FIVE PROFICIENCIES TASK FORCE REPORT

Spring 2013

Co-chairs 5 Proficiencies Task Force: Anne Marie Todd and Steve Branz

Report written by Anne Marie Todd

OVERVIEW

We envision this essay to address graduation proficiencies overall, drawing from what we know from assessment in the major in SJSU Studies courses. We also aim to focus on integrative program learning outcomes, what they are, how we assess them, and what we know about student mastery of proficiencies.

This essay asks us to assess the graduation proficiencies of our senior for these five areas:

> Information literacy
> Quantitative literacy
> Critical Thinking
> Oral Communication
> Written Communication

After the constitution of our task force in Spring 2012, we identified potential data sources for 5 proficiencies. Overall we concluded that SJSU does not assess the five proficiencies in a systemic way. We then developed and supported several pilot projects to gather data in these five areas and test methods to assess the 5 proficiencies in a programmatic way.

Pilot projects:

> Area R GEPA project (building on Area S GEPA project)
> Oral communication pilot project
> Information literacy assessment
> Program assessment: data analysis of program plans

This report includes descriptions and outcomes of these projects, notes about data sources and assessment processes and recommendations.

Separate, attached documents:

> Oral Communication Pilot Data
> Oral Communication Rubric

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

For a successful data collection regarding the five proficiencies, it is important to build sustaining innovative and inclusive assessment. This taskforce experience has led to the following conclusions:

Support structure for coordinated data collection is essential for university wide assessment.
Supportive culture of assessment is essential for data collection and meaningful WASC reporting. We need to address resistance to assessment on campus. The WASC teams are doing the work that no one else on the campus will do. If we do not change the culture on this campus, we will not be able to collect meaningful data about the quality and accountability of the education we offer.
All program plans should be assessed for five proficiencies. Program assessment will be critical to demonstrating the five proficiencies. Program planning guidelines should guide assessment. The campus should connect program planning with strategic planning to standardize program assessment. This essay should include explanation of the evolution in the process.
Need to survey existing SLOs and assessment data for undergraduate and graduate programs.
Need to draw from and feature existing data sources and planned assessment projects.
Oral Communication Recommendations
- o Recommend featuring College of Business Accreditation Reports regarding May 2013 assessment of oral communication.
- o Recommend a campus wide assessment of oral communication projects in Senior Seminar/Capstone courses across campus.

Written Communication Recommendations
- o Recommend intensive survey of existing data sources of student writing:
  - Writing Requirements Committee
  - Writing Center
  - AANAPISI writing grant projects
  - College of Business Writing Assessment: Development of working rubrics among COMM, LLD, ENG and COB 100W faculty. Assessment of 60 student papers with rigorous norming process.
  - Writing Across the Curriculum: Seek existing data with writing across the curriculum/100W classes.

Information Literacy Recommendations
- o Recommend launching 100W Assessment project campus wide Fall 2013 - Spring 2014: Needs WASC taskforce member to present to librarians who have 100W assignments in Summer 2013 and to contact 100W instructors for Fall 2013 to urge them to get their students to complete the survey. Need to have explicit campus-level support.
- o Recommend developing existing library data (InfoPower & Plagiarism)
- o Consider proposing revised greensheet policy from *recommending* library information be included on greensheets to *requiring* this information be included on greensheets.

Quantitative Literacy Recommendations
- o This as a hole in assessment data. Will have to come from GEPA and p0   yc   t

ORAL COMM PILOT PROJECT REPORT

Anne Marie Todd

Project Description

Because SJSU does not yet assess Oral Communication in a systematic way, we developed a pilot project is designed to assess how our graduating seniors have advanced their oral communication abilities beyond the basic skills learned in lower division courses.

In Spring 2012 and Fall 2012, we attempted to recruit faculty members teaching senior seminars in

Students upload the video to a secure website, where the video is unaffiliated with student names/ID. Videos will be viewed by outside evaluators who will score the video presentations as part of an assessment of SJSU students' proficiency in oral communication.

This was envisioned to be a simple request of students familiar with recording technologies and take about an hour of their time.

