

## General Information

Year of Interest:	2017-2018 and 2018-2019
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	October 7 and 21, 2019

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

G. Compton-Engle, J. McBratney, B. Brossmann, T. Pace, A. Welki, R. Clark, K. Eslinger, K. Gygli, M. Marsilli, P. Mooney, K. Tobey, A. Sobisch, C. Bruce, T. Bruce, M. Moroney, R. Hessinger, M. Reynard

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, overall trends in student learning during this assessment cycle for the Integrative Core Curriculum. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

There were a number of factors that inhibited our ability to use the assessment results to draw conclusions about student learning. A number of the reports mention the difficulty in properly assessing student work samples without understanding the context of the course(s); lack of an assignment sheet and an absence of disciplinary knowledge were two key examples cited. Possible solutions to these problems are included in the Additional Core Committee Actions section below.

There were two learning goals that were noted as student weaknesses: thesis development in writing and integration.

A weakness in thesis development is not a surprise as it is a challenging task given students' typical levels of intellectual development. The relative weakness in core courses is consistent with what a number of departments have seen in their program-level assessment, notably first-year writing, history, and English. The current series of faculty development workshops on writing may help instructors deal with this particular issue.

Integration is a difficult challenge for undergraduates, and so the results here, while lower than other learning goals, are not surprising. Instructors who have taught integrated courses for a longer amount of time confirm that successful integration requires constant (almost daily) modeling for students—demonstrating for them ways to connect the disciplines when the disciplines are far apart and explicit delineation of ways that near-neighbor disciplines can be integrated. In the Additional Core Committee Action section, we recommend some workshops on this topic.

## Response to Recommendations for the Core Committee

*Prompt:* Listed below are the recommendations from Assessment Day. Please indicate the how the Core Committee intends to respond.

<p>New CAPA Assessment Plan [CAPA 2018]</p>	<p>T. Bruce will work with K. Gygli to revise the category's learning goals and develop a new formal assessment plan, both of which will be presented to the Core Committee for approval.</p>
<p><b>Change of Requirements</b></p>	
<p>We suggest that all students at John Carroll University take at least two sections of first-year composition to prepare students adequately for the various rhetorical and academic writing tasks students will experience in college and beyond. [Writing 2018]</p>	<p>The committee is not convinced that assessment data support this conclusion, particularly given the structural changes to the entire core this would entail. The new core provides more writing instruction than students received in the old core, but there is a high instructional burden on integrated courses. The committee will continue to consider this, and IE will conduct some longitudinal assessment of student writing this spring. Continued professional development opportunities around Writing Across the Curriculum and Writing Across Disciplines is planned and may help.</p>
<p>We think that the ISJ Core Designation application form might be modified, so as to communicate (to the applicant) that the class must be fundamentally oriented towards ISJ goals. And some means of evaluating this level of engagement should be built into the application form or process (even if reviewers just need to be instructed to take a closer look at the course description and the course SLO with this issue in mind). [ISJ 2018]</p>	<p>The Core Committee may revisit the form, and category-specific workshops will be offered that may help instructors understand and implement the ISJ goals.</p>
<p>The issue did arise as to how much ISJ content had to be present in the courses that get the designation. Should courses have to demonstrate that 60% or more of the readings specifically address social justice? In the very least, the designated assignment for assessment should explicitly seek to address the three ISJ learning goals. [ISJ 2019]</p>	

<b>Faculty Development</b>	
<p>Also, re EGC: is there still any possibility of a big learning community where everyone would share a reading or two on their syllabus, but there would be no need for several meetings during the semester? Or where we could use different kinds of (extra-)classroom collaborations (guest lectures, a symposium, etc.) to form the learning community? [LINK 2018]</p>	<p>It is clear that the concept of Learning Communities will need some review and support moving forward. This particular suggestion will remain an option; the committee feels that it is worth considering despite the specter of similarity to FYS.</p>
<p>The core committee should consider funding a faculty development opportunity for faculty to share and develop prompts for assignments. [EGC 2018]</p>	<p>One of the upcoming writing workshops is focused on assignment prompts.</p>
<p>We think it would be helpful to hold ISJ-specific development sessions, helping instructors see how to develop assignments that are more likely to produce SLO at the Met or Exceeded level. We believe that most of the low scores in our sample sets had more to do with the paper prompt, rather than with what the students may or may not have learned in the class. The Core Committee might consider instituting mandatory workshops, especially for those who are inheriting a class with Core designation, to assist instructors with assessment. Should training be strongly encouraged or required, for the sake of part-time faculty, online modules should be developed to make training accessible to all and diminish the burden of attending. [ISJ 2018]</p>	<p>The prompt workshop mentioned above should help with this. The Committee has decided to start with voluntary workshops with hopes that the value will draw attendees. As with many activities at the University, the ones who need it the most who won't come. This is properly speaking a problem for CTL to solve when it is revived. The Committee suggests that documentation of attendance at all faculty development would be most helpful for chairs.</p>
<p>Internally, ISJ courses should be audited to see if the content of the course is really addressing ISJ goals. Several of the documents submitted for various courses raised concerns. A suggestion was made that having a group of ISJ teaching faculty get together to discuss how their course was meeting ISJ goals and perhaps having the group go through the ISJ norming process would be beneficial to help faculty think about their own courses. Sharing of signature assignments would also be beneficial for instructors teaching courses that scored in the "not met" category. [ISJ 2019]</p>	<p>Category-specific workshops will be offered that may help instructors understand and implement the ISJ goals.</p>

**Process and Policy Improvements**

Publicize deadlines more clearly and frequently. Is there a way to share a Google calendar or even Inside JCU reminders that are far enough out (two weeks? one month?) to give people a chance to plan once they're close enough to be able to plan effectively for what they can realistically expect to be teaching. [LINK 2018]

All deadlines will be added to the CAS Google calendar and the Core Director will continue to send regular announcements and reminders.

