

ASSESSMENT REPORT: C5 - GLOBAL COMMUNITIES
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA

Committee members

Peter Cashel-Cordo, Chair

Teresa Huerta

Marjorie Jones

Tom Pickett

March 20, 2002

DRAFT REPORT OF THE GLOBAL COMMUNITIES CATEGORY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The C5 Category Assessment Committee sees as its purpose the collection and interpretation of various sources of data in order to provide recommendations for improvement of the role Global Communities plays in achieving the overall goals of the University of Southern Indiana's Core Curriculum (UCC). Such goals are based upon the premise that students must know themselves and their world before they can become responsive and responsible leaders. This purpose is consistent with the statements in the document *Reviewing the University Core Curriculum*, which is appended to the end of this report (Attachment 1). The C5 committee does not consider its mission to assess individual courses within the category, but to assess the category as a whole, and how it fulfills UCC objectives.

Following the guidelines in the above mentioned document, the C5 Assessment Committee has involved as many faculty members as possible, interviewing all present Global Communities full-time instructors and four adjuncts, both to obtain information about C5 courses, and more importantly, to seek input about the faculty's interpretation of the category and their suggestions for improvement. At the same time, and to supplement the information provided by faculty members, an exam has been administered to Freshmen and Juniors in an attempt to measure student-learning outcomes. Furthermore, information requested from Institutional Research about student enrollment in the various C5 courses has been evaluated.

Membership And Recruitment Of Committee

In the fall of 1999 Dr. Paul Raymond, Director of UCC Assessment, convened a committee of faculty to assess categories C3 (Science), C4 (Western Culture), and C5 (Global Communities). This original committee consisted of the following members: Dr. Phyllis Toy, Associate Professor of English and Director of University Honors Council, Dr. Peter Cashel-Cordo, Associate Professor of Economics, Dr. Guillermo Latorre, Professor of Spanish, Dr. Norman King, Professor of Geology, Dr. Thomas Pickett, Professor of Physics, and Marjorie Jones, Instructor in Anthropology. The original committee's first act was to subdivide into three subcommittees corresponding to each of the major categories, each person agreeing to serve on two subcommittees.

The C5 Assessment Subcommittee, hereinafter referred to as the C5 Assessment Committee, consisted of Dr. Peter Cashel-Cordo, Dr. Guillermo Latorre, Dr. Thomas Pickett, and Marjorie Jones. Two of the members were recruited by the Deans of their respective colleges, one by a Department Chairman, and the other by the Director of Assessment. Dr. Latorre resigned the C5 Committee at the end of the first year and serves on the C4 Committee. Dr. Raymond asked the Foreign Languages for a replacement. Dr. Leslie Roberts, Associate Professor of French, served for the year 2000, but is on sabbatical for the year 2001. Dr. Teresa Huerta, Assistant Professor of Spanish is serving as Dr. Roberts' replacement.

Three of the four member of the C5 Committee have served on the larger UCC Committee and are familiar with the entire program and the issues that have surfaced from time to time. In addition, the C5 Committee was deliberately constituted to reflect a divergence of opinion and a range of interests. For example, Peter Cashel-Cordo teaches a course which is global in its reach, and focuses on linkages between countries (a horizontal perspective, so to speak) while Marjorie Jones teaches courses that are regional, in-depth treatments of cultures, often with some time depth added, making her approach more vertical. Teresa Huerta represents the interests of Foreign Languages and provided the rest of the subcommittee with knowledge about the language courses in this category. Tom Pickett, a

non-stakeholder in this particular category, serves the function of providing an external check on the assessment and conclusions reached by this committee.

Brief Chronology Of The Committee's Activities

In the first year, 1999-2000, the committee was charged with designing an assessment plan for the Global Communities category. Prior to designing a plan, the committee found it essential to clarify the existing language for the category's goals and guidelines. A brief history of the original design of the category is in order. Global Communities as a category was originally conceived and developed as a counterpart to C4 Western Traditions. The non-Western focus of C5 as presently construed is a testimonial to this initial conception of Global Communities. A second characteristic of this ideal is found in the language describing the category's goal:

Students should develop a sense of the global community by understanding at least one culture different from their own. They should learn why other cultures have developed differently and why people belonging to them often consider issues in very different ways. Students should also know where the peoples of various countries and cultures are located.

This indicates that Global Communities would be the Non-Western Traditions category. This goal description posed a problem for the committee from the onset of the assessment process. Global Communities is defined in the UCC Guidebook as "an understanding of Earth as a global community consisting of interrelated and interdependent cultures." There is a discontinuity between the category's definition and its goals. In the former the emphasis is placed on the interdependence between different cultures, whereas, in the latter, the focus is on the study of a culture other than the student's own. In order to clarify these two related but different areas of study, the committee redrafted the category's goals, as the following:

Students should be familiar with the various ways in which countries have been and are linked together. They should learn about variations in culture among and within countries and how people belonging to different cultures view and respond to global issues differently. Students should also know about changing patterns in the ways countries interact and their impacts on people located in different parts of the world. In studying these linkages, significant attention will be paid to cultures outside the United States and, in the case of Europe, to non-traditional European cultures.

