IFP Course Report

Course: SOW 1005-004: Global Perspectives on Social Services

Term: Fall 2016

Person Submitting Report: Vicki Rosenthal, MSW

1. **Learning Outcomes and Assessment(s)** *(What is being used to assess IFP outcomes?)*

    Students completing the Global Citizenship requirement will be able to describe the:

IFP SLO	Assessment
IFP SLO #1: origins and consequences of different individual, cultural, and national identities.	10 item objective test (MC, T/F) given as a final.
IFP SLO #2: economic, political, environmental, and/or social processes that influence human events across place and time.	15 item objective test (MC, T/F) given as a final.
IFP SLO #3: causes and consequences of interaction between and among cultures, societies and nations.	20 item objective test (MC, T/F) given as a final.

DTD SLO	Assessment
1.B Knowledge: Theoretical Frameworks or Genres	Test
2.B Formulate Question: Rationale	Review of Literature Writing Assessment.
4.D Critical Thinking: Conclusions	

2. **Description of the Assessment** *(What type of assessment is it? When is it given? If multiple choice test, how many items are being used for each SLO? If it is a performance assessment, what rubric factors or scoring criteria are being used?)*

    Two assessments are given in SOW1005. Both were given as final or end of semester assessments. The first assessment was a 41-item objectives-based test (MC, T/F) designed to measure the 3 IFP SLOs and 1 DTD SLO: Knowledge: Theoretical Frameworks or Genres. Ten items measured SLO#1, 15 items measured SLO#2, and 20 items measured SLO#3. Several items covered more than one SLO, and were represented in each of the SLO subtest totals.

    The second assessment was a literature review writing assignment matched to two DTD project SLOs that are a part of our SACSCOC accreditation. The 2 DTD SLOs are: Formulate Questions, and Critical Thinking. The writing assignment was scored using the DTD rubric (attached). For the assignment, students were asked to explore topics of interest related to course material in peer-reviewed journals to formulate a question and provide conclusions, predictions, generalizations, recommendations or future plans for research.

3. **Scoring** *(How is student performance being scored? What are the "above," "at," and "below" cutoffs for individual student performance?)*

<u>Cut-off criteria</u>
The EAC system allows only for an "above" cut-off which was set at .6 or 60% correct for each SLO subtest.

The writing assessment was scored by the DTD performance rubric. It is a three rating-level rubric (Exemplary, Competent, and Developing). Frequency results and percentages are reported by these three ratings categories. Exemplary and Competent are considered "passing" and are therefore set as the cut-off. The knowledge SLO for the DTD was computed by totaling all IFP SLO test items on the objectives-based assessment (with no items being duplicated). The resultant aggregate (total) score was subjected to the following range: Exemplary (total score > 22), Competent (total score = 12-21), Developing (total score <11).

4. **Sample** *(Who is being tested and why? Are you testing all sections? All students? How is your sample representative?)*

   Four sections of SOW1005 were taught (2 lecture and 2 online) in the fall of 2016. SOW1005-004 used for the AY2016 IFP assessment was selected by the Director of Assessment for Undergraduate Studies in order to pilot the EAC data management system that is used to report SLO data for the IFP. There is no reason to expect any student differences between the chosen section of SOW1005 and the other sections offered (online not withstanding). SOW1005-004 is also a part of the DTD Curriculum Grant Program which infuses research inquiry into course content and assessment. Thus, this course was also selected because it serves as an example of how to implement the DTD initiative into lower division FAU courses. In particular, this course demonstrates how an objectives-based assessment can be used to measure DTD knowledge outcomes (which are typically measured by performance assessments). The course also serves to illustrate how lower division courses can use performance-based assessments to measure higher-order SLOs (e.g., Formulating Questions via literature review assignments).

5. **Results** *(Report percentages of students "above," "at," and "below" cutoffs for each course. You may combine data from multiple sections for each course).*

IFP Outcomes

Final Objective test	SLO #1		SLO #2		SLO #3		
	Above	Below	Above	Below	Above	Below	n
Frequency	22	5	22	5	25	2	27
Percent	81.5%	18.5%	81.5%	18.5%	92.6%	7.4%	

DTD Outcomes

Final Objective test *	1.B Knowledge: Theoretical Framework			
Rating	**Exemp**	**Comp**	**Develop**	**n**
Frequency	24	3	0	27
Percent	88.9	11.1%	0%	

* Rating is based on total score on IFP final objectives test. Since the DTD evaluation system uses a three-point rating system, aggregate IFP SLO total scores were subjected to the following range: Exemplary (total score > 22, Competent (total score 12-21), Developing (total score 0-11). Total does not include duplicated items.

Writing Assessment - Literature Review	2.B Formulate Question: Rationale			4.D Critical Thinking: Conclusions			N
Rating	**Exemp**	**Comp**	**Develop**	**Exemp**	**Comp**	**Develop**	
Frequency	19	2	2	15	7	1	23
Percent	82.6%	8.7%	8.7%	65.2%	30.4%	4.3%	

6. Action *(What do the results mean to you?)*

Recommendations for Improving Assessment Processes.

Improving IFP Assessments

The IFP Assessment was an objective-based assessment (True/False and Multiple Choice) that measured the 3 IFP SLOs and 1 DTD SLO: Knowledge: Theoretical Frameworks or Genres. I would repeat the same assessment to measure the SLOs (both IFP and DTD), but I would change the test to matching where the questions would call for students to match to the correct IFP SLOs. Using a matching objective-based test, the students would be required to think about each question as it applies to the SLOs. There could be some overlap in the SLOs interpretation as it applies to each question and the instructor would have to adjust the assessment grading based on these interpretations.

Improving DTD Assessments

The DTD assessment, graded for "formulated question" and "conclusions/recommendations," were straightforward and do not need improvement. However based on each student's research competence, the instructor needs to take this into consideration in educating on research and inquiry and the expectations of research comprehension. As an IFP course, the instructor teaches a diversified class. The students' years of study range from Freshmen, including dual enrollment high school students, to Seniors and students can represent every degree that the university offers from Accounting to Women Studies. Additionally, the students are at different levels of research experiences. Some have had research inquiry projects in the past, and others experience an introduction to research in this SOW1005 DTD initiative. As far as scoring, as long as the criteria were met, the scoring methodology does not have to be adjusted.

<u>Recommendations for Improving Student Learning</u>

<u>Improving IFP Student Learning</u>

The weekly tests that were given throughout the semester, which were not a part of the DTD Course Plan scoring criteria, would also include matching questions. Having the same type of questions as they would appear of the final would give the students practice in interpreting the SLOs in an assessment format.

<u>Improving DTD Student Learning</u>

To improve DTD student learning, I would provide more individual time for each student. Being an IFP course, I have freshman to senior students in the class. Some students have had no experience in literature reviews, or literature reviews within the social sciences. Formulating a question for some students was better interpreted as a hypothesis or research question. Although the overall assessments for the students were mostly exemplary and developing, providing more class time to the project would have allowed students to take their inquiries to a more advanced level of research and critical thinking effecting their conclusions and / or recommendations.

7. **Attachments** *(e.g., rubric, sample items)*
   Attachment A: Excel Data Spreadsheet "SOW1005 Assessment Spreadsheet Fall 2016"
   Attachment B: Excel Data Spreadsheet "OURI_SOW1005"
   Attachment C: DTD Rubric