Clarify (and publicize to faculty/advisors) policies about failure in or withdrawal from one course of a linked pair. [LINK 2018]

The policy has gone through formal process and been shared at advising workshops and in the core advising guide.

Update/remind faculty about new options for scheduling linked courses. [LINK 2018]

The Core Director will include this information in forthcoming announcements.

The Core Committee should examine the procedure for approving Signature Assignments, to make sure that it is sufficiently robust and developmental such that all courses include an appropriately integrative Signature Assignment. [LINK 2019]

Category specific workshops might help achieve integration with or without a signature assignment.

The Core Committee needs to follow through in communicating the results of Assessment Day to instructors, in a fashion whereby the results are genuinely absorbed and acted upon. [LINK 2019]

See the note in the Core Action below about "reflection."

**Rubric Changes**

Writing Rubric Changes: In "Sources, Evidence, and Documentation" category, we suggest including the word "recognizable" before "citation style" under "Met." The core committee may need to revisit the use of the word "attempt" in the written expression rubric. We find this word, at times, immeasurable. We also suggest taking out the term "main idea" under "Note" and replace it with "focus." [Writing 2018-2019]

The Core Committee decided to use "professional" instead of "recognizable."

<p>Writing Rubric Changes: Note at the bottom placed in larger font and at the top, or at least a more prominent space. We suggest placing an asterisk next to “Articulate an Argument” and then the corresponding explanation would go immediately underneath in the same box. Clarify the two columns under “Not Met” in the rubric. [Writing 2019]</p>	<p>T. Bruce will move the note, and use “focus” instead of “main idea.” New column headings will clarify the meanings of each column.</p>
<p>Speech Rubric: We had some concerns with the rubrics. The differences between this rubric and the rubrics used to assess the speeches in class created difficulty. This is particularly true of the first two elements. Some problems are inevitable due to taxonomies, but others can be clarified with additional information. We suggest examining the rubrics and also providing more detailed notes on how to apply it. [Speech 2019]</p>	<p>B. Brossmann and T. Bruce will develop/clarify the rubrics.</p>
<p>QA Rubric: We recommend some improvements in the rubric so that individual requirement elements are evaluated separately. One suggestion is to break the learning goal into scored sub-goal or dimensions (separating “pose precise question(s)” and “identify appropriate methodology”) [QA 2019]</p>	<p>T. Bruce will make this change.</p>
<p>As currently written, the two global criteria, GC5A1 and GC5B3 are confusing. Here are some points that the core committee might consider: 1) The second criteria should be split into two parts, because understanding global systems is unrelated to showing that individual decisions have global implications. 2) The first criteria works at cross purposes to the second criteria: the first criteria encourages the student to emphasize how diverse geographical/historical contexts are distinct whereas the second criteria encourages students to universalize the implications of diverse geographical/historical contexts. 3) It may make sense to rephrase “global” and instead specify two or more geographical areas. 4) If we demand that students examine individual and collective decisions that have global implications, we may prevent students from examining the decisions of the weak. [EGC 2018]</p>	<p>T. Bruce will work with A. Sobisch to revise the EGC rubric.</p>

As represented in the rubric of the ISJ, 6E is really two goals, at least as represented in the boxes: a) recognizing the injustice; b) articulating the consequences of injustice. We think the boxes should better square with the singular goal (could just get rid of the “identifies”; that is a necessary precondition to “articulating consequences”). [ISJ 2018]

T. Bruce will remove the “identifies” to simplify the ISJ rubric.

## **Additional Core Committee Actions**

*Prompt:* Please use this space to discuss any further actions the Core Committee intends to take based on 1) the data contained in the sub-committee reports, 2) the sub-committee meetings themselves, or 3) this meeting.

In order for Assessment Day to promote reflection among current instructors, it is vital that a number of things will need to happen going forward. We will need to use the “draft” method rather than relying on volunteers for Assessment Day participants. Secondly, the assessment office should send the annual assessment report to the faculty along with a “highlights” document for each category assessed that will include findings and recommendations to instructors. The cover letter this year should contain language encouraging faculty to carefully select assignments for assessment (given that some of the ones submitted in this cycle were not well-chosen) and encourage faculty to think about whether or not their course continues to deliver on the learning goals for their category. We

The assessment office will re-work assessment instructions in order to better gather assignment descriptions, particularly descriptions that are intelligible to an external audience. Some further context might help mitigate the gaps between instructor scores and outside assessor scores.

The Core Committee will offer professional development for faculty on the topic of assignment prompts, possibly targeted for specific core categories. These workshops could share examples of good practice noted on Assessment Day. Additional discussions or workshops for faculty sharing models and techniques for integration, of both near-neighbor disciplines and of disciplines farther apart.

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Writing
Current Semester:	Spring 2018
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2018

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Tom Pace, Katherine Clark, Collette Epple, Maria Soriano Young, Eileen Turoff, David Young

## Courses Offered in Fall 2017

### Foundational

- EN 120 Developmental Writing I (3 sections)
- EN 125 Seminar on Academic Writing (30 sections)
- HP 101 Honors Colloquium: Life of the Mind (4 sections)

## Courses Offered in Spring 2018

### Foundational

- EN 121 Developmental Writing II (3 sections)
- EN 125 Seminar on Academic Writing (11 sections)

## Typical Assessment Process

A sample of instructors teaching in the category is created by selecting all of the new instructors and a random sample of existing instructors to bring the total number to at least one-quarter of the total number of instructors. The sampled instructors are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee (Large classes are permitted to sample students). In the spring, a group of five randomly-selected instructors work with the category director to assess a sample of student work from the previous three semesters focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2018 meeting is writing in the foundational courses.**

## Deviations from the Assessment Process

Fall 2018 assessment was conducted under the previous model of all instructors providing data.

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

During this cycle of assessing foundational writing, the sub-committee discovered that students are learning how to select and develop a topic for a sustained research-based essay.

