

University Summary Report: Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership Assessment of Student Learning for Graduate Programs

December 18, 2023, version 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

[Institutional Learning Outcomes \(ILOs\)](#) are those learning outcomes that are expected of every graduate of the institution, both undergraduate and graduate, and are closely aligned with [General Education](#) requirements. ILO Assessment follows the [ILO Long Term Assessment Plan](#) which aligns the assessment schedule for undergraduate, graduate, and the [GE Long-Term Assessment Plan](#).

Following the ILO Long Term Assessment schedule, Cal State East Bay gathered recent student learning data to support the assessment of the University's Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership Institutional Learning Outcome. These data are intended to provide additional context for existing "Closing the Loop" academic review discussions, analysis, and decision making to improve student learning.

Overview of Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership

Graduate students would be expected to have mastered general Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills as part of their undergraduate degree. Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership goals in graduate programs would then be aimed at developing and mastering discipline-specific skills such as facilitating the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning and growth of all students, working collaboratively to design a professional development experience for all school staff, or collaborating with fellow nurses, nurse managers, and various co-workers and engaging in the practice of leadership. Development of these discipline-specific Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills is completed within major courses in a student's degree major and through engagement in co-curricular activities at the university. Students who have not mastered general Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills prior to admission may address that deficiency by completing major-specific courses incorporating Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership in programs where those courses are available.

METHODS

CSUEB Academic Senate policy requires that each graduate program align to at least two university ILOs, as specified in the ILO Long-Term Assessment Plan. All graduate programs have submitted ILO-PLO mappings to indicate the ILOs to which they would align, and these alignments are available on the College assessment web pages.

Due to the wide variation in graduate program goals, each aligned graduate program was asked to specify a rubric to be used to assess the Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO. Programs could choose to use the university rubric developed to assess undergraduate work, modify the university rubric, develop their own discipline-specific rubric, or use a rubric specified by an outside accrediting agency. This process is in contrast to the assessment of ILOs in the undergraduate programs where a common university rubric is used to assess all undergraduate work across all programs for each ILO.

Each aligned graduate program identified one or more graduate courses in which the ILO was to be assessed, and the instructor of the course was asked to identify or develop an assignment that could be effectively used for assessment purposes. Individual programs decided how many samples they would gather in each assessed course and also identified faculty members responsible for applying the specified rubrics to generate the assessment data. The results of the assessment efforts were provided in each program's annual report to the Academic Senate [Committee on Academic Planning and Review \(CAPR\)](#) and to the [Office of Graduate Studies](#).

Assessment of Graduate Level Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO Student Work 2022- 2023

Seven of the thirty-five graduate programs at CSUEB chose to align one or more of their Program Learning Outcomes with the Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO and hence participated in assessment of that ILO in 2022-2023. Programs from three of the four CSUEB colleges were represented.

Table 1. Numbers of programs aligned by college for Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO 2022-23.

College	Programs Represented	# Programs Aligned to Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO
CBE	None	0
CEAS	Educational Leadership Reading and Literacy Special Education	3
CLASS	Healthcare Administration Interaction Design and Interactive Art	3

	Music	
CSCI	Nursing	1

No common process was specified for collecting or assessing data. Again, some programs were subject to assessment requirements from outside accrediting organizations. Others intended to gather data from small available samples of students completing theses, or from courses with large enrollment and multiple sections. As a result, each program was asked to specify their own assessment process and describe the process when reporting their results. Some programs assessed assignments from all students in an assessed class, and others chose a small number randomly. Most programs used a single assessor to assess each assignment.

In an effort to provide assessment results that could be compared directly with those from undergraduate programs, a project was piloted in 22-23 allowing graduate programs to follow the same assessment process and use the same university rubric as undergraduate programs. One program, Interaction Design and Interactive Art joined the pilot.

Student Survey

Due to the complexity of assessing Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills in the classroom, the university chose to conduct a survey of Cal State East Bay students to provide them with the opportunity to self-report on their Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership experiences. This survey provided the data for Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership assessment of undergraduate programs. Fortuitously, graduate students were also included in the university survey, allowing for some comparison between skill levels assessed within the disciplines and self-reported skill levels. The [survey questions](#) address the Teamwork and Leadership criteria of the ILO including where skills were learned and how they were applied.

RESULTS

Assessment of Graduate Level Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO Student Work 2022-2023

Student Performance

The results of the assessment from each graduate program were specified based upon the rubric that they used. Four programs used the university ILO rubric for assessing undergraduate programs, while the remainder developed their own rubrics or used the ones required by their accrediting bodies. The variations in rubric criteria and the number of criteria may exemplify variation in the outcomes specified by the graduate programs at CSUEB in terms of Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills or may be the result of discipline-specific terminology and proposed assessment methods in specifying those outcomes. Unfortunately,

results from five programs were not available for analysis due to participation in the assessment pilot, suspension of the program, participation in program five-year review, failure to collect student artifacts for assessment, or inability to extract Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership assessment results from combined measures that were reported.