The revision of the goal description was offered, not as a change in substance or content, but rather to make the description more consistent with the C5 heading. The committee believed it was crucial to clarify the category's goals and objectives in order to design appropriate instruments, and to clearly communicate the committee's understanding of those goals and objectives to the faculty who teach C-5 courses. The committee submitted this recommendation for the change in language to the UCC council, which approved it at the end of the Spring 2000 semester.

Meaning Of The Word Culture

As a result of the effort to revise the language of the goals statement, it became clear that some confusion had arisen about the meaning of the term *culture*. *Culture* is used in the title of the category C5 (“An understanding of Earth as a global community consisting of interrelated and interdependent cultures”), in the description of the goals that follow the title, and in the UCC “Guidelines” provided to faculty proposing courses, and to the UCC Committee evaluating proposed courses. It is therefore very important to understand what the word *culture* means in this context, since the term can have several definitions. *Culture* has often been used to refer only to the intellectual and artistic traditions of society. However, and given the courses already approved, it is clear that the UCC Committee must have a broader definition in mind. The famous definition of culture by anthropologist Edward Taylor in his work *Primitive Culture*, published in 1871 states:

“Culture ... is that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.”

This statement is echoed in the third edition of the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* in which *culture* is defined as *“The totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, art, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought”* (p. 454).

These definitions make it clear that the courses devoted to the ways in which human societies adapt to the natural environment, manipulate it, shape it or are shaped by it, belong in C5.

Assessment Plan

The committee also in the 1999-2000 academic year designed an assessment plan, which was submitted and approved by the UCC council. The assessment plan, which is appended to the end of the document (Attachment 2), was designed to seek information and data from all stakeholders in the C5 category. [{move next sentence up here}](#)

The second year of the C5 assessment process was devoted to the implementation of the assessment plan. On Assessment Day in the Fall 2000 semester an exam was administered to Freshmen and Juniors in an attempt to measure student-learning outcomes. Faculty interviews were conducted in the Spring 2001 semester. Institutional Research also provided information about student enrollment in the various C5 courses. A thorough description of the Assessment Plan and discussion of the data obtained from all sources is presented in the second section of this report. A third section presents the committee’s recommendations for change in the Global Communities category.

II. DESCRIPTION OF DATA

The committee solicited information in three forms: enrollment statistics, a student assessment exam, and faculty interviews.

As part of the assessment process, the four members of the Assessment Committee arranged hour-long interviews with each faculty member who teaches courses in this category. In the fall and winter of 2000-2001 we interviewed 14 of the 15 full-time faculty who teach C5 courses and 5 adjunct faculty members. A week before the scheduled interview we gave the person a copy of the “Goals” and the “Guidelines” for the C5 category along with the eight open-ended questions we intended to ask. We assured the faculty that the interviews were confidential and that their responses would be combined with all the other responses in a final report. Most of the interviews were conducted by two committee members. One asked questions while the other wrote down the responses. The rough interview notes were typed. Each faculty member reviewed the typed copy of his or her interview to make corrections, deletions, and additions. In some cases C5 faculty wrote responses to the open-ended questions as well, before the actual interviews. A list of the interview questions can be found as Attachment 3.

The committee created an assessment exam that, after approval from the Core Council, was administered to half the freshman and half the juniors during assessment day, fall semester of 2000. (The other half of the students was given the C3 exam.) The first three questions on the exam were designed to measure students' understanding of the global nature of today's world. The last two questions were intended to measure their appreciation for the diversity of cultures in a global community. A copy of the exam is provided as Attachment 4.

The Office of Institutional Research provided the committee with statistics concerning enrollments in the various Global Communities courses. This information consists of the number of students enrolled in each course, sorted by school, by course, and by semester, for each semester since Fall 1996, when the category was first implemented. A summary of the data is provided as Attachment 5.

III. EVALUATION OF DATA

As described in the previous section of this report the committee collected data from three major sources: the faculty, the students, and from institutional research. In this section the data from each source will in turn be evaluated.

The faculty

The faculty response to interviews was overwhelmingly positive. We, as a committee, highly recommend this tool to future assessment committees. The process of dialogue with C5 faculty members has led both the committee members who teach C5 courses, and those interviewed to reassess and introduce changes in their own courses. The following summarizes the responses to the faculty questionnaire.

Question #1: “What is your understanding of the role ‘Global Communities’ plays in achieving the goals of the University Core Curriculum as a whole?”

The responses showed nearly unanimous agreement that the most important reason for requiring a C5 course of USI students is, as one faculty member put it, “..to jolt them [USI students] out of their provincial, isolated view” of the world. The terms “parochial”, “ethnocentric”, “provincial”, “conservative attitude towards other cultures”, “resistant to foreign ideas and culture” were all used to describe our student body. Four respondents strongly felt that many USI students showed little “respect” for other cultures. All concluded that our students actually knew little about the world beyond the borders of the United States, let alone the impact that world has on our country. The lack of basic geographic knowledge was appalling. Knowledge of the rest of the world, “global awareness” and “awareness of linkages between countries” were important goals of this category for most faculty members. A couple mentioned that students ought to be exposed to worldviews outside the Western Tradition to learn “respect for things nonwestern”. Several individuals thought that such knowledge of other cultures would lead to “tolerance and respect” for people in other parts of the world, or, as one person

put it, “a greater openness to other cultures”. There was one person who thought that the UCC courses as a whole and C5 courses in particular were a “waste of time” because they had no depth and were too easy. There was unanimous agreement, however, that the goal of C5 should introduce students to cultures/countries outside the borders of the United States. In their opinion, multicultural courses focused on ethnic groups within the United States do not belong in this category.