Student strengths included the following: most essays were competently organized; most essays were able to gather a variety of research to support their positions; most essays followed a citation style; and most essays were well-focused on a specific topic. Finally, control of syntax and mechanics was capable.

Weaknesses: Most of the theses were not adequately argumentative. Many of the arguments were not clarified by a clear thesis, nor did many of the papers address multiple sides of the issue at hand



## **Suggestions for Instructors**

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the Core committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

As a program, we need to come to a consensus about what constitutes an argumentative thesis statement for EN 125. Also, we need to come to a consensus about how to teach recognizable citation styles. We will continue to focus on how to incorporate research appropriately, i.e. direct quotes. Finally, we will continue to focus on how to students learn to choose appropriate sources. This material will be delivered through two main mechanisms: one, the annual comp orientation and, two, faculty development workshops in the fall and spring semesters.

## **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

Here is what we think works well: Having the number of papers to evaluate and talking with one another about the rubric and articulating why we assigned certain scores. This was very useful.

Here are our suggestions for improvement: Please clarify instructions prior to assessment. Many readers found the instructions confusing, especially in light of multiple emails.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

The subcommittee worked very well together. Because our committee is made up of multiple readers who teach at various universities, grading deadlines overlap. We would suggest earlier notification and clarity of the method of selecting readers for assessment.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category's director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, do you need to make to your application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

We strongly suggest we keep the cap for EN 125, 120, and 121 at 15.

## Recommendations for the Core Committee

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, do you need to make to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

We suggest that all students at John Carroll University take at least two sections of first-year composition to prepare students adequately for the various rhetorical and academic writing tasks students will experience in college and beyond.

Rubric Changes:

- In “Sources, Evidence, and Documentation” category, we suggest including the word “recognizable” before “citation style” under “Met.”
- The core committee may need to revisit the use of the word “attempt” in the written expression rubric. We find this word, at times, immeasurable.
- We also suggest taking out the term “main idea” under “Note” and replace it with “focus.”

### General Information

Core Category Discussed:	<b>Writing</b>
Current Semester:	<b>Spring 2019</b>
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2019

### Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Annually, a small group of instructors assesses a sample of student work from the previous year focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2019 meeting is Additional Writing.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors’ work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Tom Pace, Patrick Mooney, Maria Soriano Young, David Young, Jaleh Fazelian, Heinrik Hellwig

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

*Strengths:*

The papers featured an appropriate complexity of topic selection, appropriate presentation of that material. The papers overall used straightforward language, appropriate mechanics and syntax, conveying meaning to readers with clarity and at times grace and fluency. Although there were some exceptions, the writers also incorporated outside research appropriately, using a recognizable citation style appropriate to the discipline. Finally, we noticed a correlation in the level of the course and the level of sophistication of the writing. For instance, students at

the 400-level and 300-level tended to support arguments with appropriate organization, presentation, and content stronger than the 200-level papers.

*Failure to Meet the Goals:*

We found that while many of the writers were able to articulate an argument/controlling idea/focus appropriately, we also found that some writers were unable to do so. However, because many of the papers did not include a course assignment, the committee found it difficult to assess the rhetorical situation of these assignments.

## **Suggestions for Instructors**

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the Core committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

We suggest the following for instructors teaching AW courses:

- Choose assignment verbs carefully and articulate them clearly in the assignment, i.e. “analyze” vs. “describe”; “tell a story” vs. “write a review,” etc.
- Clarify for students the availability of materials/library expertise from Grasselli Library.
- Clear articulation of the assignment’s rhetorical situation in the assignment sheet, i.e. audience, purpose, genre, style, appropriate evidence used, disciplinary conventions, citation style, etc.
- Clarify for students the difference between appropriate use of online resources and databases and misuse of web-based materials.
- Please ask instructors to upload their assignment sheet for assessment.

*Mechanism:*

- Fall workshop on assignment design.
- Additional resources on the new WAC website.
- Concerted effort to improve orientation for part-time instructors on writing instruction, regardless of department.
- Integrate writing instruction-at-JCU in the year-long new faculty orientation.

## **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group’s evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

We cannot stress enough the need for writing assignment sheets (prompts, instructions) for all of these papers. Inaccurate ratings can result without the appropriate context in which the paper was composed. We recommend not pulling papers from courses that do not also include the assignment. Or, we should contact professors who did not include assignment sheets in order to obtain them.

If possible, when assessing AW courses, we should include faculty from the department for which these papers were written. For instance, we read a number of science papers, and all the readers were from the humanities.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

The subcommittee worked very well together. We would reiterate that AW readers from a diversity of departments would benefit the assessment process.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, need to be made to the application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

N/A

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, need to be made to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Rubric Changes:

- In "Sources, Evidence, and Documentation" category, we suggest including the word "recognizable" before "citation style" under "Met."
- The core committee may need to revisit the use of the word "attempt" in the written expression rubric. We find this word, at times, immeasurable.
- We also suggest taking out the term "main idea" under "Note" and replace it with "focus."
- Note at the bottom placed in larger font and at the top, or at least a more prominent space. We suggest placing an asterisk next to "Articulate an Argument" and then the corresponding explanation would go immediately underneath in the same box.
- Clarify the two columns under "Not Met" in the rubric.

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	<b>Speech</b>
Current Semester:	<b>Spring 2019</b>
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2019

## Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Annually, a small group of instructors assesses a sample of student work from the previous year focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2019 meeting is COMM 125 ()**. Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Carolyn Demanelis, Karen Gygli, Brent Brossmann, Trent Maverick, ,Laura Rouse, Debra Schwartz

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

Students need more focus on providing development of a credible source. Some students were excellent in this regard, but others were far less so. Currency of research is a similar issue. Students did a uniformly good job of providing oral citations, but didn't always provide the relevant information, like a date.

Students need to focus their presentations more on an immediate persuasive goal that is tied to their audience. Referencing their surveys, asking questions of the audience, or otherwise attempting to reach their audience was good, but a lack of framing issues sometimes made it unclear as to what the audience should or could do.

