

2012 ITL Summer Institute Report

Campus: SF State

Team Lead Submitting Report: Trevor R. Getz

What were your goals for the workshop?

Our expressed goal for this workshop was to advance our sense of what the assessment process will be for the new GE as a program by identifying strategies we can use and processes by which these strategies might be debated, modified, and adopted by the campus as a whole.

We had an additional goal –not explicitly expressed –of identifying the program outcomes for our new baccalaureate out of our campus baccalaureate goals and LEAP outcomes.

Which goal(s) do you believe that you and your team achieved?

Our team was very efficient in developing a draft baccalaureate outcomes document that we can share with the campus. We plan to refine it further this summer and then share it with the Baccalaureate Requirements Committee (BRC) and the academic senate.

We have also begun to provisionally develop a rotating GE review strategy. We identified the strengths, weaknesses, and applicability of several tools to our own program. We are in the process of developing a report for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the BRC. The BRC will make assessment one of its primary foci this semester.

How will your team implement some of the tools in the three workshops to assess your GE program?

We have begun to put together several draft assessment plan proposals for the GE program. The first of these would be to implement a pilot program with a select group of students. This group would probably be a program that uses e-portfolios – either Health Education or Liberal Studies. Our pilot strategy in this case would be to combine several strategies for evaluation at the capstone level. These could include a survey of graduating students, assessment of e-portfolios for evidence of a single program outcome using a rubric adapted from the LEAP value rubrics to our own program, and possibly assessment of a signature assignment.

We also discussed the more difficult strategy of utilizing a 4-point analytical rubric to assess a program outline at several points in a student's trajectory at SF State. For example, we might adapt a written communication rubric so that a "4" would represent the level a student should achieve at the end of the baccalaureate program, a "3" the level students should have achieved at the end of their Written English Communication program, etc. We could then evaluate select groups of students at both of these points. To establish a baseline, we might also evaluate incoming students.

What obstacles does your team see hindering implementation of your plan?

Our new baccalaureate program, including our new GE program, will not even be fully implemented until Fall 2014. For that reason, we have some time to develop our assessment program. We are in the process of completing the important step of converting our baccalaureate goals to baccalaureate and GE program outcomes. We have already begun the process of evaluating all of our GE courses for specific student learning outcomes related to the baccalaureate goals/outcomes. Therefore, we are in precisely the right position to begin developing our assessment policies and processes prior to the implementation of the program.

Having said that, we anticipate a number of problems in the development and implementation of assessment for the new GE program. The first obstacle is to win support for our draft outcomes and assessment strategy from the senate and other faculty stakeholders. If we hope to use e-portfolios, especially, we will need to identify faculty willing to work with us to use this tool for assessment. The second obstacle is finding the necessary financial or other support from program leadership and administrators to reward faculty who involve themselves in the assessment process. The third major obstacle is identifying a pilot groups for the first round of assessment.