the US and/or other countries.
- Student can identify the rights and responsibilities of citizens and/or leaders as embodied in political, civic, or service organizations.

Community Learning Outcome:

- Student demonstrates through analysis and/or personal engagement an understanding of the emergence, development, changes and challenges to and, in some cases, destruction of diverse social groups who are marginalized within the context of larger societal environments.
- Student demonstrates through written, oral, media or other communication process a critical perspective on issues of civil rights, self-representation, participatory politics, and/or similar issues of inclusiveness.

Service Learning Outcome:

- Student examines the theoretical and/or applied aspects of community service through coursework and/or through active engagement in a service -earning experience and demonstrates:
 - the ability to apply discipline-specific and/or interdisciplinary knowledge and critical thinking skills to community issues.
 - critical self-reflection of the student's own assumptions and values as applied to community issues.
 - knowledge and sensitivity to issues of culture, diversity, and social justice as applied to community engagement.

Supports University Theme (*Some or all of the program's learning outcomes must support at least two of the university's strategic themes*)

- *Themes: Internationalization, Personalized Education, Faculty/Student Research, Interdisciplinarity, or Student Writing*
- *Describe how the theme is supported by the learning outcome*

All of the courses in all three of the categories emphasize personalized education; each asks students to examine their own systems of beliefs and values against particular social realities that may challenge those beliefs and values. Citizenship, Community, and most Service courses require reflective writing, and most courses in all three categories require research and inquiry across disciplines. Courses require students to consider ideologies, cultural values, and systems of belief in the context of particular disciplines, which brings sociological considerations to bear on matters of the law, government, history, literature, and the other disciplines within which these courses are offered.

Personalized education is supported in each of the student learning outcomes concerning analysis and reflection, which requires students to examine and challenge their own values and beliefs. Citizenship, Community, and most Service courses require reflective writing. All the courses require multidisciplinary attention to matters of social justice, minority rights and representation, and other community issues.

<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>Community, Citizenship, and Service courses require students to think critically about their beliefs and values regarding the rights and representation of groups different from themselves. Most require written communication to demonstrate their understanding of the issues.</p>										
<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 GE Community, Citizenship, Service Learning Outcome is published on all courses that fulfill the GE Community, Citizenship, Service 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</p>										
<p>Evidence of Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capstone project • presentation • performance • course-embedded exam • assignment • standardized test • portfolio 	<p>GE Community, Citizenship, Service Inquiry (CC) instructors were instructed to choose an assignment from their courses that would address the CC Learning Outcome sufficiently (see assessment instructions below). Given the variety of courses in different programs that meet the GE C 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 1/22/2020 with the instructors. As such, there were a variety of assignments chosen for this assessment (see assignment prompts folder).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GE CC Instructions for Instructors • GE CC Assignment Prompts <p>When instructors decide to use the final exams to assess the CC Learning Outcome, it is not included in the assignment prompt folder in order to protect the exam from unauthorized distribution.</p>										
<p>Collecting and Analyzing the Data</p> <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>In Spring 2020, Chapman University offered 41 GE CC courses (11 are combined with another course), with 85 sections altogether. Out of the 41 courses, 9 fall into the Citizenship category, 16 fall into the Community category, and 16 fall into the Service category (9 of the courses are service-learning experiences, with 2 internships, 6 individual studies, and 1 study abroad course). There were a total of 1403 students enrolled in these courses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GE CC Course List <p>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. 7 instructors teaching 9 sections volunteered to participate in the GE assessment. The enrollment for these course sections are as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Course</th> <th>Sample</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Documentary Filmmaking 380</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Humanities 102</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Humanities 205</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leadership Studies 397</td> <td>32</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Course	Sample	Documentary Filmmaking 380	5	Humanities 102	65	Humanities 205	43	Leadership Studies 397	32
Course	Sample										
Documentary Filmmaking 380	5										
Humanities 102	65										
Humanities 205	43										
Leadership Studies 397	32										