Organizational issues were sometimes problematic. They are supposed to use Monroe's Motivated Sequence, but that was rarely used or used effectively. Perhaps additional organizational patterns could be added. Even when used, it was more of a "checkbox" of ideas rather than a coherent pattern designed to advance the persuasive goal.

This year's focus was on the organization and support of speeches, but the committee found that delivery problems undercut the effectiveness of these questions. Students cannot be allowed to read their speeches. Vocal variety, while good at times, needs a lot of work for students. Eye contact is a similar concern,

We suggest students to focus on topics that are persuasive to a particular audience. For example, a speech that it is important to eat right and exercise daily is not new. The instructors have heard it 100 times. The students know it. However, many students still don't do it. The persuasive element is not to tell us to eat right, but to figure out why students aren't eating right, and to target ways to persuade them to change their habits. The information isn't the key, the persuasion is.

## **Suggestions for Instructors**

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the Core committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

Faculty should continue to emphasize the importance of outlining and planning for three reasons: 1) to create structure; 2) to identify areas that don't belong within the focus of the thesis; and 3) to help students continue practicing putting the ideas into their own words, which should help with the reading issue.

Additionally, the Committee found that the presentations impacted negatively by some delivery issues that can be resolved. Some well-designed speeches lost their effectiveness due to these delivery problems. Toward that end, we recommend:

Stressing the importance of putting your speech into your own language. Most of the presentations had a very 'read' quality and did not show the students demonstrating ownership or knowledge over the material.

Often, the delivery undermined the quality of the speech. The content, structure, and details were present, but the vocal quality and physical presence were so diminished that witnessing the speeches became effortful. Having concentrated lesson time devoted to speaking with intention, speaking from a place of authority, and maintaining a grounded and motivated posture.

Utilizing Powerpoints as a form of visual rhetoric that enhances your presentation and supports the main action of your speech.

Finally, we suggest vetting topics, to focus on choosing topics that are applicable to JCU freshmen, that feature persuasive elements (as opposed to informational elements), and are focused so that tangential concepts are removed.

## **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should provide useful data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

Having all the videos on Canvas was very easy. We applaud that.

We had some concerns with the rubrics. The differences between this rubric and the rubrics used to assess the speeches in class created difficulty. This is particularly true of the first two elements. Some problems are inevitable due to taxonomies, but others can be clarified with additional information. We suggest examining the rubrics and also providing more detailed notes on how to apply it.

It was suggested that adding the relevant speech plans would help the assessment process.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

There is no application process for this element. We have no other comments.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, need to be made to the application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

We reiterate the need for a stronger instruction document on expectations and application of the rubric.

We recommend a closer connection between the rubrics used in the class setting and the ones used for assessment. The terminology and grouping of concepts could be conceptually more similar.

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, need to be made to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

We believe our recommendations for changes are important. This would include modification of the current rubric. We'd consider those changes for elements not covered by this year's application. Other than that, we have no specific recommendations for the Core Committee.

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	<b>Quantitative Analysis</b>
Current Semester:	<b>Spring 2018</b>
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2018

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

**list names here**

## Courses Offered in Fall 2017

DATA 100 Introduction to Data Science (2 sections)  
EC 208 Business and Economics Statistics 2 (5 sections)  
EC 210 Business Analytics & Statistics (2 sections)  
ED 101 Making Sense of Data  
ER 115 Quantitative Analysis in Science, Business, and Humanities  
MT 122 Elementary Statistics (6 sections)  
MT 228 Statistics for Biological Sciences  
PO 105 Political Analysis  
SPS 122 Statistics in Sports

## Courses Offered in Spring 2018

CH 261/263 Analytical Chemistry  
DATA 100 Introduction to Data Science  
DATA 122 Elementary Statistics (5 sections)  
DATA 228 Statistics for Biological Sciences (3 sections)  
EC 208 Business and Economics Statistics 2  
EC 210 Business Analytics & Statistics (3 sections)  
ED 101 Making Sense of Data  
MT 119 Quantitative Analysis

## Typical Assessment Process

A sample of instructors teaching in the category is created by selecting all of the new instructors and a random sample of existing instructors to bring the total number to at least one-quarter of the total number of instructors. The sampled instructors are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee (Large classes are permitted to sample students). In the spring, a group of five randomly-selected instructors work with the category director to assess a sample of student work from the previous three semesters focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2018 meeting is representing data.**

## Deviations from the Assessment Process

Fall 2018 assessment was conducted under the previous model of all instructors providing data.

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

Students demonstrated the ability to execute at very high levels very well defined tasks in representing data. Conversely, the students struggled with the ability to identify “best” approaches when faced with an ambiguous situation. That is, given a description of a particular scenario and asked to choose the best representation method, they were much less competent in doing that successfully.



## **Suggestions for Instructors**

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

The ability to address and process ambiguous situations is a very important skill. Instructors should probably blend assignments that focus on execution of methods (not requiring student identification) with assignments that force the student to grapple with the “identification” issue.

## **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group’s evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

The group felt the system works well and had little to offer. One suggestion however was that beside the assignment used for assessment an answer key would help the assessment group better understand the teacher’s expectations.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group’s evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

The group appreciated the smoothness of flow and felt the rubric was easy to use. The dimension to evaluate this cycle was straightforward and may have contributed to that outcome.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the group and the assessment office. What changes, if any, do you need to make to your application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

The group felt it would be helpful if there was some type of repository or location where other QA course teachers could see materials, assignments, projects, etc. that were used in the assessment of student learning process. The group felt everyone on the path of continuous improvement is looking to benefit from their peers. The group also felt that, while assessment could occur any time during the class, the assessment offers the opportunity for the best information closer to the end of the semester as the student would have the ability to demonstrate deeper levels of learning.

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, do you need to make to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Nothing to suggest for the committee.

