

## Citizenship ISLO Town Hall

September 22, 2014, 2-3:30, Room 6203

Present: Steve Aurilio, Kristina Brower, Lorraine DeMello, Alice Erskine, Jan Fosberg, Nick Kapp, Lucia Lachmayr, Evan Leach, Aaron McVean, Sarah Perkins, Sarita Santos, Alana Utsumi, Karen Wong

Guests: Belinda Chan, Serena Chu-Mraz, Michael Cross, Walter Hanley, Ray Hernandez, Rob Williams, Adam Windham

Absent: Michael Bishow, Jacquie Escobar, Stephen Fredricks, Angelica Garcia, Arthur Takayama, Dennis Wolbers

Documents: Citizenship ISLO Powerpoint; Citizenship ISLO Handout

I. Introductions

II. Group Discussion about the Overall Results

A. Challenges

1. Highest percentage of “novices” was under “leadership.”

a) The results may be due to the types of assessments and/or context of leadership being assessed. For example, it was assessed in Physics labs, where collaboration more than leadership is common practice. In contrast, team sports may emphasize exercising leadership as it’s defined in the rubric.

b) **Potential Action Plan**

(1) Professional development integration-- May want to initiate more conversation about how these ISLO competencies manifest themselves within our disciplines, and techniques for both teaching and assessing each ISLO component.

2. Lowest levels of Mastery, and highest levels of Basic/Novice all involve global criteria.

a) While it is in our mission statement, perhaps global topics are not reinforced enough in our curriculum.

b) Possibly the age of the students also factored into the result. The vast majority are 18- 22 and may not have been sufficiently exposed to global topics.

c) Also there were low levels of representation of those areas in the courses sampled. It may be due to some of the data having been “lost” due to a problem with the online entry form.

d) **Potential Action Plan**

(1) May want to offer more professional development about how we can incorporate global topics into our curriculum.

(2) May want to launch a “One [Global] Book” initiative such that students study a common book from different disciplinary perspectives.

(3) May want to integrate more service learning opportunities into classes.

(4) May want to disaggregate the data according to the number of units students have taken to see if there’s a difference between the two groups (e.g., 36+ units and those with fewer).

(5) Is there a better way to select courses so that representation of the areas is better balanced? If more courses had this as a focus, the results on the rubric might be different.

(a) May want to prompt people to review their mapping, which could help to improve the sampling of courses used for ISLO assessments.

B. Positive Outcomes

1. Highest percentage of “basic, advanced and proficient” was under “Social Interaction.”

a) Do students already have these competencies before they enter our classrooms?

II. Group Discussion about the Disaggregated Results

A. Gender

1. Females appear to be more highly represented on opposite ends of the spectrum, “advanced” and “novice.” On the other hand, all three categories (including “other/unreported”) are about evenly split between “novice and basic” and “proficient and advanced.”

2. Questions were raised about how objective assessors can be, whether that’s others assessing or self- assessing.

a) Question was raised about who is assessing. Generally professionals in the field, instructors, and peers evaluated students, with fewer instances of self-reporting.

(1) Females may be harder on themselves, as do those who come from cultures in which modesty is practiced. On the other hand, sometimes scores are inflated when self-reporting.

(2) Females who exercise leadership qualities also may be perceived as “bossy” whereas males are continued leaders.

(3) The rubric attempts to make the criteria explicit, countering subjectivity as much as possible.

#### B. Ethnicity

1. There are fewer “advanced and proficient” Asian Pacific Islanders and Hispanic students.

a) Questions were raised about this category since historically Asians from dominant groups (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, etc.) tend to do well whereas others within this category (e.g., Pacific Islanders, Southeast Asians, etc. ) tend to struggle more at school. Most likely if API was split into Asian and Pacific Islander, even more PIs would fall into the “basic and novice” categories. So the question is who within that category is struggling?

b) Also other demographic factors may impact performances, such as being an immigrant, a first generation college student, and/or of a lower socioeconomic background.

### III. Positive Findings

A. The assessed students appear to be socially competent.

B. We’re building a culture of connectivity. Instead of only focusing on assessment as the end product, we’re moving in the direction of using it as a means to have more discussions around curriculum and teaching practices, the “input” that enables students to practice and develop these competencies.

### IV. Areas for Additional Dialogue

A. The assessed students appear to be struggling with making global connections and exercising leadership.

1. A question was raised about whether we’re assessing what we’re not necessarily teaching. For instance, while social skills are integral to labs, these skills aren’t taught; rather, the science content is. A related

question is whether these competencies manifest themselves in contexts outside the classroom where we're assessing.

**B. Potential Action Plan**

1. Assessment methods-- Might these results be impacted by the rubric or the assessment method?

a) Stay the course so that we can build a baseline average.

b) Other ideas that emerged in small groups:

(1) To do a change analysis:

(a) Embed ISLO assessment in orientation for those captured in the matriculation net.

(b) Pre/Post design

(c) Trigger re-administration at certain unit attainment threshold

(d) Yes, this is a pipe dream.

(2) Sampling of courses could be approached differently.

Is there a way to get away from the "coalition of the willing" approach and move to a sampled approach?