**2019-2020 Annual Program Assessment Report Guide**

Please submit your report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean and Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by **September 30, 2020**. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please include this form with your report in the same file and identify your department/program in the file name. Please do not change the date on the form, and be sure to check that your report is ADA accessible.**

# College: Humanities

# Department: Liberal Studies

**Program:**

# Assessment liaison: Krystal Howard

1. **Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.**

**B. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.**

**C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.**

**D. \_\_\_x\_\_\_\_\_\_ Participated in the 2019-20 assessment of General Education Section D: Social Sciences and U.S. History and Government student learning outcomes**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:

* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, application, or GE assessment) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options** **A, B, and/or C**, identify the GE learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include: e.g. SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes) and the creation or modification of new assessment instruments

1. **Preview of planned assessment activities for 2020-21.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

# Overview of Annual Assessment Activities 2019-2020

Liberal Studies completed two Assessment tasks this year: (1) Option A: Measurement of student work within program major/options (ITEP-Freshman, ITEP-Junior, and Pre-Credential Options) using the new SLOs and assessment related to those SLOs that were developed in the previous academic year, and (2) Option D: GE Assessment. We selected Option A because we wanted to test how the newly designed SLOs and assessment instruments functioned when applied to student work. We selected Option D because Liberal Studies has only previously participated in GE Assessment once, and we wanted to continue assessing GEs in a different course category (SUST) than last year (HUM) in order to add to our ongoing GE Assessment Plan. Each is detailed below.

Liberal Studies is a diverse program that serves many underrepresented students, so we focused on trying to capture a broad range of those specific student groups in our assessment activities for the year. When designing the Program SLOs, the department decided to include a framing statement with our SLOs, “The Liberal Studies Program at California State University, Northridge is committed to producing socially responsible, informed and engaged individuals who value diversity and:…” In so doing, we explicitly state that we aim to graduate students who value diversity, and this is further reflected in our assessment of students’ work in their area of specialization. We believe this sends a message from our department that increases a sense of belonging for students from underrepresented groups. It also urges all our faculty to frame their course design in a way that promotes inclusion and diversity.

# Option A: Measurement of Student Work Within Program/Major Options

In 2017-2018, the Liberal Studies program began developing new program SLOs and assessment instruments. In 2018-2019, these program SLOs and assessment instrument were finalized. As mentioned in previous years’ reports, Liberal Studies faces unique challenges because most of the courses that all of our students take are taught by faculty outside of Liberal Studies or lecturers. It has also been difficult to isolate an entry and exit point class for all three Teacher Preparation options (ITEP-Freshman, ITEP-Junior, and Pre-Credential), because depending upon their option, students take different courses.

After working out some initial issues with these elements, during the 2019-2020 academic year, we assessed the first of our new SLOs: SLO #3: “access, evaluate, and make use of a range of informational resources.” We decided to focus on the exit point course this year, so we asked all graduating students to choose a required major class from any time during their degree that they felt demonstrated that they met the SLO. Student submitted work from a variety of courses, some in Liberal Studies, some in Elementary Education, and some in their area of specialization (courses from English, Child and Adolescent Development, Queer Studies, Geology, Chicano/a Studies, etc.)

We employed a revised version of an assessment instrument developed in 2017-2018. See Appendix A: Assessment Instrument. We assessed students work based upon three categories: “access a range of informational resources,” “evaluate a range of informational resources,” and “make use of a range of informational resources.” Of the 105 graduating ITEP-Freshman, ITEP-Juniors, and Pre-Credential students, 98 students submitted essays for assessment. During the annual faculty retreat, we held a norming session for the tenure-track faculty where we could discuss expectations for each rating and approaches to assessment. The three tenure-track faculty in Liberal Studies were given the anonymous essays of 30 students (approximately 1/3 of student submissions), 10 from each major option. We then averaged the responses of the three faculty to assign a score to each student.

Students’ average scores across the three categories ranged from 2 to 5. The average student score for all three categories was 3.8 (76%). The average student score for “access a range of informational resources” was 3.9 (78%), for “evaluate a range of informational resources” was 3.8 (76%), and for “make use of a range of informational resources” was 3.5 (70%). This means that all students assessed were able to at least access and evaluate around two or more informational resources, as well as appropriately utilize at least two resources for the purpose of the specific assignment. Furthermore, students exiting the program are, overall, at or above the 70% benchmark rate of meeting or exceeding expectations in the SLO.