## General Information

Core Category Discussed: **Quantitative Analysis**

Current Semester: **Spring 2019**

Date of Assessment Meeting(s): **May 15, 2019**

## Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Annually, a small group of instructors assesses a sample of student work from the previous year focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2019 meeting is Find and Pose Precise Question.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Andy Welki, Ashley Wain, Maria Donaldson-Misener, Heidi Moawad, Mark Waner, Carole Krus

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

For the most part, the students were pretty good at following directions. The students chose reasonable quantitative techniques for the questions they posed. In assignments where the requirements were clearly stated, the students seemed to follow the instructions well.

However, there was a wide variability in the quality and precision of the questions posed by the students – which then affected their ability to analyze the question appropriately. Some of the students failed to perform a true statistical analysis. Instead they provided only descriptive statistics or only one variable.

## Suggestions for Instructors

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the Core committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

Instructors should tell the students when they expect *multiple* questions posed that might cover a *variety* of analytical techniques, not just the most recently taught method. This feedback could be provided from the QA subcommittee to the current instructors and in future QA core applications.

We found that some of the assignments didn't clearly articulate the different expectations for each of the QA criteria.

## Evaluation of Assessment Processes

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

We see the first competency of the rubric contains two distinct goals: the posing of question(s) and choice of appropriate methodology. The rubric doesn't allow the independent assessment of those two elements. There was some confusion about the scoring. Are 1, 3, and 5 the only allowable scores, or are they just anchor points and 2 and 4 are potential scores?

In the case of quantitative analysis assignments, our committee had a hard time seeing how one could exceed the expectations of these types of assignments, as described. In reality, the work was typically evaluated as either a 1 or 3.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

n/a

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, need to be made to the application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

We recommend some improvements in the rubric so that individual requirement elements are evaluated separately. One suggestion is to break the learning goal into scored sub-goal or dimensions (separating "pose precise question(s)" and "identify appropriate methodology").

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, need to be made to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

n/a

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	<a href="#">Linked Courses</a>
Current Semester:	<b>Spring 2018</b>
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2018

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

George Bilgere , Carrie Buchanan, Emily Butler, Mona DeBaz, Roger Purdy, Kristen Tobey

## Course Pairs Offered in Fall 2017

Beat Generation (AH/EN)  
Climate Change (COMM/PH)  
Communication + Writing (COMM/EN)  
Consciousness (BL/EN)  
Energy (CH/ER)  
Environment (BL/EN)  
Forensics (CH/PO)  
Gender Issues (HS/SC)  
Inquiry (CH/PH)  
Islamism (PO/TRS)  
Plato (PL/PO)  
Religious Enthusiasm (HS/TRS)  
Rome (AH/HS)  
Science & Innovation (EP/ER)

## Course Pairs Offered in Spring 2018

American Media (COMM/HS)  
American Writing and Film (COMM/EN)  
Childhood (HS/PS)  
Environment (BL/EN)  
Forensics (CH/EN)  
Ideas and Health (CH/ER)  
Islamism (PO/TRS)  
Japanese History & Society (HS/ SC)  
Language/Linguistics (BL/EN)  
Pop Culture (EN/PL)  
Race & Ethnicity in Theatre (COMM/SC)  
Soul Food (IC/TRS)  
Supernatural (EN/HS)

## Typical Assessment Process

A sample of instructors teaching in the category is created by selecting all of the new instructors and a random sample of existing instructors to bring the total number to at least one-quarter of the total number of instructors. The sampled instructors are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee (Large classes are permitted to sample students). In the spring, a group of five randomly-selected instructors work with the category director to assesses a sample of student work from the previous three semesters focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2018 meeting is critical thinking.**

## Deviations from the Assessment Process

Fall 2018 assessment was conducted under the previous model of all instructors providing data.

## **Findings**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

We saw some collaborative papers that seemed to be of higher average quality than the much more variable individual papers we read.

Students often struggled to articulate a clear trajectory for their paper in a way that went beyond simply restating the assignment. Lots of creative mixtures of citation styles.

## **Suggestions for Instructors**

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

More emphasis in assignment guidelines or prep on setting up and framing the argument from the outset of the paper.

Discussion of appropriate sources and how to evaluate a potential source, especially online, where there is so much available that is reliable and so much available that is not reliable.

Clarification of citation standards.

Incorporate expertise from librarians and Writing Center consultants into student learning – find mechanisms to require/reward students for using the Writing Center, have class work with librarians, give library tours, etc.

Build in ways for students to become more familiar with what constitutes effective writing in the relevant disciplines.

Perhaps the Core Committee could bundle some common or fundamental concerns/suggestions into a message to all faculty or all faculty teaching in the core.

## **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

Good to have only a small set of criteria to consider! Thanks also for trying to streamline everything; Drive is a great resource. Maybe include the rubric in the Drive folder, too.

Encourage instructors to share assignment guidelines!! Some assignments tricky to decipher and/or assess without a sense of what was asked of students.

Divided opinion as to whether or not it would help to have a day or more in between submission of final grades and assessment activities, or whether this could happen during the semester.

Some in the group felt that we could have been effective with smaller numbers of papers from each class.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

Need more flexibility about how we try to forecast teaching obligations, when Grauels, etc. can drastically change plans.

Is there a way to streamline this? JCU is sometimes inclined to go with procedure over product.

OnBase created some technical problems for some re saving intermittently. (Sounds like this has been addressed?)

Wide support was expressed for a \$2501 stipend. Wide support was also expressed for Todd – thank you for all you do.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the group and the assessment office. What changes, if any, do you need to make to your application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Continue the streamlining process that has begun. It is greatly appreciated!

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, do you need to make to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Publicize deadlines more clearly and frequently. Is there a way to share a Google calendar or even Inside JCU reminders that are far enough out (two weeks? one month?) to give people a chance to plan once they're close enough to be able to plan effectively for what they can realistically expect to be teaching.

Clarify (and publicize to faculty/advisors) policies about failure in or withdrawal from one course of a linked pair.