GOALS OF C5 AS EXPRESSED BY C5 FACULTY
(Many expressed multiple goals)

to counteract students' ethnocentrism and provincialism	knowledge of other cultures and world views	tolerance and respect for other cultures	development of cross cultural skills	better understanding of own culture by comparison with other cultures	global awareness and perspective	geographic knowledge	courses are a waste of time
19	13	5	1	1	10	3	1

Question #2: “What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of this category?”

One professor thought that a significant strength of the C5 category was the diversity of courses from all schools thus giving students a variety of good choices. However, this very diversity was also a cause for concern because, at times, he was afraid that it was becoming “a dumping ground” for departments trying to fit courses into the core. Others expressed concern that C5 should not have a “huge menu of courses” or the category would lose its focus or “clarity” or become “fragmented”. One suggested that the way to help create a sense of unity would be to use the Humanities model and have workshops and retreats for those who teach courses in this category. Faculty could exchange information and ideas.

One weakness of the category is that students only have to take one three-hour course. The category could easily require six hours. A number of professors expressed this view but usually added that it was probably unrealistic to expect that any more hours would be added to the University Core Curriculum. One instructor expressed concern that with

only three hours required, professors would be tempted to try to cover too much territory in a single course. One recommended that C5 be expanded to require six hours, with one “culture” course, and one “global/linkage” course.

A couple of people raised questions about the presence of upper division courses with large numbers of prerequisites in the category, essentially limiting these courses to a few highly specialized students. The view is that University Core Curriculum courses should be relatively open to all students.

One major weakness identified by many was that the original focus of the C5 space needed here category expressed in the “Guidelines” was that it was to be a complement to the Western Tradition courses under the Humanities requirement, and be non-Western in its focus.

The problem with that is that delete second “that” it leaves Russia and Eastern Europe in limbo. Are they Western or non-Western? They are not covered in the Western Tradition classes. Furthermore, the Western Tradition courses have a grand historical sweep and cover only some aspects of modern European “culture” as we have defined “culture”—namely philosophy, art, music, literature, and some science—the intellectual tradition. However, “culture” includes language, social organization, kinship systems, family life, technology, economic systems, environmental adaptations and manipulations, popular/folk arts and music, etc. Modern Europe is not really covered in the Western tradition classes; for example, ancient Greece is taught but not modern Greece, Renaissance Italy is taught but not modern Italy. To complicate the matter even further, all modern European countries have significant non-Western elements within them—there are Turks in Germany, North Africans in France, Indonesians in the Netherlands, Pakistanis and Indians in Great Britain, etc. And what about Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania and South Africa? Are these countries not worthy of study? Given the global nature of the world today, dividing modern world cultures into “Western” and “Non-Western” makes little sense.

In other words, C5 in its original formulation as a companion to Humanities leaves out many modern world cultures. Ten faculty members thought that our students would benefit from the study of ANY culture(s) outside the borders of the United States. Several pointed out that it is a myth that modern Germany or modern Sweden or any other European country is very much like the United States. These countries are just as foreign to our students as China, Egypt, or Mexico. Two professors still thought that the emphasis should be on non-traditional Europe and non-western cultures, and two could go either way. Only two respondents thought that the category should stay non-western in its focus, suggesting that the study of modern European cultures could be done under the proposed new “International Studies Program” in the process of formulation. This program will have a European track.

PREFERRED FOCUS OF COURSES IN C5 CATEGORY

	focus on culture	focus on global linkages	focus on both culture and global linkages	Total
Modern	6	4	2	12
Historic	1	0	0	1
Both Modern and Historic	3	1	2	7
Total	10	5	4	19

Question #3 “Are you satisfied with this category as it stands? If not, how would you like to see it changed?”

The majority interviewed thought that courses that introduced students to any part of the world outside the borders of the United States were valuable and that they could include modern Europe. In fact, several teachers thought that the focus should be on broad areas of the world, if not the whole world. They voiced some concern about courses in the category that looked at individual cultures/countries or were regional treatments.

This concern points to the fact that there are two kinds of courses that have been approved for this category – on the one hand, courses that are global in scope and study linkages between countries, often for only one aspect of culture (economies for example),

and on the other, courses that focus on specific cultures or the cultures of a significant region of the world. The courses that concentrate on linkages are usually synchronic and focus on one aspect of culture, while those that focus on specific cultures or regions are usually diachronic and focus on all aspects of culture. Two courses are primarily historical treatments of non-western cultures. Nine of the faculty teaching these courses thought that the C5 category should concentrate on modern peoples, countries, linkages, and cultures, while six thought that both approaches were valid. Only two thought that a purely historical study of regions or cultures that did not have a significant modern component belonged in this category.