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td> Peace Studies/Political Science 120 </td> <td> 57 </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Theater 374 </td> <td> 27 </td> </tr> </table> <p>The overall sample size was 229 students (16% of students enrolled for GE CC).</p> <p>Instructors assessed their chosen assignment (see an explanation for prompt #5 above) using the GE CC 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.</p> <p>The GE CC Learning Outcome has three rubrics for each section: Citizenship, Community, and Service. Citizenship includes two assessment criteria: (1) Student demonstrates through analysis and/or personal engagement an understanding of the emergence, development, operations, and/or consequences of political systems in the US and/or other countries; and (2) Student can identify the rights and responsibilities of citizens and/or leaders as embodied in political, civic, or service organizations.</p> <p>Community includes two assessment criteria: (1) Student demonstrates through analysis and/or personal engagement an understanding of the emergence, development, changes and challenges to and, in some cases, destruction of diverse social groups who are marginalized within the context of larger societal environments; and (2) Student demonstrates through written, oral, media or other communication process a critical perspective on issues of civil rights, self-representation, participatory politics, and/or similar issues of inclusiveness.</p> <p>Service includes three assessment criteria: (1) Demonstrate the ability to apply discipline-specific and/or interdisciplinary knowledge and critical thinking skills to community issues; (2) Demonstrate critical self-reflection of the student's own assumptions and values as applied to community issues; and (3) Demonstrate knowledge and sensitivity to issues of culture, diversity, and social justice as applied to community engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GE CC Rubric <p>NOTE: In spite of courses that align to specific to a specific inquiry category (e.g., citizenship), instructors assessed students on rubric categories that they believed were relevant to their assignments. See additional discussion in the progress section of this report (below).</p>	Peace Studies/Political Science 120	57	Theater 374	27
Peace Studies/Political Science 120	57				
Theater 374	27				
<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 each of the seven criteria, the target was to achieve a mean score of 2 (from score range of 1-4) or greater across all participants, indicating basic levels of proficiency.</p>				

II. Performance

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

Students achieved the expected benchmarks in each category. The Citizenship 1 question responses scored the lowest. The question reads: *Student demonstrates through analysis and/or personal engagement an understanding of the emergence, development, operations, and/or consequences of political systems in the US and/or other countries.* The response was very near 2, identified as “Effective” rather than “Proficient” (3) or “Advanced” (4). 34 of the 132 students scored below 2. We will bring this to the attention of the teachers of Citizenship courses.

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
Citizenship 1	132	2.12	1.09	34
Citizenship 2	164	2.90	1.09	19
Community 1	117	3.61	.83	5
Community 2	117	3.61	.86	7
Service 1	52	3.33	1.10	6
Service 2	84	3.23	.97	6
Service 3	57	2.70	1.06	6

For Citizenship 1, 98 students (74%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 34 students who did not score 2 or above, 32 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 2 students received a score of .99 and below.

For Citizenship 2, 145 students (88%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 19 students who did not score 2 or above, 16 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 3 students received a score of .99 and below.

For Community 1, 112 students (96%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 5 students who did not score 2 or above, 3 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 2 students received a score of .99 and below.

For Community 2, 110 students (94%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 7 students who did not score 2 or above, 5 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 2 students received a score of .99 and below.

For Service 1, 46 students (88%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 6 students who did not score 2 or above, 4 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 2 students received a score of .99 and below.

For Service 2, 78 students (93%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 6 students who did not score 2 or above, 4 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 2 students received a score of .99 and below.

For Service 3, 51 students (89%) received a score of 2 or higher. Of the 6 students who did not score 2 or above, 4 students received a score between 1-1.99 and 2 students received a score of .99 and below.

	<p>Below is a link to the complete assessment data table:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020 GE CC 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, Director of General Education, and General Education Faculty Committee for their review and feedback. We will share these results with all the relevant departments and faculty. And when the CCS courses are examined for recertification, we will share these results with faculty engaged in that recertification.</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 CC 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 may be consistent with this year's process and more effective longitudinal comparisons may be drawn.</p>
<p>2. Based on your analysis and review, what improvements (if any) will the program initiate in the coming academic year?</p>	<p>As noted above, some instructors teaching CCS courses assessed their students' performance across CCS categories, even if the categories were outside of the course category. For example, an instructor of course under the Citizenship category could have assessed their students' performance under the Service category because the instructor deemed their assignment to cover this category. Likewise, some instructors teaching a specific category may not have assessed their students' performance in this category because they deemed their assignment not to cover elements of this category.</p> <p>As noted above, we will notify faculty teaching Citizenship courses that the Citizenship 1 student responses barely reached the minimum expectations of the assessment.</p> <p>Before going forward with the next CCS assessment, we will assign a group of relevant faculty to recertify each course in each category. I hope that process will help us design a universal assessment question for each category.</p>