Technical Support

Students were to upload their speeches to Speech Studio, a software/website that enabled uploading of speeches and easy evaluation using rubrics. Technical support for the website was supplied by Cengage, publisher of the public speaking guide and developer of Speech Studio.

The Communication Center (Hugh Gillis Hall 229, http://commcenter.sjsu.edu/) was available to support students' recording of presentations. Students could make an appointment with a trained student coach who would help them record and upload their speech.

Recruitment Results

Initial emails to senior seminar/capstone course instructors in Spring 2012 revealed the need for more lead time for instructors to incorporate in the course.

A more robust recruitment effort in Fall 2012 involved:
- o Personal emails to 35 faculty teaching Senior Seminars/Capstone Courses (culled from the course schedule)
- o Email to UCCD with requests to forward to faculty
- o Follow-up emails responding to questions and concerns and to nonresponsive faculty

Eleven (11) faculty agreed to participate, with an anticipated 200+ student speeches to be recorded. Faculty represented 4 colleges (CASA, COB, COE, COSS).

Follow-up emails, phone calls to faculty who agreed to participate resulted in three (3) faculty actually participating (with 125 student speeches anticipated).

Public speaking booklets were sent to students in these three courses. Because these were high enrollment courses, not all students received booklets, thus not all students received access codes and instructions to Speech Studio.

Alternative arrangements were made for these students—who would upload to Dropbox or Youtube. Students with the Speech Studio booklets discovered that the listed access codes were inaccurate and they did not have access to the website. Cengage support was too late for students.

One instructor required students to upload (resulting in 15 speeches), another encouraged them to upload (resulting in 10 speeches), the third did not have students send him the video (resulting in 0 speeches).

Speech Collection Results

Students uploaded speeches via Dropbox and YouTube.

Accessible YouTube videos: 3 speeches, featuring 12 students. (Several student speeches on YouTube became unavailable; removed by user, marked private, or marked unavailable.)

Students speeches collected by Dropbox: 15 speeches, featuring 21 students

Technical issues reported included: videos downloading or buffering slowly, some unable to be paused without restarting the video.

Recording quality varied. Video quality was low: visually, particularly when audio and video were misaligned.

Inconsistency in recording made evaluation more difficult. Some students recorded presentation slides with a voiceover rather than their own images. Students recorded group speeches—not individual portions of group speeches.

Assessment Process

Evaluators recruited from Communication Studies Graduate Teaching Assistant and TA pool (experts in evaluating public speaking).

Agreed upon rubric developed by Jessica Kaven (SJSU COMM Studies Alumna), Professor and Chair, Cañada College (See Attached). This rubric best applies to presentations of sufficient length such that a central message is conveyed, supported by one or more forms of supporting materials and includes a purposeful organization. An oral answer to a single question not designed to be structured into a presentation does not readily apply to this rubric. The rubric worked well to grade a large quantity of speeches in a short amount of time.

**Note- we revised rubric to include whole integers, rather than half points – the COB follow-up assessment did this as well. **

Evaluators participated in assessment training to provide assessment instructions, discuss the rubric and calibrate assessment procedures.

Evaluators assessed speeches individually—recording three ratings per speech.

The pilot data are attached.

Recommendations

Recruitment

Impress on instructors the importance of recruitment for the purposes of WASC assessment. Responses from instructors who ended up not participating (other than the most typical—no response) included: reluctance to create more work for students, disinclination to add another syllabus requirement, concern that their students' would not meet project expectations, concern that students would not receive guidance beyond a booklet, and, perhaps most surprisingly, a belief that their students did not need extra practice and that the exercise seemed like a waste of time.

Recording & Uploading

Require students to record individual speeches (portions of group speeches) for easier assessment. Recorded group presentations are difficult to assess because reviewers must keep track of speakers.

If it must be group presentation, students should have an assigned speaking order, which is made known to the reviewers.

Students should appear in the video (slides with voiceover are not easy to evaluate). Film angle: Students should stand away from the camera, so upper body is visible (for evaluation of non verbal communication).

Students should use streamlined uploading site (i.e. youtube) or Canvas. so file formatting is not an issue. Ideally, develop a centralized hub with very easy access for students, instructors and evaluators (suggest Canvas). If using Canvas, rubric could be integrated into course, to make evaluation of a greater number of students easier.

