**University 100 2017-2018 Annual Program Assessment Report**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to james.solomon@csun.edu, Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by September 28, 2018. 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 identify your department/program in the file name for your report.**

**College: Undergraduate Studies**

**Department: Academic First Year Experiences**

**Program: University 100**

**Assessment liaison: Susanna Eng-Ziskin**

**Report prepared by: Cheryl Spector, 9/28/18**

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

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

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

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 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
* 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, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

**3. Preview of planned assessment activities for 2018-19.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

# University 100 Assessment Report, Items 2 and 3: Overview for 2017-2018 and Preview for 2018-2019

## Why we chose to do what we did

Having spent the previous six years assessing one SLO per year, we decided to step back for a big-picture review of the course in 2017-2018. To make it clear to the faculty that the review would be comprehensive, we announced that we were “re-imagining University 100.”

In November 2016, we had already asked faculty informally for suggestions to improve the course, and we collected their responses in a document shared back to the faculty later that same month. Building on the 58 suggestions we received, Kim Henige and Lisa Riccomini (the course director and assistant director) hosted three formal faculty workshops during summer 2017 as part of our regular professional development series.

The end result was the identification of five core concepts for U100:

1. Personal Wellness/Self-Care
2. Civic & Community Engagement
3. Personal Responsibility to Self
4. Accountability to Others
5. Strategic Thinking

Participants in the faculty workshops also worked to identify and distribute new and existing course components (SLOs and assignments, for instance) under each of these five core concepts. Applying them to the course proved to be a daunting task that is still under way. It may require us to rethink the course description and SLOs, in which case it will be a multi-year process.

## Discussion: Option B “Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options” and Option C “Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options”

Based on our review of the past six years of assessment data, we concluded that University 100 students were meeting all six SLOs. In addition, our “re-imagining U100” meetings with the faculty offered a broad array of small but significant changes to the course that we have begun implementing while we consider whether a wholesale reworking of the course is advisable. The changes include

* establishing a clear distinction (for faculty) between required assignments (that all faculty agree to implement in the classroom) and optional assignments;
* thorough revision of the Canvas-based U100 Instructor’s Manual;
* re-creation of the 2016-2017 U100 student e-text (formerly on Versal) as a 2017-2018 Canvas course;
* creation of a new “instructor course outline” as a companion piece to the sample course syllabus;
* a new focus on pedagogy for the summer 2018 faculty workshops, which this year included one on transparent assignments and another on increasing student participation while maintaining control of the classroom; and
* the ongoing transfer of leadership to the new course director.

We also determined that it would be useful to revise our course assessment schedule, because we have learned what we can from our previous approach (assessing one SLO per year). Our revised process will focus instead on individual signature assignments, and the assessment instrument will ask faculty and students to gauge how well the given assignment fulfills selected course SLOs. In 2018-2019, we are assessing the Cultural Event Report in this way. We expect that the assessment results will help us continue our work on re-imagining the course.

## Diversity

We continue to invite all U100 faculty and all students to participate in each year’s assessment. In recent years, about two-thirds of U100 faculty have provided assessment data for their sections, and 60-73% of U100 students have participated by responding to assessment prompts given as part of the course.

## Other assessment-related information

We have recently learned that Institutional Research and the Office of Student Success Innovations conducted a retrospective analysis of students completing University 100 during the fall semesters of 2013, 2014, and 2015 to investigate the effect of the course on persistence (defined as third-term enrollment), grade point average at the end of year one, credit accumulation, and opportunity gaps (for underrepresented students, first generation students, and students who were Pell grant recipients). Though that report has not yet been published, one of the two principal authors described the results in some detail to the course director and the AFYE director. Key findings:

* there is no opportunity gap in University 100
* students taking University 100 persist to the third semester at higher rates than those who do not take the course
* students taking University 100 accumulate credits more rapidly than non-takers
* students taking University 100 have a higher GPA than non-takers

We have also been told that these findings are deemed statistically significant. We look forward to reading the published report.

## Preview of 2018-2019 assessment activities

For 2018-2019, we have created a new assessment instrument using Google forms to gather data about the Cultural Event Report assignment. In addition, we took this opportunity to make slight revisions to the Cultural Event Report assignment template.

We will continue discussing with the faculty how to continue improving University 100, and whether our traditionally incremental approach should be supplanted by a major overhaul.