PREFERRED FOCUS OF COURSES IN C5: WESTERN OR NON-WESTERN

Any cultures outside the borders of the United States	Outside United States but ambivalent about whether must be non-western culture	Emphasis on non-western cultures and non-traditional European	Only non-western cultures outside United States	Total
10	2	5	2	19

Question #4 “What specific goals and objectives do you have for the course(s) you teach in C5? and Question #5 “How does your course[how do your courses] meet your goals, the stated goals of C5, and the overall goals of the Core Curriculum?”

Those who teach foreign languages have as one goal, of course, the “cross-cultural skills” that learning another language implies. Developing cross-cultural skills requires detailed knowledge of the culture, as well as purely linguistic knowledge. As one professor stated, “....language is culturally determined....” Every aspect of X language is wedded to the culture, and the context is of great importance.” Or as another said “the student in our classes is immediately challenged to become a somewhat different person, a person who does not speak English” They are in a foreign country.....students are surprised, sometimes shocked, sometimes angry. They are always pushing the boundaries of the familiar.”

Everyone teaching in this category repeated that their personal goals were for our somewhat provincial student body to be exposed to other “worldviews”. As one person put it, it is necessary to break down “stereotypes” of other cultures particularly stereotypes of “third world countries.” As another person said “..need three dotsto enlarge how they[students] look at the world.” This exposure will inevitably result in students comparing other cultural views and values with their own. One goal of education in general is an examination of one’s own ideas and values.

Another frequently mentioned goal was to understand that the United States is linked to the rest of the world. It is important that students understand these linkages and the countries to which we are linked. Students will see that we in the United States do not live in isolation, that globalization is affecting our culture now.

One content-oriented goal mentioned by a couple of professors is to teach students basic geographic knowledge since students come to USI lacking this background. It would be an embarrassment to USI to graduate students who think that Nigeria is in Asia and the Atlantic Ocean lies between India and Indonesia.

Everyone teaching courses in this category wants to teach students to think critically. These goals were expressed in statements such as: We want to broaden “the students’ ability to understand complex issues...to solve problems;” we want students to be able to “analyze primary sources;” we want to “train students on how to retrieve quality literature on each topic covered;” we want students to learn to write well about complex issues; “We consider writing essential.” In many of the courses, students are required to write essays on exams. Others required in-depth reading, critical discussions of reading material; some required individual or group classroom performances, a few research papers, etc. One person required students to interview someone from a specific part of the world--to “put a human face” on what was being learned in class. Another took students on “cultural field trips”.

A number of the faculty members were using web sites and the internet in very innovative ways. Two people have created their own texts in words and one in pictures and text on class web sites. One person said, however, "I do not find the computer discussion board, Blackboard, very helpful. Students tend to write simplistic comments on it." Another found that students assigned to view a web site complete with color slides and maps, would not read it, even when in despair the professor tested them on its content.

Plagiarism poses a limitation in the assignment of research projects and research essays. Plagiarism is so common that the checking necessary to catch violators in any medium to large-sized class would require too much time on the part of the professor. Further, there are now many web sites selling research papers that do not plagiarize sources on the papers; that is, the papers are often very well done, but the students turning them in didn't write them (this is often difficult to prove, although in specific areas there are web sites that contain such papers one can check). It is fraud but not plagiarism. The result is that many on our faculty feel that they can no longer assign research papers.

Question #6. "Is the class size as it currently exists effective in meeting the course(s) objective? If not, what would be the ideal course size for you?"

Those that teach courses that require a lot of teacher -student verbal interaction in class, such as the foreign language courses, and courses requiring class performance and discussion, thought that 30 was the limit, but that 20-25 would be ideal. One professor expressed reservations about the value of distance education classes for courses that are designed to have student-student interaction believing that chat rooms are no substitute for face-to-face interaction.

Large class sizes (50-100+) put an enormous strain on any professor who assigns papers, research projects, or essays on tests. "With 150 students, the number of responses, we have to read is staggering. We would like to be able to offer more sections." or "What the instructors need is TIME. We do not have the time to participate and guide the

students. We need smaller classes with more writing and more student involvement quotation marks?....I need assistants” Or “It is impossible to teach this course as it should be taught with 55 students in each section. Class size should be 25. Because of the size, the whole approach has to be different. We would like to do small group work, and to have students report on their findings.”

Question #7. Are the resources and support, including computer and library support, available to you adequate to teach these courses? What improvements could be made?”

Human Resources:

1. No one had any complaints about the number of computers available to faculty and students, but a couple mentioned that there was a need for assistants to man labs with computers so that they would be open for students to use more hours per week, and to help students having trouble with the computers and printers. With specific reference to the foreign language laboratory: It is “. Delete dot)not fulfilling its potential or its mission. Because of insufficient funding, there is no full-time person running the lab. We need an expert who is trained in this area. The lab needs to be open for students at hours when they are available. We [foreign language instructors and professors] all teach four classes each semester. We need assistance with the lab. We do not have the time to prepare extra materials or to research what other materials are available. Please treat us as professionals and give us the support we need.”

Although there are privacy issues, it would be very helpful to those who have large classes to have student workers (since we have no graduate student assistants) who could help with grading chores. Two mentioned the need to maintain slide collections/libraries that could use student help.