Reviewer Process

Assessment process recommendations – for outside reviewers, set disciplinary expectations to contextualize assignments in the following categories for selecting a meaningful topic and appropriate language – jargon. Also set assignment expectations so reviewers know what type of speeches evat `

Œ {   T   Ü   Ú } [c Ù [~   J

Plagiarism tutorial

Data collected from Fall 2003 to Spring 2012; the sample size ranges from 200 to 3500. Students scored high (80% or above) on questions 1-10, but below 55% on Q11 and Q12 so we received feedback from our student workers at King. We will use their comments to revise these 2 questions in the hope that students will perform better.

Data Mining tool

Campus instructors and librarians also partnered to develop a new data mining information literacy assessment tool. This tool can be used to collect data and guide creation of guidelines for more effective, outcomes-driven composition writing intensive classes (100W) in the majors and improved library instruction. This project requires standardized accessible 100W syllabi so they can be read by PDF reader. Requests to 100W coordinators for these materials were rebuffed, low participation from faculty prevented sufficient 100W materials for full testing and implementation. This is a potential source of data.

Ongoing Projects

Pilot project for 100w assessment

Pilot project for 100W assessment—library faculty who visit 100W classes to discuss library research assessed students' information literacy skills. Developed 15 standardized questions that have been tested and honed by library 100W faculty that they can choose from the list. Library does pre-test before presentation. Currently, a small sample size (no more than 100) of students participated from Engineering and Business. We need to analyze the data to assess how this pilot works. We will share this experience with other librarians who then will implement it in the fall. To support this effort, we have revised a set of standardized questions based on AAC&U IL rubrics for standards 1, 2, and 3. There is no need to assess standard 5 because we already have been collecting data with the Plagiarism tutorial. The campus will have to decide how to fully assess this standard from legal and ethical perspectives. AY 2011-2012, librarians have delivered 157 sessions of InfoLit lectures to 100w classes. We have been successful because of librarians working with department – sample size depends on participation. In order to have participation, up to instructors to require students to engage.
.
This pilot can launch campus wide Fall 2013 – Spring 2014: Needs WASC taskforce member to present to librarians who have 100W assignments – in Summer 2013. Then need to contact 100W instructors for Fall 2013 to urge them to get their students to complete the survey. Need to have some kind of support from campus level to encourage instructors.

Information literacy Faculty Development Program

This project is an extension of the InfoLit Symposium conducted in April 2012. (See related materials http://libguides.sjsu.edu/content.php?pid=68667&sid=3724221) Twenty-one (21) professor/librarian

pairs attended the symposium, library faculty attempted a follow-up survey last week, only 6 responded to the survey (one of them is a test). Even though the sample is very small, the outcomes are very positive. The challenge is how to implement this practice across the campus. At the WASC Core Competencies retreat, WASC task force members and librarians developed an action plan for developing this program:

1) Goals of Action Plan
   a. Expand campus efforts in integrating and assessing information literacy into curricula.
   b. Increase support for best practices in information literacy assignment development and assessment.
   c. Showcase campus partnerships in information literacy between teaching and library faculty.
2) Actions
   a. Document the history and gather assessment data of this project for university assessment (WASC). Gather assessment data from library information literacy project and from departments for inclusion in university assessment efforts.
   b. Showcase Event
      i. Co-sponsored by Library and Center for Faculty Development and Undergraduate Studies or Academic Affairs
      ii. Early adopters showcase models of excellence in assignments and assessment. Cross-pollinate best practices on campus and develop a faculty learning community around information literacy.
   c. Communication Strategies & Outreach
      i. Campus meetings
         1. Departmental promotion by faculty involved in info lit efforts. Share assignments and greensheets.
         2. Info literacy brown bags. Align IL standards and AAC&U rubrics with program learning outcomes.
         3. UCCD (Chairs' Council) and Deans' Council, College meetings.
      ii. Develop ongoing web presence
         1. Promote and increase internal links between campus efforts
         2. Share models of excellence.
         3. Increase partnerships between library faculty and teaching faculty.
   d. RECOMMENDATION: Consider proposing revised greensheet policy from *recommending* library information be included on greensheets to *requiring* this information be included on greensheets.

