**CSU San Marcos**

**General Education Program Assessment Plan**

The General Education Committee (GEC) charged the GE Assessment Subcommittee with the task of developing steps toward implementing the GE Assessment Plan, accepted in 2015. The goals of the Assessment Plan were:

1. The plan shall assess the General Education (GE) program as a whole and in particular, address the GE areas and GE Program Student Learning Outcomes (GEPSLOs).
2. All efforts will be made to keep class-time intrusions to a minimum while ensuring instructor control.
3. The GEC will work with departments to ensure that data is collected in a manner that does not cause undue burden on the department.
4. No part of this assessment process shall be used for faculty evaluation purposes (for neither tenure track or lecturer faculty).
5. The assessment plan shall include a mechanism to close the loop by which weaknesses in the GE program can be addressed, modifications made, and then retested for effectiveness.
6. A schedule will be created and established in order to systematically capture data from all GE areas within a three-year period.

Status update on each of the goals:

**Goal 1**The GEC Assessment Subcommittee determined that the GE Program assessment should be viewed within a Program Review framework and viewed through that lens. In order to review the program, determine if the learning outcomes are met, and then provide opportunities to make improvements to the program, the pilot survey used to obtain initial feedback from instructors was an effective way to evaluate one portion of the program review process.

For example, the GEC decided on a triennial assessment cycle that would begin with areas CC and DD. To further determine where faculty were “at” regarding assessment in GE courses, course instructors in areas CC and DD were asked to respond to the following brief prompts:

1. Are you aware of the nine GEPSLOs?
2. Have you seen the GEPSLOs anywhere prior to this survey?
3. If yes, where have you seen them?
4. Have you ever included these GEPSLOs on your syllabi?
5. How do you introduce concepts from GEPSLO #2 in your class?
6. How do you know that students have learned the concepts described in GEPSLO #2?
7. How do you introduce concepts from GEPSLO #6 in your class?
8. How do you know that students have learned the concepts described in GEPSLO #6?
9. How do you introduce concepts from GEPSLO #8 in your class?
10. How do you know that students have learned the concepts described in GEPSLO #8?

The results from this survey demonstrated that faculty were aware of the GEPSLOs, received information about them from their departments and from the website, but have not included them on their syllabi. Faculty provided information on the GEPSLOs 2, 6, and 8 in this schedule, particularly how concepts of each are introduced in the class and how faculty measure whether students have learned the concept.

**Goal 2**  
The survey method of collecting feedback from faculty did not intrude on any class time. However, it did intrude (briefly-about 10 minutes) on personal time.

**Goal 3**  
Information was captured completely online and aggregated by the Assessment Specialist; therefore no departments were impacted.

**Goal 4**  
All responses were anonymous and there were no opportunities to identify courses or departments.

**Goal 5**  
By capturing this information, the subcommittee believes we will be able to indirectly assess faculty perceptions of the learning in their own course. This method will be supported by a follow-up request for sample work that will be evaluated within the GEC by rubric (to be developed). Disparities (and supporting data) identified by the GEC will be shared with the area faculty, asking them to provide some feedback on why the disparity occurs, what can be done about it, or what modifications can be made within the GEC purview. This will allow the GEC to address disparities (and successes), thereby closing the loop.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cycle Year** | **Assessment Objective** | **Assessment Activity** | **Responsible Office/Committee** |
| Year One:  Begin Fa 2016 | GEPSLOs 2, 6, & 8  Areas C & D | Pilot: GE course instructors in these areas respond to online feedback regarding GEPSLO awareness and concepts addressed in courses; Samples of work demonstrating each LO will be submitted and reviewed using a rubric. | GEC Assessment Subcommittee, GE faculty, program chairs/directors, Academic Programs, Assessment Specialist |
| Year Two:   Begin Fa 2017 | GEPSLOs 1, 5, & 7  Area B | If above pilot is successful, same procedure will take place for Area B instructors. | GEC Assessment Subcommittee, GE faculty, program chairs/directors, Academic Programs, Assessment Specialist |
| Year Three:  Begin Fa 2018 | GEPSLOs 3, 4, & 9  Areas A & E | If above pilot is successful, same procedure will take place for Area B instructors. | GEC Assessment Subcommittee, GE faculty, program chairs/directors, Academic Programs, Assessment Specialist |

**Goal 6**   
The GEC established the following schedule in Fall 2015:

**Recommendations**

The GEC Assessment Subcommittee makes the recommendations below in order to put this process into motion.

1. Giving specific attention to the outcomes of the assessment activity is key. Assessment should be conducted with the purpose of program improvement, but how does the GEC feel about “suggesting” improvements to all programs represented in the GE course spectrum? Therefore, the GE Assessment subcommittee recommends the GEC
   1. Consider viewing GE Assessment through the Program Review lens, which means we assess the program wholly and not course-by-course.
   2. Consider using the developed survey model to continue to assess faculty perceptions in the other GE areas as outlined in the triennial cycle developed in 2015
   3. Consider requesting sample student work from the faculty that can be evaluated by the GEC and used to support the information reported through the faculty survey.
   4. Consider developing a rubric to evaluate sampled student work.
2. Creating a culture of assessment and opportunities for closing the loop is the next step. Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs, and Directors should be fully informed of the purpose behind the GE assessment activity and invested in making sure all departments and faculty know the assessment of the program will happen and is important. Therefore, the GE Assessment subcommittee recommends the GEC
   1. Report to the Academic Senate of the need to begin an information campaign so that all programs with GE courses are aware of their role in this activity.
   2. Suggest “policies” be developed that will support the assessment activity.
   3. Report results from assessment activity (faculty survey and evaluated sample of student work) back to the departments involved in the area assessment, identifying disparities or successes, and ask for feedback and suggestions about how to address or promote where applicable.
   4. Identify any themes in the feedback and suggestions from departments (this will be completed by the Assessment Specialist) and share the information back so that departments/programs can implement changes. Changes will be specifically asked about in the next assessment cycle (in two years).
   5. Consider making necessary changes to outdated GE forms to reflect alignment of GEPSLOs on each proposal and recertification.