Table 2. Characterization of Rubrics for Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO Assessment

College	Program	Rubric	# Criteria	Scale
CBE				
	None			
CEAS				
	Educational Leadership	University	4	1-4
	Reading and Literacy	Discipline-specific	5	1-4
	Special Education	University	4	1-4
CLASS				
	Healthcare Administration	Discipline-specific	4	1-4
	Interaction Design and Interactive Art	University	4	1-4
	Music	N/A	N/A	N/A
CSCI				
	Nursing	University	4	1-4

Given the variation in criteria used for assessment, direct comparison is problematic. That said, all programs have a common goal of measuring various aspects of proficiency in Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills. As such, there appears to be a degree of commonality in the criteria with many programs using at least a number of criteria similar to the university rubric criteria. In the absence of a mapping from discipline-specific criteria to university rubric criteria, which might allow for detailed comparisons on a per-criteria basis, a rough comparison was completed using the following method. Scores were averaged across criteria on a per-program basis, rescaled to a 1-4 scale, and then averaged across all programs in a college, and finally across all programs in the university. One might interpret these numbers as estimates of how programs themselves see the proficiency levels of their students, where various programs may hold different expectations as to the manner in which proficiency may be demonstrated by their students.

The results of the assessment of Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership performance for the Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO on a per-program basis ranged between 3.6 to 3.76 on a 1-4 scale. The interpretation of the ranking values for the university rubric is given below. Due to the small number of participating programs, only a university average is given.

Table 3. Average score on all Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership criteria on scale of 1-4

	University	CBE	CEAS	CLASS	CSCI
Average score	3.68	N/A	-	-	-

1 – Major Gaps 2 – Some Gaps 3 – Competent 4 – Fully Competent

Perhaps more useful are some themes that emerged throughout the ILO assessment reports.

- Most programs were satisfied with the Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skill proficiency of their students across most of the criteria that they assessed.
- While proficiency scores were generally high, programs suggested concrete plans for improving them further, many of which were already in the process of being implemented.
- In all cases, programs which identified concerns specified that those concerns could and would be addressed within the programs themselves. This is in contrast to comments made when reviewing results of the Written Communication ILO assessment from 2018-2019 where many programs suggested solutions that would need to be implemented at the University level.
- Several programs experienced difficulties mapping accreditation organization rubrics and results to address the university ILOs or in aligning their PLO assessment schedule with the university ILO assessment schedule.

Program Feedback Highlights for Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership

Highlights of feedback from programs which aligned to the Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO, taken from their ILO assessment reports, included:

Example Successes

- “In the spring the same cohort scored 21.6 out of 24 points indicating that they have successfully completed a scholar-practitioner research project on leadership for social justice in educational settings.”
- “Data from the assessments indicate that candidates are successfully meeting the Program Standards, Teaching Performance Expectations, and Program Learning Outcomes.”
- “In general, the curriculum design supports achievement of student learning objectives, program learning goals and the University’s institutional learning objectives.”

Example Challenges

- “Due to the challenges raised by the CoVid-19 pandemic, about 20% of the MS students were unable to complete all the data collection phases... As a result, these students modified their empirical research projects to semi-theoretical studies.”
- “Additionally, we recognize that some candidates require multiple opportunities for feedback. We also recognize that some candidates need additional support to remain engaged and participate in classes, including submitting assignments.”
- “Individual students will continue to show strengths and areas for improvement, and will need customized advising and academic support from their faculty members.”

University Survey Results

As described in the [University Summary Report](#), qualitative responses to the survey questions were grouped into topic areas and coded by ILO Subcommittee members. Again, both undergraduate and graduate students were surveyed. A dashboard provides the Teamwork and Leadership [student survey results](#).

PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE GRADUATE PROGRAM ILO ASSESSMENT CYCLES

In discussions with Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) members, and the Chair of the Committee on Academic Program Review, it became clear that it would be advantageous to further refine the guidelines for assessment of graduate programs. In addition to issues raised in the [22-23 Graduate ILO assessment report](#), additional issues that could be addressed include:

- Require that ILO assessment results be included in the truncated annual report required of programs undergoing five-year program review.
- For each program, identify the department member responsible for assessment.

DISCUSSIONS

SUGGESTIONS FOR COLLEGE AND GRADUATE ADVISORY COUNCIL DISCUSSIONS

Role of ILO Subcommittee

The ILO Subcommittee will review calibration results and faculty feedback in order to recommend potential changes to the Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO Rubrics and the ILO Assessment process for undergraduate work. Graduate programs currently using the university rubrics may then decide whether to adopt any proposed changes or move to a discipline-specific rubric.

Graduate Advisory Council meetings

Discussion of ILO assessment results will be placed on the agenda for the Spring 2024 Graduate Advisory Council meeting. Graduate coordinators will be asked to review results and discuss changes made to improve students learning, as well as evaluating the assessment process in order to add meaning to the results and help to improve processes for future assessment cycles.

College/Unit Discussions

Led by associate deans, each college/unit will decide their own approach to reviewing results and conducting discussions generally following the schedules outlined in ILO Long Term Assessment Plan and EEC Communication Plan focused on discussions in Fall of 2023 and implementation in Spring 2024. This includes reviewing those results that add meaning to their

discussions about improving student performance in Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills.

Support for College and Graduate Advisory Council Discussions

Please see the University Summary Report for contacts and potential meeting format. Possible additional graduate-specific discussion questions include:

1. How do results of graduate assessment compare to undergraduate assessment in departments with both undergraduate and graduate programs? Were results as expected?
2. Were there commonalities between programs in areas of student proficiency or gaps? Can common solutions for addressing gaps be suggested?
3. What is the importance of each criteria within a rubric? Should weights be assigned?
4. Are expectations for proficiency for similar criteria different between programs or colleges? Should they be?
5. Which Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership interventions are working well, and which are not, for graduate students in particular?
6. What else can be done to improve Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership skills?