Program Assessment

Anne Marie Todd

Data Mining Tool

Under the direction of Debra Caires, a group of 9 graduate and undergraduate students in Computer Science developed a data mining tool to evaluate program plans. The project focused on developing an online application/tool that reads each college departmental program plans, read these documents via OCR and using a java application, searches certain keywords, counting the frequency each word appears. A list of key words was developed to get at each of the five proficiencies (see attached table). This application/program is similar to a resume scanner (ie: resuscan) that scans each documents or pdfs. In addition we need a feature that search for multiple keywords and, with the use of Google analytics, separate the departments to their respectable proficiency based on the keywords. This project developed a program that reads in documents and pdf using java and looked for a way to use Google drive to
ng to   t   dC   rogM

General Education Program Assessment

Spring 2013 Report

Anne Marie Todd and Steve Branz

Model

Modeled after a successful pilot project in 2010 in which three

AREA S GEPA Report

Spring 2011
Scot Guenter, Matthew Masucci, Wendy Ng, Anne Marie Todd

1. Intro

SLOs
We evaluated AAC&U LEAP SLOs of : Inquiry & Analysis, Critical Thinking & Integrative Learning, and SJSU Studies Area S: Self Society & Equality in the United States, Learning Objective 1: describe how identities (i.e. religious, gender, ethnic, racial, class, sexual orientation, disability, and/or age) are shaped by cultural and societal influences within contexts of equality and inequality.

Courses & Assignments
Assignment S (for assessing SLO 1, Inquiry and Analysis, and Critical Thinking) was an essay assignment from AMS/HUM 169: The American Dream.

Assignment M (for assessing SLO 1, Inquiry and Analysis, and Critical Thinking) was a research paper assignment from KIN 101: Sport in America.

Assignment W (for assessing SLO 1, Inquiry and Analysis, and Critical Thinking) was a research paper assignment from SOC 162: Race and Ethnic Relations

Assignment A: Integrative learning: assignment assessed was a short essay question on the final exam of COMM/ENVS/GEOL/HUM/METR 168W: G Æ

Assessment: Reading diverse assignments from several classes of Area S was informative regarding the

Findings
For this rubric, we seem to have a shared understanding of the intellectual process covered by this rubric regardless of discipline. This rubric covers the major steps in a research paper or project and this is why we had convergence on a lot of our evaluations.

2.3 Critical Thinking (AAC&U Leap)

Strengths (what we liked about the rubric/assessment of assignment)
Rubric: Good differentiation between areas on spectrum. Provides basic elements for evaluating critical thinking.

Assessment: This assessment process was very instructive in terms of how we evaluate the process of comparative analysis, and also how we develop assignments that clarify our expectations that students demonstrate advanced critical thinking skills.

Weaknesses (or what we didn't like about the rubric/assessment of assignment)
Rubric: "Influence of context and assumptions" category is a bit hard to work with, not sure our assignments ask for this. Assessors noticed after the fact the fine print that encouraged us to assign a "zero" for projects that failed to meet the basic requirements of the assignment. This is problematic because we inferred that "one" was a failing grade.

Assessment: This one required very careful interpretation of the papers, because our assignments did not address critical thinking explicitly. Some assignments lend themselves better to this than others.

Findings
We found convergence on this rubric. There is not the big spread of Area S, SLO 1. Most of the ratings fall within 2-3 range, and assessors found agreement in many categories with ¾ or 4/4 assessors agreeing. In our meetings, we found this rubric the most effective in evaluating the papers with the exception of distinguishing at what level "capstone" emerges.

2.4 Integrative Learning (AAC&U Leap)

Strengths (what we liked about the rubric/assessment of assignment)
Rubric: The "reflection and self-assessment" component is crucial to students' long term education perceptions, so it needs to be introduced somewhere, and it makes sense for AAC&U to put it here.

Assessment: Fun to evaluate for integration of concepts. The random sample provided a diversity of student work. The assessment of "reflexive" and "personal experience" categories of the rubric provided numerous interpretations of what are appropriate reflexive responses.

Weaknesses (or what we didn't like about the rubric/assessment of assignment)