

Global Awareness Assessment

Fall 2018

Method:

Global Awareness was assessed through the collection of samples of student work. Sixteen courses were chosen for the assessment (see Table 1), which comprised 117 individual classes. These courses were selected for inclusion based upon course outcome mapping to the Global Awareness General Education Outcome. A stratified random sampling method was used to select the courses for this semester's assessment. Two courses were randomly selected from each department from a list of all of the courses mapped to the outcome from that department's programs. In this way, each department will be represented by two courses in the assessment. Three students from each of the included classes were randomly selected for assessment, for a total of 351 students.

Instructors were initially notified of their class's inclusion in the assessment with an email sent within the first month of the semester. This notice informed the instructors of the outcome that was to be assessed, and that they would be asked to submit a sample of student work that demonstrated the skills represented in that outcome. They were further asked to await specific instructions in an additional, forthcoming email notice. The second notice was sent two weeks following the initial email and contained instructions for submitting the pieces of student work along with the names of their selected students. A reminder email that again contained the instructions and student names was sent approximately a month and a half later. This email also included, as an attachment, the rubric that would be used to score the student artifacts in order to assist instructors in choosing an appropriate assignment to submit for the assessment. Two weeks prior to the due date, a second reminder email was sent to instructors whom had not yet made a submission.

Instructors were asked to send samples of work from the selected students that demonstrated the criteria of the outcome, as outlined in the rubric. Work could be submitted electronically or in paper form. If work could not be submitted, instructors were asked to indicate the reason for the lack of submission, such as the student dropped the course or did not complete the selected assignment. Instructors were also asked to submit a copy or brief description of the assignment

in order to assist the assessors in evaluating the student work. Both digital and paper artifacts submitted by faculty members were collected by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. All artifacts were logged and anonymized upon submission.

The rubric for the assessment was developed by the College-wide Assessment Committee (CWAC) by examining examples of rubrics used by other colleges and universities for similar outcomes. Input was also solicited from the faculty at large. A draft rubric was written by CWAC through discussions of the information pooled from these data sources, and then feedback was again solicited from the faculty. The rubric was further refined based upon the feedback, and then finalized.

At the time of this assessment, the College was transitioning to a new assessment management system. Therefore, the evaluation of the artifacts could not be conducted in the online juried assessment function in the manner of previous assessments. Instead, a juried assessment of the artifacts was conducted in a shared Google Drive folder, with each jury member recording scores for their pool of assigned artifacts in an Excel file.

Table 1. Courses selected for assessment of Global Awareness

Course	Number of Classes
ART 105	5
COMM 253	2
EDUC 210	3
ENGL 206	1
FRCH 102	1
GEOG 201	10
GP 205	1
HIST 102	9
HUM 101	20
HUM 115	1
HUM 201	14
MGMT 201	26
MUS 104	3
PHIL 200	12
SPAN 102	5
SPAN 201	5

Results:

Artifacts were submitted for 222 students (62.9%). Artifacts could not be collected from 42 (18.9%) of the selected students because the students either dropped the course or did not turn in the assignment that was chosen for assessment. Artifacts for 15 students (6.8%) were not submitted because instructors reported that they did not have an assignment suitable for the assessment. The remaining missing artifacts (74 (21.0%)) could not be accounted for.

Each of the 222 submitted artifacts were assigned to two of the eight assessors in the jury pool for assessment, resulting in an expected total of 444 scores. However, several of the submitted artifacts were found to be written in Spanish. These artifacts were redistributed for assessment among a group of Spanish-speaking assessors, with each of these artifacts also being scored by two assessors. Rubric scores for the assessed students are shown in Table 2. Please note that the total number of artifacts assessed for each criterion does not equal the expected total because missing scores were eliminated.

Table 2. Frequency table of rubric scores for all assessed students

Criteria	3-Advanced	2-Established	1-Developing	0-Entry	NA	Mean (SD)
Cultural Self-Awareness	22(5.12%)	72(16.74%)	77(17.91%)	16(3.72%)	243(56.51%)	1.53(.81)
Cultural World Views	58(13.33%)	130(29.89%)	92(21.15%)	15(3.45%)	140(32.18%)	1.78(.82)
Diverse Societies	42(9.72%)	105(24.31%)	84(19.44%)	34(7.87%)	167(38.66%)	1.58(.91)

Note: NA responses are not included in criteria mean calculations

Mean scores for all criteria fell between the “developing” and “established” score categories. Of these, the mean for the Cultural World Views criterion was the highest, with a mean of 1.78 (.82). The mean for the Cultural Self-Awareness criterion was the lowest, with a mean of 1.53 (.81).

A significant limitation for this assessment was the large number of Not Applicable scores given to all criteria. Not Applicable scores were given to almost half (42.4%) of all artifacts across

criteria. For the Cultural Self-Awareness criterion, over half (56.72%) of scores given were Not Applicable. Assessors noted that many of the submitted artifacts could not be assessed for at least one of the criteria (most often the Cultural Self-Awareness criterion), and commonly could not be assessed at all for the outcome. The submitted artifacts simply did not require students to demonstrate skills reflective of the outcome.