Update/remind faculty about new options for scheduling linked courses.

Also, re EGC: is there still any possibility of a big learning community where everyone would share a reading or two on their syllabus, but there would be no need for several meetings during the semester? Or where we could use different kinds of (extra-)classroom collaborations (guest lectures, a symposium, etc.) to form the learning community?

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:

[Linked Courses](#)

Current Semester:

Spring 2019

Date of Assessment Meeting(s):

May 15, 2019

## Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Annually, a small group of instructors assesses a sample of student work from the previous year focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2019 meeting is Integration.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Cindi Deutschman-Ruiz, Maria Marsilli, Reiko Simmons, Matt Zarzeczny, Rodney Hessinger, Bryan Hurd

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

The students seemed to be able to master each domain of knowledge as separate units, but struggled more in integrating these.

Well-designed prompts seem to produce better results (sufficient scaffolding, but not overly complicated or overly ambitious goals). We think the vicinity of the disciplines needs to be considered when designing the assignments. If the disciplines are closely related, it seems the instructors need to further highlight disciplinary-specific knowledge and methods for the students, so that the students can better appreciate how integration can occur. If the disciplines are far apart, it seems that more scaffolding, so as to structure the interdisciplinary conversation is needed.

## Suggestions for Instructors

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the Core committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

In thinking about course design, it would be worth thinking about the various forms that integration can occur (additive complementary knowledge; application of one field's discipline-specific methods to another field's domain of knowledge, etc.). In designing assignments, one might provide a menu of methods of integration.

The university needs to provide more training to course instructors, helping them learn how to accomplish interdisciplinary conversation (between themselves, the courses, and in the work of students). Mentoring from more seasoned instructors might be one way to accomplish this

(including observing classes) . Moreover, this needs to be structurally facilitated by an Associate Provost or a Director of CTL.

## **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

We feel that conversations are enriched by having student work fresh in our minds and by having two sets of eyes on the same student papers. We feel like we are better able to see what is working (or not) and why.

It would be good to provide a more deliberately selected cross-section of randomly selected papers (not just a large batch, leaving it to us to pick which ones we read). That is, be more intentional and prescriptive in giving us papers to score.

We should continue to encourage those who teach (or want to teach) in certain categories to participate in assessing those categories on Assessment Day. Self-reflection on one's own course design happens naturally, as one is considering student work from other Linked classes.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

We are confused by this question. Are you asking about the process whereby an instructor applies for Core designation for a Linked class? If so, we think renewed attention to helping people find Linking partners is needed.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, need to be made to the application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

One possible way to encourage more integration would be to tie Core designation to participation in a set number of (stipended) development workshops centered on interdisciplinary integration (staged by the Provost's Office/CTL). We need to incentivize faculty to sit in on one another's courses, for this provides better opportunities for interdisciplinary dialogue.

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, need to be made to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

The Core Committee should examine the procedure for approving Signature Assignments, to make sure that it is sufficiently robust and developmental such that all courses include an appropriately integrative Signature Assignment. The Core Committee needs to follow through in communicating the results of Assessment Day to instructors, in a fashion whereby the results are genuinely absorbed and acted upon.



## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	<b>Engaging the Global Community</b>
Current Semester:	<b>Spring 2018</b>
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2018

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Maria Marsilli, Leslie Curtis, Marcus Gallo, Dan Kilbride, Mindy Peden, Gerald Sabo

## Courses Offered in Fall 2017

Cultural Encounters (4 sections from EN and HS)  
Global Debt (PO/SC)  
Globalization (2 sections from HS and PO)  
Healthcare in Latin America (1 section from PO)  
Japanese Pop Culture (HS/IC)  
Power and Identity (1 section from HS)  
Storytelling (4 sections from COMM, EN, and IC)  
World Art, Culture, and History (9 sections from AH and TRS)

## Courses Offered in Spring 2018

Cultural Encounters (6 sections from EN, HS, and PO)  
Global Feminisms (1 section from HS)  
Globalization (1 section from SC)  
Political Economy of State Formation (1 section from PO)  
Power and Identity (3 sections from CL and HS)  
Storytelling (3 sections from IC and PO)  
World Art, Culture, and History (9 sections from AH and TRS)

## Typical Assessment Process

A sample of instructors teaching in the category is created by selecting all of the new instructors and a random sample of existing instructors to bring the total number to at least one-quarter of the total number of instructors. The sampled instructors are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee (Large classes are permitted to sample students). In the spring, a group of five randomly-selected instructors work with the category director to assesses a sample of student work from the previous three semesters focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2018 meeting is writing in the foundational courses.**

## Deviations from the Assessment Process

Fall 2018 assessment was conducted under the previous model of all instructors providing data.

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

It is difficult to identify trends that apply across all classes. Having said that, students were more likely to meet expectations for criteria 5A1 and less likely to meet expectations in criteria 5B3.

Some EGC prompts are clear and thoroughly address both “Global” criteria -- others fail to address the learning goals. In some classes, students met or exceeded all expectations. In others, students consistently fell short of meeting expectations for criteria 5B3, in part because the prompt (or assignment) did not demand that the students address all criteria. We found that the prompts that asked students to directly address texts clearly related to the goals generally resulted in papers that addressed those goals more effectively. This is likely related to classes’ writing as a process (second drafts tend to produce a better product), although this is only one of the ways to address the goals effectively.

The study abroad prompt is crystal clear, but a significant number of students failed to address the prompt, especially with regard to criteria 5B3.

## Suggestions for Instructors

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

Instructors should construct their prompts specifically to address the learning goals. Instructors may want to include the language of the criteria in their assignments in order to avoid being vague.

In general, well-constructed prompts assign key readings, films, experiences, or other materials to students that are rich enough to allow students to see an obvious connection to the EGC learning goals.

Faculty may consider sharing prompts for their signature assignments with one another in their learning communities.

## Evaluation of Assessment Processes

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group’s evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

Doing the assessment at this point of the semester and paying a stipend is appropriate.

