

The 2007/2008 Education Policies Committee Activity Report

Steve Cox
Chris Darr
Nancy Greenwood
Deb Horoho
Gail MacKay
Barbara Sehr
Ellen Sigler

September 24, 2007

- Approved 7 courses that are new to our campus but already in the I.U. catalog. The courses are listed below:

SBSC-A 307 *American Cultural History*
INFO-I 391 *Internship in Informatics Professional Practice*
EDUC- F 500 *Topical Exploration in Education*

FINA-F 471 *Sculpture III*
FINA-S 445 *Relief Print Media*
FINA-S 472 *Sculpture IV*
FINA-U 401 *Special Topics in Studio Art*

- Approved 1 course change request:

EDUC-E 525 *Advanced Curriculum Study I Early Childhood*

October 25, 2007

- Approved one course new to the Indiana University system. The course is listed below:

INFO-I 213 *Web Site Design and Development*

- Approved 1 course new to our campus but already in the I.U. catalog. The course is listed below:

EDUC-P 255 *Educational Psychology for Middle and Secondary Teachers*

November 9, 2007

- Approved 1 course new to our campus but already in the I.U. catalog. The course is listed below:

SPCH-C 444 *Political Communication*

- Approved 4 course change requests:

- AHLT-R 481 *Clinical Practicum in Vascular Imaging*
- AHLT-R 482 *Clinical Practicum in Computed Tomography*
- AHLT-R 483 *Clinical Practicum: MRI*
- AHLT-R 484 *Clinical Practicum: Ultrasound*

November 19, 2007

- Approved 1 course new to our campus but already in the I.U. catalog. The course is listed below:

FINI-T 320 *Video Art*

- Approved 2 course change requests:

EDUC-E 490 *Research in Elementary Education: Internship in Elementary Education*

EDUC-E 490 *Research in Elementary Education: Internship in Early Childhood Education*

December 7, 2007

- Approved 1 course change request:

NMCM-N 395 *Independent Study in New Media Communications*

January 28, 2008

- Approved three courses new to the Indiana University system. The courses are listed below:

NMCM-N320 *Video Production*

NMCM-N213 *Web Site Design and Development*

BUS-F494 *International Finance*

February 25, 2008

- In Faculty Senate – Proposed and passed “Policy On Transfer Credit From An Associate’s College Applied To An Indianan University Baccalaureate Degree”.

March 18, 2008

- Approved two courses new to the Indiana University system. The courses are listed below:

BUS-J411 *Small Business Management and Entrepreneurship*

BUS-L406 *Employment Problems and the Law*

- Approved 1 course change request (title and description):

NMCM-N315 *Web Usability and Information Architecture* (this is the new title)

- Approved 3 courses that are new to our campus but already in the I.U. catalog. The courses are listed below:

BUS-S415 *Enterprise Resource Planning*
 BUS-S307 *Data Management*
 BUS-S310 *Systems Analysis and Design*

April 8, 2008

- Approved one course new to the Indiana University system. The course is listed below:

BUS-S480 *Professional Practice in Computer Information Systems*

April 28, 2008

- Approved two courses new to the Indiana University system. The courses are listed below:

FINA-U370 *2D Animation*
 NMCM-N370 *Animation for Integration Media*

Throughout the Year

Campus-Wide General Education Requirements

(Approved by Faculty Senate on March 24, 2008 for implementation Fall 2009)

Note: Total hours will typically be 41 or 42. With the exception of courses jointly listed under Sections I and II, no course can be used twice to satisfy multiple requirements. Some courses may have prerequisites. Students should consult with their advisor for more information. Courses taught by adjuncts must be assigned a full-time faculty member to participate in the initial creation of the components to the learning outcomes and to document how the components will be delivered and assessed. A full-time faculty member or administrator must assist in assuring that adjunct faculty members fulfill their assessment obligation.