2. There is a strong need for more faculty in general in all departments. In several cases, teaching these courses strained the resources of a department whose first duty is to service the majors. Teaching these courses tied up faculty time and resources making it

more difficult to teach upper division specialty courses. Several mentioned the need to recruit faculty in departments with the expertise to develop and teach more C5 courses. Specifically, some professors mentioned the need to develop courses on comparative religions and philosophy, comparative literature, non-western literature, and the art of non-western cultures. A more ethnically-diverse faculty might also be of benefit to our students.

3. USI needs more funding to help students who want to study abroad since so many of our students really cannot afford to do this. Freeing up money for faculty development in this area would also be helpful.

Physical Resources:

Nearly everyone interviewed said that the library resources were inadequate. The library is “woefully underfunded”. For example, it needs the IMF data base, but cannot afford it. The foreign language section, sections on Asia, and anthropology are “inadequate” for lack of both funding and space. Two faculty stated that they subscribed to journals to share them with their students since the library will not, or cannot. In particular, there was a great need for more money or even, any money for videos, movies, slides, slide library equipment, maps, CDRoms, DVD’s, etc. Many universities are no longer renting their videos and films to other smaller places like USI, and USI will have to either buy these or do without them. Many of the faculty interviewed had spent money, in a few cases considerable funds, to have these resources for their classes. These resources are especially important to teach students about other parts of the world.

Question #8 “Do you have any other issues or concerns that the questions asked haven’t addressed?”

One faculty member stated that he/she thought that all UCC courses, including those in C5, should be taught by seasoned faculty; by the best teachers. He/she did not think that inexperienced faculty should be teaching these courses.

The committee came to the general conclusion that the faculty teaching C5 courses were all very committed to teaching, and to teaching these courses in particular. They were constantly seeking better ways to reach students, while still maintaining high standards. The four members of this assessment committee learned so much from these interviews from other faculty, that have all decided to change some of what we do in our courses as a result of this assessment process. Those interviewed put a lot of thought into their responses, reassessing what they do as well. In conclusion, we can state that any students who want to, can get a great education here from innovative and dedicated teachers.

The students

As previously discussed, the Global Communities Assessment Test was administered to freshmen and juniors in the Fall 2000 semester. The design of the exam, open-ended general questions, accommodated the diverse nature of the courses included in the Global Communities category. With open-ended questions a qualitative approach was necessary in the grading. The questions allowed the grader to judge the student's understanding of global communities by asking for its definition and by providing examples.

Only the exams given to juniors were graded. Each exam included a cover sheet identifying the student and the global courses they might have taken. These cover sheets were detached from the exams prior to grading. The cover sheet and the exam were numbered allowing the committee to later match exams with individual students. At the time of grading the grader was unable to identify exams with students.

Each member of the committee graded the same exams using a scale of "good"=1, "average"=2, and "poor"=3, based on the student's ability to define and demonstrate global communities issue. Three random samples of fifty exams were select from the total of 276 exams. After grading each sample, the scores from each grader were compiled and compared. With few exceptions the scores reflect a high degree of consistency across the graders (see Attachment 6). The exams were divided into two

groups, allowing comparisons between those students who had or were presently enrolled in a global course, and those who had not yet fulfilled the Global Communities requirement. A one-tailed Student's t-test was used to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups. The following table presents the average scores and p-values associated with the three samples of 50 tests each, the second two samples combined, and the combined total of 150 tests.

Interpreting The Results

The lower the average scores, given the grading scale, the better the group scored on average. This would suggest that students who have fulfilled the C5 requirement or are presently enrolled in a C5 course (Global Students) had a better understanding of global communities in the second two samples, $1.73 < 2.10$ and $1.88 < 2.10$ respectively. However, in the first sample non-Global Students scored lower/better $2.26 < 2.37$. Overall, when the three samples are combined, Combined tests #'s 1-150, the average scores suggest that Global Students performed better than non-Global Students. In order to determine if these differences are statistically significant a two-tailed Student's t-test was used to find out if there was a difference between the means of the two groups of students. The last column presents the probability values generated by Excel. These p-values are interpreted as the probability that the difference between the two groups is as a result of chance. For example, for the combined sample of 150 exams, the p-value of 0.05 would suggest that there is only a 5% probability that the difference in the means of the two groups is a result of chance. In other words, there is a statistical difference at the 5% level between the responses given by Global Students and non-Global Students. This also holds true for the second sample, and is marginally true for the third sample.

The first sample's p-value of 0.55 however presents an anomaly. It would suggest that the difference between the means can be attributed to chance, or that the two groups are statistically inseparable. This result from the first sample evaluated was a cause for concern. The committee in its discussions came up with four hypotheses as to why this

might be the case. It could mean that Global Students did not increase their understanding of Global Communities as a result of taking a Global course. Alternatively, the assessment test and the experimental design in its use could have been flawed. It could be the case that juniors realizing that they are unaccountable for their performance on the exam did not take the exam seriously and made little attempt to demonstrate their actual understanding. Lastly, the first sample may have been non-random and is an outlier.

To test which of these hypotheses dominates, two more samples were taken and graded. The difference between the samples: group means, p-values, group size, and number of graders, suggests that the last hypothesis is mostly likely to be true. An analysis of variance between the three samples will be conducted to further determine if this conclusion has merit. Supposing that the first sample is an outlier, then only the second and third samples should be considered. The fourth row of the table presents the statistics for the combined second and third samples. The means across the two groups of students (1.81 and 2.14) suggest that Global Students performed better and that this result is statistically significant at the 1% level. In either case of how to treat the first sample, the results show that students on average, who have had a Global Communities course, have a statistically better performance than students who had yet to complete this UCC requirement.