The assessment process seems to be working well at the moment, especially because the assessors have taught EGC classes. Sampling makes the assessment process more palatable and is methodologically sound.

## Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group’s evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

We do not feel capable of addressing this question.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the group and the assessment office. What changes, if any, do you need to make to your application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Are study abroad experiences being assessed appropriately for EGC purposes?

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, do you need to make to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

The core committee should consider funding a faculty development opportunity for faculty to share and develop prompts for assignments.

As currently written, the two global criteria, GC5A1 and GC5B3 are confusing. Here are some points that the core committee might consider:

- 1) The second criteria should be split into two parts, because understanding global systems is unrelated to showing that individual decisions have global implications.
- 2) The first criteria works at cross purposes to the second criteria: the first criteria encourages the student to emphasize how diverse geographical/historical contexts are distinct whereas the second criteria encourages students to universalize the implications of diverse geographical/historical contexts.
- 3) It may make sense to rephrase “global” and instead specify two or more geographical areas.
- 4) If we demand that students examine individual and collective decisions that have global implications, we may prevent students from examining the decisions of the weak.

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	<b>Engaging the Global Community</b>
Current Semester:	<b>Spring 2019</b>
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2019

## Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Annually, a small group of instructors assesses a sample of student work from the previous year focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2019 meeting is Integration.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Mindy Peden, Andreas Sobich, Salomon Rodezno, Martha Pereszlenyi-Pinter, Wally Salkauski, and Michele Freyhaut

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

It is unclear how to assess different methodologies if methodologies diverge even within fields.

It would be helpful to have integration and methodology more conceptually defined and articulated.

Study abroad paper becomes a reflection absent academic content/rigor in some cases so we recommend that incentives and the prompt should reflect the learning outcomes more directly. The current prompt does not offer guidance on integration, which is what we assessed today. Second paragraph of the prompt needs to be drawn out to hit the rubric/academic expectations, since students are there for course work. Perhaps requiring sources for each of their cultural observations. Perhaps requiring a minimum number of primary resources/references. A pre-departure and post-abroad interview is being done by the chair of the EGC committee- this is inefficient and exploitative.

Some study abroad papers also were very moving and impactful.

We think that many of the course papers were excellent at integration and we suspect that it strongly correlates to assignment details.

## Suggestions for Instructors

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the Core committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

All instructors are strongly urged to participate in this core assessment day process at least once; great for professional development.

Integrating and repeating the EGC rubric language into signature assignment instructions is really effective and results in students meeting or exceeding the integration learning goal.

Please tell professors to put assignment prompts on canvas so they can be extracted for assessment.

### **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

The process was smooth and using only one criteria helped the norming and assessing process.

Having all assignment prompts available for the assessors would be really helpful.

Small group work was preferred, instead of large group work.

Continue the stipends for the work.

### **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

Simplify the application process to get the course designation approval or rejection.

### **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, need to be made to the application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Will instructors included in this year's assessment receive feedback on how their assignments matched or didn't match with EGC rubric assessment from today? We think that it could be an interesting conversation and professional development opportunity for instructors.

### **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, need to be made to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Thank you for your hard work.

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	<b>Issues in Social Justice</b>
Current Semester:	Spring 2018
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2018

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

Gloria Vaquera, Mary Beadle, Nancy Conrady, Rodney Hessinger, Michele Freyhauf, Sherri Young

## Courses Offered in Fall 2017

33 sections across 11 departments

## Courses Offered in Spring 2017

20 sections across 10 departments

## Typical Assessment Process

A sample of instructors teaching in the category is created by selecting all of the new instructors and a random sample of existing instructors to bring the total number to at least one-quarter of the total number of instructors. The sampled instructors are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee (Large classes are permitted to sample students). In the spring, a group of five randomly-selected instructors work with the category director to assess a sample of student work from the previous three semesters focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2018 meeting is the items specifically focused on social justice.**

## Deviations from the Assessment Process

Fall 2018 assessment was conducted under the previous model of all instructors providing data.

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

We found that the nature of the assignment itself was key to whether or not students met the goals. Those assignments better aligned with the ISJ goals were more likely to have stronger SLO. We also found that students were more successful with 6E (understanding consequences) rather than 6D (examining conditions that give rise to injustice). Consequences of injustice are more readily observed, whereas understanding causality requires a much deeper engagement with a particular issue. We also wondered whether any one assignment could realistically do both. We also thought the selected assignments must necessarily be longer in order to achieve these goals. A 5 page paper might be able to hit the “Met” bar, but Exceeded is out of reach. Some assignments were only 3 or fewer pages ; few of these were able to reach the exceeded category. We also noted that assignments dealing with fictional representations (TV shows, novels, etc.) had greater difficulty in meeting the SLO. Even though instructors prompted them to “engage with the real world,” we wondered if that engagement was instructing students to incorporate actual scholarly evidence into their narrative/essay. Students often were content to summarize plot lines and characters without much analysis.

## Suggestions for Instructors

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

As described more fully above, we think longer assignments (suggested: 6 to 8 pages) are better selected for assessment. In addition, the assignments should not have too much scaffolding. Many student papers were too fragmented, “checking boxes,” so to speak, rather than developing a deeper analysis of the causes of inequality. We also think that classes that lean more towards fictional works need to provide more guidance to students, asking them to engage with academic sources or data on inequality.

In terms of delivering feedback, we think there are various opportunities for sharing results with instructors. First, this report can provide some general guidance to all instructors. This would involve reminding instructors of the rubric being used to assess ISJ courses. In addition, one could see one’s own scores side by side with the aggregate scores (both as scored by instructors, as well as by Assessment Day groups). Additionally, perhaps courses could be grouped by discipline with averages reported for the whole area (ex: TRS - ISJ courses or English - ISJ courses).