ITEP-Freshman students’ average score for all three categories was 3.8 (76%). The average ITEP-Freshman student score for “access a range of informational resources” was 3.8, for “evaluate a range of informational resources” was 3.9, and for “make use of a range of informational resources” was 3.6. ITEP-Junior students’ average score for all three categories was 3.9 (78%). The average ITEP-Junior student score for “access a range of informational resources” was 4.0, for “evaluate a range of informational resources” was 4.3, and for “make use of a range of informational resources” was 3.3. Pre-Credential students’ average score for all three categories was 3.7 (74%). The average Pre-Credential student score for “access a range of informational resources” was 3.9, for “evaluate a range of informational resources” was 3.8, and for “make use of a range of informational resources” was 3.5. These scores indicate that in general, our students are able to access, evaluate, and make use of informational resources.

# Option D: Assessment of General Education Section D: Social Sciences and U.S. History and Government SLOs

This was Liberal Studies’s second attempt at GE assessment. While last academic year, we looked at HUM 105 for the Arts and Humanities SLO, this year, we looked at SUST 300 for the Social Sciences and US History and Government SLO. We decided to assess the GE SLO “demonstrate understanding of how social problems impact individuals, communities and societies.” The instructor for this course identified that the weekly “practical application” writing assignment as the best way to assess this SLO, and we found a short-answer, open ended question in this assignment which asked students “Which social/environmental justice issue did you identify with the most and why? AND How does this issue relate to sustainability.”

The three tenure-track faculty in Liberal Studies were given the anonymous answers of the students who responded to this weekly writing assignment. Because we were measuring a GE competence, we use da basic three-point scale to assess the responses:

3 Yes, the author demonstrates competence on this SLO

2 The author demonstrates limited competence on this SLO

1 The author does not demonstrate competence on this SLO

We then averaged the responses of the three faculty to assign a score to each student. This simple scale was used in part because the weekly writing question did not provide clear guidelines for the response, so the length and detail students responded with varied greatly. We could not quantify detail into a scale as a result, and thus employed the simple scale.

Students’ average scores ranged from 1.66 to 3, and the average of all students assessed was 2.53 (84%). This means that all students assessed had at least limited competence in the SLO. The most frequent average scores students received were 3 and 2.33, so most students demonstrated competence or at least limited competence. Of note is that the most frequent individual score given by faculty was a score of 3, so many students were assessed to be competent at the SLO. The score of 3 was given two times as often as the next most common score, which was 2. What we learned from this process is that in a 300-level GE course, as opposed to a 100-level GE course, students are more likely to demonstrate competence in the SLO. This is likely because they have had more experience in other courses across their academic career.

# Preview of Planned Assessment Activities for 2020-2021

The College of Humanities is conducting a College-wide assessment during the 2020-2021 academic year in lieu of program assessment.

# APPENDIX A: Assessment Instrument

Student are able to access, evaluate, and make use of a range of informational resources.

Students are able to:

Access a range of informational resources

5 Evidence of three or more appropriate and relevant resources

4 Evidence of two appropriate and relevant resources

3 Evidence of one appropriate and relevant resources

2 Evidence of some attempt at appropriate and relevant resource

1 No evidence of appropriate and relevant resources

Evaluate a range of informational resources

5 Evidence of three or more credible resources

4 Evidence of two credible resources

3 Evidence of one credible resources

2 Evidence of some attempt credible resource

1 No evidence of credible resources

Make use of a range of informational resources

5 Appropriately, clearly, and thoroughly utilizes at least two resources for the purpose of the specific assignment

4 Appropriately and clearly utilizes at least two resources for the purpose of the specific assignment

3 Appropriately utilizes at least two resources for the purpose of the specific assignment

2 Limited, inappropriate, or cursory use of at least two resources; or student uses only one resource for the purpose of the specific assignment

1 Does not make use of resources for the purpose of the specific assignment