Institutional Research

Sixteen courses in thirteen disciplines from four different schools presently make up Global Communities at the University of Southern Indiana. Data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment reveals that 6594 students enrolled in Global Communities courses over the time period of the Fall 1996 semester through the Fall 2001 semester. As noted in the previous section, the Office of Institutional Research provided data on a semester-by-semester basis for each Global Communities Course showing student enrollments by major. The following set of tables summarizes this

information focusing on enrollment patterns and frequency of course offerings in the category.

Table 1 presents aggregate enrollments over the four and one-half academic years for each C5 course broken down by students' school of major. In the first column the courses are listed in descending order with regards to the percentage of total C5 enrollment shown in the second column. The third column shows the total enrollment in each course. The remaining columns show for each school the percentage of their total C5 enrollment in a particular course. The total for each school is shown in the last row of the table. For example, Global Economic Issues (ECON 241) had 28.2% of all C5-enrollment totaling 1857 students. It accounted for eight-four percent of the 1813 C5-enrollments by business students, six percent of the 984 C5-enrollment by education students, etc.

As Table 1 demonstrates Global Economic Issues, ECON 241, has since the inception of the UCC serviced the largest percentage of global communities students. This is in part explained by the requirement that all business students take this course as part of their business curriculum. SPAN 102 accounts for 15.2% of C5 enrollments with a relatively diversified student population. Environmental Biology, [move next line up here](#) BIOL 251, accounts for 11.6% of the total. Therefore, these three courses to date make up more than 50% of global communities enrollment. This high level of concentration, however, is misleading. As new courses were admitted to the category, more courses are now available than initially, when the core curriculum was first introduced.

Unsurprisingly, an analysis of each school shows that there is a bunching of enrollments in courses offered by their school of major. As previously noted, business students are required to take ECON 241; hence there is a very high concentration of business students in this course. The remaining business student enrollments in C5 courses represent students taking additional C5 courses as electives. One side note is that an ECON 241 enrollment of non-business students is not insignificant. It represents 11.2% of University Division enrollments, 7.2% of science and engineering enrollments and so

forth. The next highest concentration of students can be found in the health professions. Almost half of its enrollments are in HP 435. SPAN 102 and GEOG 330 together account for another 21% of health profession enrollment, while the remaining enrollments are fairly spread out over the remaining courses. Science and engineering enrollments to a lesser degree favor BIOL 251, which accounts for a little over a third of its enrollments. Otherwise its enrollments are more or less evenly dispersed over the other C5 courses. The schools of education and liberal arts do not exhibit highly significant groupings of enrollments in particular classes.

Table 1 COURSE	% of total	total enrollment	Business majors	Education majors	Liberal Arts majors	Health majors	Science majors	UD students
ECON 241	28.2%	1857	84.2%	6.0%	6.4%	4.3%	7.2%	11.2%
SPAN 102	15.2%	1002	6.9	16.9	16.2	11.9	15.4	32.5
BIOL 251	11.6%	767	2.5	27.5	9.6	6.8	33.8	8.2
POLS 271	8.8%	581	0.8	7.0	18.1	3.5	3.8	14.1
GEOG 330	8.7%	572	0.9	20.3	11.1	9.1	12.5	3.5
HP 435	5.2%	342	0	1.0	0.5	46.7	3.0	1.8
ANTH 255	4.8%	313	0.4	5.2	8.0	4.4	5.1	6.3
ANTH 251	3.4%	224	0.2	4.3	5.7	2.5	3.6	4.5
FREN 102	2.8%	183	1.3	2.4	4.2	0.6	2.8	4.9
GERM 102	2.8%	182	1.7	2.7	3.3	0.6	4.7	4.5
ENG 386	2.5%	166	0.2	2.2	5.7	1.8	1.3	1.9
ANTH 262	2.4%	157	0.2	3.1	3.7	2.1	3.4	3.2
ART 253	1.7%	111	0.1	0.3	4.9	0.3	0.6	1.0
JPN 102	1.0%	65	0.6	0.6	1.0	0.2	1.9	2.3
HIST 365	0.6%	37	0.1	0.4	1.5	0	0.6	0.1
HP 492	0.5%	35	0	0	0	5.2	0.4	0
TOTALS	100%	6594	1813	984	1915	630	473	779

While Table 1 is useful in examining enrollment patterns, it does not provide information with regards to when and how frequently each course is offered. Table 2 is provided for that purpose, showing course offerings by semester. The numbers represent the number of sections offered during a particular semester. The three summer sessions are combined together as a single time period. Of particular interest are the bottom two rows which show the total number of C5 courses and number of sections offered in each semester. Two trends emerge. Over time a greater diversity of courses is being offered in meeting the demand for global communities courses; however, the growth in the

number of courses is slow, which provides opportunities few?new offerings. A second more important trend is that C5 offerings are heavily weighted towards the Spring semester. In the calendar year 2001 almost twice as many courses were offered in the Spring semester as in the Fall. This is in part explained by foreign language courses; however, ANTH 251, ENG 386 and ART 253 also appear to be offered more often in the spring.