<p>I. <u>Communication Skills</u> Requirement – Three required courses (total of 9 hours)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will read critically 2. Students will write effectively 3. Students will listen effectively 4. Students will speak effectively 5. Students will use technology appropriately to support communication 	<p>ENG-W131 (not required if student places into ENG-W132) ENG-W132 SPCH-S121</p>
<p>II. <u>Information Literacy</u> No incremental requirement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will determine the nature and extent of information needed 2. Students will access the needed information effectively and efficiently 3. Students will evaluate information and its sources critically 4. Students will identify ethical, economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the access and use of information 5. Students will use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose 	<p>Satisfied by ENG-W131, ENG-W132, SPCH-S121 above</p>

<p>III. Quantitative Literacy Requirement – Choose from one of three options (total of 3 – 6 hours at the core level)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will draw inferences from mathematical models 2. Students will interpret empirical results 3. Students will represent mathematical information symbolically 4. Students will represent mathematical information graphically 5. Students will use algebraic methods to solve problems, using technology when appropriate 6. Students will use graphical methods to solve problems, using technology when appropriate 7. Students will use fundamental statistical information 	<p>Option 1 MATH-M118 or MATH-M119 or MATH-M215 <u>and</u> a statistics course at the major level (ECON-E270, MATH-M366, MATH-K310, PSY-K300, EDUC-M440, NURS-H365)</p> <p>Option 2 A new course in applied mathematics developed by the math faculty in consultation with the Educational Policy Committee to be first delivered in the spring of 2010. This course will have M117 as a prerequisite and will have statistics content.</p> <p>Option 3 Students pursuing the B.A. in Mathematics will satisfy the statistics requirement through MATH M366 or through an independent study project that will be assessed on the General Examination that is required to earn the degree.</p>
<p>IV. Critical Thinking Requirement – One course from the list (total of 3 hours)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will recognize issues that have alternative interpretations 2. Students will compare the perspectives of others to their own 3. Students will assess the quality of supporting evidence 4. Students will assess the implications and consequences that result from proposed conclusions 	<p>PSY-P211 COAS-S400 PHIL-P150 ENG-L202 SPCH-S336 SOC-S340 BUS-J401 SPEA-V379, SPEA-J201 NURS-S470 NMCM-N315 INFO-I303 EDUC-P250, EDUC-P251, EDUC-P255, EDUC-P249</p>
<p>V. Cultural Diversity Requirement – One course from the list – courses are required to satisfy at least two of the three learning requirements (total of 3 hours)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will demonstrate knowledge about diverse cultures and societies 2. Students will analyze cultural patterns in terms of ethnicity, class, gender, age, or religion 3. Students will analyze the interconnectedness of global and local concerns 	<p>SOC-S100 SOAS-I100*, SOAS-F200* SPCH-S302 , SPCH-S427 EDUC-M300 BUS-D301 SPEA-V130, SPEA- J355 Any 200-level or above foreign language course NURS-S485 INFO I202</p>

<p>VI. Ethics and Civic Engagement Requirement – One course from the list – courses are required to satisfy at least two of the three learning requirements (total of 3 hours)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will identify the key elements and approaches to ethical situations and issues 2. Students will identify the benefits of making informed judgments with regard to individual and group conduct 3. Students will identify the benefits of civic engagement 	<p>SPCH-S223, SPCH-S233 PHIL-P100, PHIL-P140, PHIL-P242, PHIL-P342 EDUC-H340 BUS-L201 SPEA-V170, SPEA-J101 NURS-S472</p>
<p>VII. Social and Behavioral Science Requirement – One 3 credit hour course from each of the two areas (total of 6 hours)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will explain the methods of inquiry used by social or behavioral scientists 2. Students will explain how political or historical processes shape civilizations 3. Students will explain behavior using social or behavioral science concepts 4. Students will explain the factors that influence how different societies organize themselves 	<p>Sociology and Psychology</p> <p>SOC-S100, SOC-S101, PSY-P103, PSY-P216 COAS-E104*</p> <hr/> <p>Political Science, History, and Economics</p> <p>POLS-Y103, POLS-Y217, POLS-Y219 HIST-H105, HIST-H106, HIST-H113, HIST-H114 ECON-E175, ECON-E200, ECON-E201, ECON-E202 COAS-E104*</p>
<p>VIII. Humanities and Arts Requirement – One 3 credit hour course from each of the two areas (total of 6 hours)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will articulate how intellectual traditions have helped shape present cultures 2. Students will evaluate various literary, philosophical, or historical works and approaches 3. Students will demonstrate aesthetic appreciation through the experience of fine or performing arts 	<p>Fine, Performing, and Communication Arts</p> <p>FINA-A101, FINA-A102, FINA-A108, FINA-F100, FINA-S200 HUMA-U101, HUMA-U102, HUMA-U103, HUMA-U305, MUS- M174, MUS-Z201, MUS-X001, MUS-X040, MUS-U320 THTR-T120 ENG-W203 COAS-E103*</p> <hr/> <p>Literature and Philosophy</p> <p>Any PHIL course except PHIL-P150 Any ENG-L course or ENG-E course COAS-E103*</p>
<p>IX. Physical and Life Sciences Requirement – One 5 credit hour course with a lab and one 3 credit hour course from a different area (total of 8 hours)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students will apply the methods natural scientists use to explore natural phenomena 2. Students will distinguish between scientific facts and other information 3. Students will demonstrate understanding of the basic scientific principles in the biological or physical 	<p>Biology (credit hours in parenthesis)</p> <p>BIOL-L100 (5), BIOL-L105 (5), BIOL-L270 (3), BIOL-L370 (3) ANAT-A215 (5) PHSL-P215(5) MICR-J200 (3) PLSC-B2035), PLSC-B364(5) COAS-E105*</p>

