

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Engaging the Global Community
Current Semester:	Spring 2016
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 17, 2016

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Dr. Gerald Sabo, Dr. Martha Perenzslenyi-Pinter, Dr. Marcus Gallo, Dr. Rodney Hessinger, Dr. Wendy Widenhoft, Dr. Peter Kvidera, Dr. Jen Ziemke, Dr. Maria Marsilli

Courses Offered in Fall 2015

HS	283	51	Japanese Popular Culture	R. Purdy
IC	220	51	Japanese Popular Culture	K. Nakano

Courses Offered in Spring 2016

AH	399A	51	Special Topics: The Silk Road	B. Liu
TRS	351	51	Silk Road Religions	P. Nietupski
PO	297	51	Special Topics: Global Debt	W. Weidenhoft Murphy/M. Peden
SC	195	51	Global Debt and Justice	W. Weidenhoft Murphy/M. Peden
EN	299C	51	Special Topics: English as a Global Language	E. Butler
HS	202	51	World Civilization	M. Gallo
HS	202	52	World Civilization	M. Gallo
HS	270	51	Introduction to Latin American History and Cultures	M. Marsilli Cardozo
HS	270	52	Introduction to Latin American History and Cultures	M. Marsilli Cardozo
PO	241	1	History, Culture, and Politics (Central Asia and the New Silk Road)	P. Mason
SC	353	51	Latina/o Transnational Experience	G. Vacquera/W. Weidenhoft Murphy

Typical Assessment Process

Faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Each semester, the category sub-committee assesses a sample of student work from the previous semester focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2016 meeting is Integration.** The assessment meeting, held at the end of the Spring semester each year, focuses on data from the previous spring semester and the most recent fall semester. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

Deviations from the Assessment Process

Because fall 2015 was the first semester of the new integrative core, there were no integrative core classes offered in spring 2015. There was only one EGC course in fall 2015, for which no data was reported; therefore, this meeting will only be able to make use preliminary data from spring 2016.

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

EGC Rubrics; EGC Feedback 2016, EGC Preliminary Data 2016

Findings

Prompt: Describe, in words, what your sub-committee has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

From the data collected for Spring 16, it seems that, in average, students met integration. However, the large standard deviation indicates that there was significant deviation (meaning that in the given pool many students in reality did not meet this benchmark,) since mathematically the mean is very sensitive to these outliers.

The same situation is detected in the results collected using the global awareness rubric, which in this case shows an even larger standard deviation. This indicates that there was a significant number of students left behind in achieving Global Awareness learning goals.

Student performed poorly in writing in the given data; in this case the average is “below expectations.” Plagiarism and citation scores are the lowest, which is a matter of concern not so much in terms of actual, mindful plagiarism but more in terms of students not being able to integrate academic sources into their own analysis.

In this case, there are fewer outliers, which means most students concentrated in the “not met” category.

Suggestions for Instructors

Prompt: Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

Our group did not consider suggestions for specific instructors teaching in this category. Instead, we discussed how there should be a campus concern about the quality of student writing, and the implementation of means to help them achieve this goal. Writing, indeed, appears to be a problem in across the new core. This is not discipline/core component specific.

Disciplinary integration is also hard to achieve for students. Integrative courses are, indeed, challenging given the limited college experience that students have when they are prompted to enroll in them. Poor writing skills do not help this situation. Achieve and demonstrate integrative knowledge, therefore, get to be very difficult for students.

Evaluation of Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee’s evaluation of application and assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

In term of applications, our subcommittee felt that there was time pressure to review applications, and we had to make a great effort to do it in a timely manner.

Also, there’s was disparity in the quality of presented applications, which made difficult evaluation difficult.

Some colleagues did not make a point of making explicit the means of assessing their learning goals and simply stated “see syllabus.” That made the whole process more onerous upon the subcommittee.

Posting samples of successful applications in the New Core website helps. However, colleagues indicated that there’s the need for faculty to be more closely helped during the core designation application process.

The specificity of details required for each assignment in the application form was difficult for some colleagues to handle. Also, some faculty felt there were not enough details in the application categories that elicited a clear answer.

Some faculty did not put the time of trying to fill application boxes, probably because of the complexity of the forms.

Recommendations for Internal Changes

Prompt: This section pertains to changes that can be made by the sub-committee and the assessment office. What changes, if any, do you need to make to your application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluation and these recommendations.

A simplification of the core approval forms seems to be needed.

A closer couching of applicants to new core designation might help.

Flexibility of deadlines in the application process.

Give more support to faculty applying for core designation

There is the need to present faculty interested in applying with a timeline of what needs to be done to get their class running, so they can properly plan.

Faculty need to be reminded that they should not tell students that a class has or not Core designation until the class is actually approved.

Make clear to the campus community the names of Subcommittee Directors and Members for faculty to contact them formally or informally. Several colleagues do not know who directors and subcommittee members are.

There is the need for more specific details (as in positive feedback) given to applicants to review their applications. They need to know how to improve their applications.

Some colleagues trying to organize an EGC Learning Community have trouble identifying possible members. Activities to help them are currently done via CTL, but may be the subcommittee might be involved in the process as well.

There might be the need to get more EGC team-taught classes. There may be ways to motivate faculty to offer EGC classes under that modality.

Recommendations for the Core Committee

Prompt: This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, do you need to make to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluation and these recommendations.

Writing and integration need to be attended, sooner rather than later. Student's writing skills should be enhanced before they tackle integrated courses.

In terms of faculty assessment of Core learning goals:

- a. There is the need to get numbers in the different rubrics more standardized. As in: 1 lowest, 5 the highest, regardless of the category being addressed. Also, there should be a different category, not 0, for missing assignments.
- b. Filling the rubrics, as they are, is very onerous on faculty time, especially at the end of the semester, around final grades. Simplified rubrics (especially in writing and integration) and more time to fill them in Canvas is in place.
- c. Rubrics need to be consolidated, there are too many categories so as to make the process simple, specially the combination of integration + writing.

For EGC Learning Communities:

- a. There might not be the need to insist on the concurrent offering of classes in a given semester. Participating faculty need the freedom to decide the rotation of classes in their Learning Community without that additional constraint.
- b. Foster the establishment of Learning Communities that do not sunset while meeting EGC standards might be helpful. In that way, new faculty can join structures already in place. This would help to incorporate new hires more easily into the core curriculum.

In general terms:

- a. Some consideration to more flexibility to the modes of delivery of integrative courses (linked, team-taught, learning community) might be in place, so as to make it easier for interested faculty to participate.