Table 2	1996	1997			1998			1999			2000			2001		
	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall
ECON 241	2	2	1	2	3	1	3	2	1	3	3	1	4	3	1	4
SPAN 102		7	1		7	1		7	1		8	2		8	2	
BIOL 251	1	1		1	1	1	1	2		1	1	1	1	2	1	1
POLS 271	2		1	1	1		2	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
GEOG 330			1	1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1
HP 435						1	1			1	1		1	1		4
ANTH 255	1		1	1			1	1		1	1		1	1		2
ANTH 251		1			1			1		1	1			1		
FREN 102		2	1		2	1		2			2	1		2		
GERM 102		3	1		2	1		3	1		3	1		2		
ENG 386		1	1*				2		1		1			1	1	
ANTH 262	1			1			1				1			1		1
ART 253			1					1			1			1		
JPN 102		2			2			2			2			1		
HIST 365																1
HP 492							1	1*	1*		1			1		
COURSES	5	8	9	6	9	6	8	12	6	7	15	5	6	15	5	8
SECTIONS	7	19	9	7	17	6	13	24	6	9	28	6	9	27	6	15

* denote enrollments of 1 student

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The assessment committee bases the following recommendations on our experience in the assessment process and [those](#) data we obtained in conducting that process. The recommendations are broken into three categories. The first part of this section reflects what we learned in conducting this assessment and the committee's suggestions and recommendations are made with an eye towards the conduct of future assessments for this category and the UCC assessment process as a whole. The second part of this section presents the committee's recommendations with regards to the definitions and guidelines used specifically to the Global Communities category. The basis for these recommendations comes from data obtained in the assessment process and primarily reflects the attitudes and thinking of the faculty stakeholders teaching Global Communities. The final part of this section presents the committee's thinking with regards to its concerns and suggestions for improving the University's institutional structure for meeting the demands in fulfilling the UCC's Global Communities requirements. These three parts are discussed in turn below.

Recommendations for the Assessment Process

It is the committee's belief that our experience in conducting the assessment process has been highly successful on several levels. One outcome of the process has been the engagement of faculty stakeholders in an open and productive dialogue of the purposes, design, and execution of the requirements for this core category. The faculty interviews provided a venue for this discussion, however the success in engaging faculty, in the opinion of the committee, was the insistence that the committee was not assessing individual courses. Once faculty was assured and convinced that their own approaches and conduct of their courses were not under scrutiny, they were far more willing to be part of a dialogue about the primary target of our assessment process, the UCC and Global Communities in particular. This dialogue served the purpose of gathering data about faculty's concerns regarding the purposes, goals and guidelines for Global Communities and how best to achieve them. The result of this dialogue is the basis for the suggestions and recommendations in the subsequent parts of this section of the report.

This committee understands, however, that there needs to be some mechanism to evaluate individual courses not only in the Global Communities category, but also in the UCC as a whole. From our viewpoint, the need for such a mechanism stems from primarily two strong possibilities. First, faculty over time learns different and, hopefully, better ways in the design and delivery of course content. Also, with new developments in a discipline course content as well may change. Thus the course description originally submitted to the UCC may not reflect subsequent course content and activities. Secondly, faculty turnover in who actually teaches a particular course affects its content and execution.

In the committee's opinion, the responsibility for individual course review lies with the UCC Council itself. We would not have been successful in engaging and enfranchising faculty stakeholders if we took on this responsibility ourselves. Consequently, we recommend that the council create some mechanism to review individual courses. We would suggest a requirement for the resubmission every five years of course petitions for approval by the council for a course to remain in the UCC.

Another recommendation involving the assessment process deals with the structure of category assessment committees. We found our structure to be conducive for the task of assessing the Global Communities category. While it may not be universally true, we believe that there should be one committee per category. The committee's membership include a relatively small number of representative stakeholders and at least one "outside" member. This results in members being motivated with a check and balance in maintaining objectivity.

With regards to our own assessment process, perhaps the area that presented the greatest difficulty was the design and implementation of a student outcome measure. The C5 assessment exam presented the committee with a perplexing conundrum. It had to be sufficiently broad to accommodate the breadth of the courses in the category, however the cost of inclusivity was a diminished ability to measure meaningful outcomes. While we demonstrated a statistically significant difference between students who were taking or fulfilled their C5 requirement as compared to a control group of similar students who

had yet to take a C5 course, the question to be addressed is exactly what they were superior doing. The assessment exam questions were of such a general nature that it is difficult to have a measure of student learning or understanding beyond the superficial. Overcoming this problem will be a challenge for future Global Communities assessment committees.

Global Communities – definitions and guidelines

In this part of the report the committee's suggestions and recommendations emanate from the faculty interviews described above. The interviews included a discussion of the role of Global Communities in meeting the UCC's goals and objectives. The C5 faculty unanimously saw Global Communities as the primary avenue for the UCC in the goal that students know their world. In this context C5 faculty undividedly agreed that there are two primary purposes of this category: to expose typically provincial USI students to cultures and countries outside the United States, and to demonstrate how and why these other cultures and countries are important to these students.