sciences 4. Students will recognize the interaction of humans and the natural environment	Physics (credit hours in parenthesis) PHYS-P100 (5), PHYS-P201(5) COAS-E105*
	Chemistry (credit hours in parenthesis) CHEM-C390 (3), CHEM-C100/C120 (5), CHEM-C101/ C121(5), CHEM-C105/C125 (5) COAS-E105*
	Geology (credit hours in parenthesis) GEOG-G315(3), GEOG-G107 (3) GEOL-G100 (5), GEOL-G133 (5), GEOL-G400 (3), GEOL-T312 (3) COAS-E105*

* To facilitate the graduation checklist process, records will need to be kept at the registrar level or the advisor level indicating the goal satisfied in any given semester (if any).

General Education Assessment Report 2006 - 2007

I. Brief Summary of Assessment Plan

Goal: Communication

1. Outcome: “Students Will Write Effectively.”
2. Components: As stated on the attached rubric.
3. Benchmark: None, as this was a pilot program and the first usage of the rubric at the campus level.

II. Assessment Methods

For 2005 - 2006, the Educational Policies Committee, as the Faculty Senate body which has purview over general education, created a pilot project to assess the outcome “Students will write effectively.” In Spring, 2007, IU Kokomo faculty who assigned a written paper of at least two pages in length were invited to volunteer a sample of those papers to be assessed. Fourteen faculty members (15 classes) agreed to volunteer. The CTLA director randomly selected 20% of the papers from each class (before they were graded). A total of 46 papers were collected: 10 from Freshmen, 11 from Sophomores, 8 from Juniors, 14 from Seniors, 2 from Non-degree students, and 1 from a graduate student. Nineteen (41%) of the papers came from transfer students.

CTLA removed all identifying information from the papers, which were then assessed by two English composition faculty members (Nadene Keene and Karla Stouse). They used the attached rubric, which has been approved by the English composition faculty for use in assessing writing in general education. The English faculty agreed that, to meet the

outcome, a student must achieve at least a “Good” on the first three components (Focus, Organization, and Development) and at least a “Fair” on the remaining components

Although the raters were very familiar with the rubric, they had some difficulty rating some of the papers because they did not have access to the instructions relating to each writing assignment. There was a fair amount of variability in ratings between the two raters. In cases where they disagreed as to the rating of the component, the average of the two ratings was used in the analysis.

III. Assessment Results

Results presented to the Educational Policies Committee

Only one student paper met the criteria for writing effectively, while 45 papers did not. The one paper came from a freshman.

Ratings for each component of the Outcome (e.g., Focus, Organization, Development) were compared across class years (Freshman through Senior). There was no significant difference in performance based on years in school. Thus, this sample does not provide evidence that writing improves as students progress through school.

