



COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW

14-15 CAPR 14
February 4, 2015

TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning Review (CAPR) via the CAPR Institutional Learning Outcomes Subcommittee

SUBJECT: 14-15 CAPR 14: Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Academic Senate approve the proposed Institutional Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In a referral to CAPR on February 15, 2010, ExCom requested that CAPR develop a list of institutional learning outcomes (ILO) and, as a second phase, develop a plan for assessing them as part of the program review process. A set of ILOs were developed by the ILO Subcommittee and endorsed by CAPR with the recommendation that they be submitted to the Academic Senate for adoption. This was duly done and the set of six ILOs were approved unanimously by the Academic Senate at its May 8, 2012 meeting.

Since that time, the ILO Subcommittee has been engaged in a variety of activities involved in fulfilling the second prong of the committee's original charge, the development of a plan for assessing these ILOs. These activities have included the selection and implementation of an electronic learning assessment platform (Blackboard Outcomes) to assist with the alignment, collection and assessment of student work. It has also overseen the piloting of using various faculty teams to further define the constructs identified in the ILO's, develop rubrics to be used in ILO assessment, create assignments to elicit student work that demonstrates the achievement of an ILO, and review assessment results, and make recommendations for improvement. Based on the results of this preliminary work, the ILO Subcommittee has developed the following plan for the ongoing assessment of CSUEB's Institutional Learning Outcomes and requests approval of this plan by the Committee on Academic Planning and Review and by the full Academic Senate.

Cal State East Bay Institutional Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

ILO Assessment Cycle—Phase 1

This proposal presents a cyclical plan for institutional level assessment of our Cal State East Bay institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) and the WASC core competencies. The plan is to assess each ILO over a three-year period, with overlapping 3-year cycles; that is, the first ILO will be assessed in Years 1, 2 and 3, with the assessment of ILO 2 beginning in Year 2, and beginning its own 3-year cycle, and so on. The first year of each cycle will consist of developing and piloting a rubric for that ILO. Year 2 will be spent working with faculty to develop and align class assignments, collect student artifacts, apply the rubric to the artifacts, and analyze the results. Year 3 will be spent disseminating the results and implementing closing the loop activities.

The chart below outlines this plan, with “ILO X” representing the particular ILO being assessed in that 3-year cycle.

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define ILO domain and develop rubric in FLCs (faculty learning communities) for ILO x. 2. Pilot rubrics across disciplines in FLCs/working groups. 3. Send out call for Assessment Working Groups for ILO x. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessment Working Groups develop assignments aligned with ILO x. 2. Assess ILO x in GE Subcommittee, ILO Subcommittee, and Assessment Working Groups using rubric developed in year one. 3. Collect and post samples of student work for ILO x portfolio based on call from ILO Subcommittee. (See attached call.) 4. Conduct focus groups on co-curricular effects on ILO x (data gathering: students; analysis: ILO Subcommittee). 5. Subcommittees and 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement closing the loop activities for ILO x based on year two findings. 2. Synthesize recent CAPR annual and 5-year review reports for evidence of closing the loop on ILO x. 3. Prepare for next three-year assessment loop for ILO x.

	working groups report assessment results, analysis, and closing the loop recommendations to CAPR and CIC.	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Assessment Schedule—Phase 1 Pilot

Start Year	ILOs	WASC Core Competencies
2012-2013	Critical thinking	Critical thinking
2013-2014	Writing Diversity	Writing
2014-2015	Ethics	Information Literacy
2015-2016	Oral Communication	Oral Communication
2016-2017	Collaboration	Quantitative Reasoning
Continuous	Disciplinary knowledge (annual PLO assessment in programs)	Information literacy (annual assessment of lower-division library class)

ILOs:

Thinking and reasoning (critical, creative, quantitative)
 Communication (written, oral)
 Diversity (multicultural competencies, social justice)
 Collaboration (leadership)
 Sustainability (social responsibility, ethics)
 Disciplinary knowledge

WASC Core Competencies:

Critical thinking
 Information literacy
 Written communication
 Oral communication
 Quantitative reasoning

Alignment of General Education and Degree Program Learning Outcomes with ILO's

The long-term plan for ILO assessment also involves the alignment and assessment of both General Education and degree program learning outcomes with the ILO's. These two components are described below.

Alignment of ILO's with General Education Learning Outcomes

The General Education Subcommittee of CIC is responsible for developing and implementing the assessment plan for the GE learning outcomes. It is recommended that the long term plan should be to require courses that have GE approval be required to align one assignment and submit student work samples for GE learning outcomes that are aligned to ILO's on a schedule coordinated with the ILO assessment described above. (This process has already begun, with the assessment of the GE critical thinking learning outcome in conjunction with the critical thinking ILO assessment pilot project in 2013-2014.)

Alignment of ILO's with Program Learning Outcomes (PLO's)

As part of our commitment to continually improving our curriculum, all academic degree program learning outcomes (PLOs) will be aligned with the disciplinary knowledge ILO and at least two additional ILOs the program faculty select. A curriculum map showing these alignments will be presented in each program's assessment plan. (The quarter-to-semester conversion will provide programs with an opportunity to build ILO alignment into their PLO and curriculum development processes.)

The disciplinary knowledge ILO will be assessed through the program's ongoing program assessment process. For the two ILOs that each program faculty aligns with one of its PLOs, the program will identify an assignment in one or more relevant upper-division major courses to be sampled and assess student work according to the University's ILO assessment cycle described above. Programs may also choose to coordinate this assessment with their program assessment processes and timelines. Resources will be available in the Office of Educational Effectiveness Services to assist programs with the development of assignments, collection of student work, etc.

ILO Assessment Cycle —Phase II

Phase 1 plans were created based on structures and ideas that developed during the Critical Thinking Assessment Project, which began in 2012. Similarly, Phase 1 experiences will be used to develop a second general assessment loop. It is likely that Phase 2 will use similar committee structures, activities, time lines, etc. However, Phase 1 is a discovery process in a number of ways, and we may find that we need something very different for Phase 2.

ILO Assessment Cycle—Phase III

The dissemination of the results of the first two phases of ILO assessment is critical to closing the loop on each ILO assessment with a view to improvement. Dissemination will be widespread and initiated from Academic Affairs (AA), including Academic Programs and Graduate Studies (APGS), Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRADS), and Faculty Development (FD). Discussion will be fostered through FD workshops, and in the ILO and GE Subcommittees, campus assessment committees, and departments. Results in the form of data and preliminary analysis will be distributed through IRADS and APGS, and improvement initiatives will be developed through faculty efforts in various committees and departments.