One major topic of discussion dealt with the concept of global communities as being linkages between cultures as opposed to an in depth study of a specific culture or group of cultures different from the student's own. This dichotomy was seen as the category's greatest weakness and as its greatest strength. Overall there was a consensus that these two points of view are not mutually exclusive. As such the assessment committee recommends that the category's definition be broadly interpreted so as to accommodate both points of view. Courses should have a major focus in one point of view without the complete exclusion of the other. Linkage courses should include some discussion of the cultures being linked, whereas, culture courses should include some discussion of the linkages a culture has with others. The emphasis depends on the nature of the course. The C5 faculty and the committee agree that both points of view serve to meet the UCC's goals in the student knowing their world.

Two major issues regarding the definition and guidelines for the category, which require further examination (see below), surfaced during the assessment process. The first of these deals with the definition's language found in its last sentence, "*In studying these linkages, significant attention will be paid to cultures outside the United States and, in the case of Europe, to non-traditional European cultures.*" The issue deals with the treatment of Europe. The exclusion of Europe, in the majority of C5 faculty and the committee's opinion, is a mistake given the category's role in the UCC. However, there is a caveat to the committee's argument for its inclusion in the category. This raises the second major issue, that the main focus of a C5 course be contemporary or modern. Therefore courses that study modern Europe, both Western and Eastern should be considered for inclusion in Global Communities. Note that the main focus of a course should be contemporary. This does not exclude the study of the past but that the purpose for the study of the past is to explain the present.

Therefore, since this interpretation may require changing the present understanding of Global Communities, the committee recommends that the UCC convene a body of all faculty stakeholders and other interested persons. The body, to better reflect the thinking of the majority of C5 faculty, would review and possibly recommend changes in the category's definition and its guidelines. Should the UCC and the University Assessment Committee accept recommendations for change, then we suggest a review of all present C5 courses by the UCC in meeting the recommended changes.

Institutional Recommendations

A. COURSES IN THE CATEGORY: Distributions and Pressures

1. More C5 courses should be offered in the fall and summer

Rationale: There is a heavy concentration of C5 course offerings in the spring semester with half as many courses and sections in the fall and only 6 in the summer. Foreign language 102 courses are concentrated in the spring, of course, but that fact does not account for all of the uneven distribution of courses.

2. More C5 courses should be developed and offered regularly

Rationale: There are major gaps in both academic disciplines offered in this section and gaps in areas of the world covered.

a. Global linkage courses lacking that should be part of any C5 category choices:

Comparative Religion and Philosophy; Comparative Literature

b. Cultures of major areas of the world that receive some coverage in global linkage courses but not in depth regional treatments: Africa; India and rest of South Asia; Russia and Eastern Europe

3. Recommend departments or schools that require a particular C5 course as part of department or school policy review [this](#) policy

Rationale: The pressure on a department that offers such courses as a service course can be enormous. For example, 28.2% of all C5 enrollments in Econ.241, and 84.2% of these are business majors because this is a required course. Business students then have no other options for completing the C5 requirements although they could take another course in this category for general credit.

4. Offer more sections of popular courses that currently have large enrollments to take some of the burden of grading off present instructors

B. HUMAN RESOURCES:

1. UCC might consider recommending the creation of several full-time faculty positions in Spanish and one in geography and a tenure-track position in anthropology

Rationale 1: Spanish 102 accounts for 15.2% of C5 enrollments. In the last two years that was 10 sections. Most of these are taught by adjuncts, not instructors or other full-time faculty.

Rationale 2: The Geography course accounts for 8.7% of the enrollments in C5. It is taught by an adjunct.

Rationale 3: Anthropology courses count for 10.6% of the total enrollments in C5 courses. These are taught by one instructor hired on a yearly contract.

These three areas constitute 34.5% of the enrollments in C5. The University is relying heavily on individuals to whom it is not making major commitments in salary, benefits, or status. Furthermore, these individuals may not subsequently make strong commitments to continue teaching these C5 courses should they have other more attractive options.

2. Several of C5 courses with large enrollments need student assistants and computer/language laboratories need laboratory assistants so that the labs can be open longer hours for students to use them and so that the students can receive help with equipment or software problems

Rationale: Faculty teaching courses with large enrollments will not be able to continue demanding much written work or projects from students without some help in grading or enrollment reductions. The demands in time for grading such assignments make it impossible to do research, etc. Part of UCC mandate is to teach students how to write, do critical thinking, and find resources, all of which require assignments beyond just scantron-graded tests.

3. More faculty development funds should be available to faculty to develop new courses in C5 and to expand their knowledge for those courses already being taught.

4. Using the Humanities as a model, C5 instructors should have workshops and retreats occasionally to exchange information and ideas and research.

C. MATERIAL RESOURCES:

1. Invest in more library resources for courses in the C5 category

Specifically, in addition to books and journals:

- a. IMF data base
- b. videos, DVDs, and CDROMs
- c. slides and slide library materials
- d. classroom maps

Rationale: Our students need the visual images and geographic knowledge that comes from these kinds of sources since few of them have ever been outside the United States.

2. Solicit more funding to send students to programs abroad

The committee wishes to thank the many individuals who made this assessment not only possible, but enjoyable as well. There are too many to name and we do not wish to run the risk of omission.