We also examined the relationship between writing courses completed and performance in this assessment. Twenty-nine (63%) of the students had taken W131, 37 (80%) of the students had taken W132, and 5 (11%) of the students had taken other writing courses (Eng-W courses). (Thirteen students had taken W132 but not W131.) We do not have information on the grade the students received in these courses, nor whether they passed the course.

There was a very small (but statistically non-significant) positive relationship between the total number of writing courses the student had taken and the ratings his or her paper received ($r = .23$). Students who had taken W131 received, on average, a rating of 1.87 on the components, whereas students who had not the course received, on average, a rating of 1.71. Students who took both courses did significantly better than those who took only one on Development (1.73 vs. 1.44) and Examples (2.15 vs. 1.86). They did slightly (approaching statistical significance) better in Transition Statements (2.02 vs. 1.72), Sufficiency and Quality of Evidence (1.81 vs. 1.50), and the overall average rating on all components (1.91 vs. 1.70).

Interpretation of Results by the Educational Policies Committee

This was a pilot study with limited sample size and it is the first campus-wide use and interpretation of the rubric. On average, the results were at or just below "fair" with no improvement based on years in school. The assessors also deemed that only one paper out of 46 met the criteria for effective writing. The Committee agreed the results are disappointing and potentially indicate an area of concern. However, the small sample size, irregular writing assignments, and pilot use of the rubric, indicate that caution should be used before implementing significant program changes. Below the Committee details suggestions for improvement in the assessment process and in writing education.

IV. Using Assessment for Program Improvement

Improvement in the Assessment Process

We must find a way to assess more papers across a broader sample of our students. This will allow for proper statistical analysis and comparison of changes over time. The Committee believes that, in the absence (for example) of a required writing exam at the junior year that must be passed for graduation, it is important to assess writing assignments with clear instructions and links to portions of the writing rubric. Specifically, faculty members who assign written assignments for use in assessment should identify the writing components from the rubric that are most important. Assessors of the writing must have access to the instructors' writing assignments and the identified components. In addition, students should be aware that their writing assignment will potentially be assessed and they should be aware of the components of the rubric that will be evaluated for their particular assignment.

The Committee feels that the criteria for "meeting the criteria" may need to change. The English department hurdle was designated as good (the top rating) on the first three components and at least fair (the middle rating) on all of the next nine components. Given the varied nature of the writing assignments, this is a very difficult hurdle. For example ignoring that in some writing assignments some of the rubric components may not be relevant, an excellent writer who would satisfy any given component 90% of the time would have only a 39% chance of satisfying all 9 (.9 to the 9th power for math hobbyists) and that ignores the hurdle of scoring at the top level for the first three components. This issue may be mitigated if the rubric components are customized to the individual assignment in the functional areas as described in the preceding paragraph.

Finally, the Committee needs more timely feedback from the CTLA following assessment of the papers during the summer session. In this case, the results from the summer of 2007 were received midway through the spring semester of 2008. Thus, the results from the previous year were not formally used to inform changes for the subsequent year. Instead, for the 2007 – 2008 year, the Committee decided to use samples of student writing from the W131 courses within the campus Freshman Learning Communities. Specifically, the first and last assigned papers were collected and will be evaluated during the summer of 2008. This should result in more standardized papers.

Improvement in Programs

The Committee feels that significant program changes would be premature given the issues addressed above. However, the Committee members report antidotal observations of weaknesses in student writing that mirror some of the findings of the English faculty members who evaluated the student papers. Depending on results from subsequent assessment efforts, substantive changes in writing education might be warranted. In the mean time, the Committee believes that writing education can be improved if faculty members at all levels on campus are encouraged to grade content and writing when

grading written assignments. It is the Committee's impression that many faculty members are hesitant to grade the writing because they are not teaching a writing course or because they are not comfortable making "subjective" writing judgments. The Committee intends to encourage faculty members to make the writing portion of any written assignment worth a specific number of points on the assignment. The CTLA has offered to hold workshops to help "train" faculty members who feel ill-prepared to evaluate writing.

V. Dissemination of Results

The results of this report should be presented in written form to the Faculty Senate and the Committee recommends a brief presentation to encourage the grading of writing quality in all courses and to answer questions and take suggestions relating to the assessment of writing effectiveness. This report should also be available to the students at an appropriate spot on the campus web site.