## Evaluation of Assessment Processes

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group’s evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

The timing of the assessment day perhaps needs to be reconsidered. Please push this day back later (day after grades being done is “brutal”). Since it is stipended, we might consider a day after Commencement. We might also consider just having an initial norming meeting, then be given a longer (1 month?) block of time to score on our own, then reconvene for a 2nd reporting meeting. We also wondered whether a random sample of assignments from a wider range of classes (rather than fewer complete sets) might be a better way to sample the data.

## Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group’s evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

Several of us had not read the norming papers prior to the morning meeting, so we first selected two papers that we all read and then normed. We felt comfortable enough to then break off and divide the papers amongst us (rather than having members of pairs score the same ones). The advantage was that we covered most of the student work that was provided to us in the google docs folders. After reading the papers, we reconvened and discussed the experience and drafted this report.

## Recommendations for Internal Changes

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the group and the assessment office. What changes, if any, do you need to make to your application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

We wonder if for classes seeking ISJ designation, the course needs to show that the fundamental orientation of the class is truly towards the ISJ goals. Meaning that the **central** focus of the course is to: *understand and respect human cultural differences, examine the*

*consideration that have given rise to injustice and to understand the consequences of injustice. If it is not, then it is unlikely that student work will show a deep analysis of the causes or consequences of inequality. Even if a single assignment is on inequality, the course will not have given students sufficient knowledge or context to do this analysis sufficiently.*

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt: This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, do you need to make to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.*

As represented in the rubric of the ISJ, 6E is really two goals, at least as represented in the boxes: a) recognizing the injustice; b) articulating the consequences of injustice. We think the boxes should better square with the singular goal (could just get rid of the “identifies”; that is a necessary precondition to “articulating consequences”).

We think that the ISJ Core Designation application form might be modified, so as to communicate (to the applicant) that the class must be fundamentally oriented towards ISJ goals. And some means of evaluating this level of engagement should be built into the application form or process (even if reviewers just need to be instructed to take a closer look at the course description and the course SLO with this issue in mind).

We think it would be helpful to hold ISJ-specific development sessions, helping instructors see how to develop assignments that are more likely to produce SLO at the *Met* or *Exceeded* level. We believe that most of the low scores in our sample sets had more to do with the paper prompt, rather than with what the students may or may not have learned in the class. The Core Committee might consider instituting mandatory workshops, especially for those who are inheriting a class with Core designation, to assist instructors with assessment. Should training be strongly encouraged or required, for the sake of part-time faculty, online modules should be developed to make training accessible to all and diminish the burden of attending.



## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Issues in Social Justice
Current Semester:	Spring 2019
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 15, 2019

## Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Annually, a small group of instructors assesses a sample of student work from the previous year focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2019 meeting is Injustice.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

George Lewandowski; Richard D. Clark; Sydnia Tcheurekdjian; Deniz Durmus; Nathaniel Morehouse; Gloria Vaquera

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your group has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

In considering the submissions as a group, we found the papers to be generally well written with demonstrated student learning. The failure we found, in most cases, was related more to the instructions students received which ensured that they would not be able to meet the stated ISJ goals. Assignments that did not explicitly ask students to "examine the conditions that gave rise to injustice" focusing on historical or structural issues had little discussion on the topic. Similarly, if the instructions failed to ask how the topic presents "understanding of the consequences of injustice," the papers were also lacking this element. The best papers in the group came from courses which had clearly written assignments that were structured to meet the two ISJ learning goals that we were assessing. We also found that longer papers (7 to 12 pages) were able to reach the "exceeds" category, more often, than shorter papers (3 to 4 pages).

## Suggestions for Instructors

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the Core committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

Based on some of these assignments, the assessment group was left to wonder how much of the actual course was truly focused on social justice because the designated assignment failed to provide evidence of an understanding of the conditions that give rise to social justice and the consequences of that injustice. The suggestion of the committee to instructors is to

examine the course being taught as ISJ and ensure that the focus is on social justice and that the designated assignment for evaluation actually addresses the stated learning goals for ISJ. Additionally, it is difficult for one assignment, which is only 3 to 4 pages, to address all the learning goals. For all ISJ courses, it is also useful for instructors to be reminded of the goals and the rubric that is used to assess this assignment to ensure that the students can demonstrate knowledge in those areas.

## **Evaluation of Assessment Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

The following were some of the suggestions:

\* When sending the instructions for norming, just send the reviewers two sample papers with the instruction sheets as an email attachment and not a zip file. Having two zip files was a little cumbersome and some folks opened the wrong one.

\* Have the norming include a set of papers from a lower division course, like 100, and an upper division course, so that the committee can see a range of depth.

Overall, the participants enjoyed the structure of the day. "It was much more enjoyable than I anticipated," stated on participant. Everyone enjoyed the norming process and talking about the papers. Working with a partner on the same paper was also very useful. Lunch could be shorter.

## **Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes**

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

Only one of the participants had recently submitted a course for an ISJ approval so she was the only one to comment on the process. This participant mentioned that the online system and instructions available were "vague and confusing." After submitting, the current ISJ chair scheduled a face-to-face meeting to explain what the Core committee was looking for and that was extremely helpful. So it was suggested that more informational meetings about how to submit and what should be present in an ISJ course should be offered to faculty.

## **Recommendations for Internal Changes**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, need to be made to the application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

Internally, ISJ courses should be audited to see if the content of the course is really addressing ISJ goals. Several of the documents submitted for various courses raised concerns. A suggestion was made that having a group of ISJ teaching faculty get together to discuss how their course was meeting ISJ goals and perhaps having the group go through the ISJ norming process would be beneficial to help faculty think about their own courses. Sharing of signature assignments would also be beneficial for instructors teaching courses that scored in the "not met" category.

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, need to be made to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluations and these recommendations.

This group felt the ISJ designation was essential at JCU and that the goals and rubric were adequate. The issue did arise as to how much ISJ content had to be present in the courses that get the designation. Should courses have to demonstrate that 60% or more of the readings specifically address social justice? In the very least, the designated assignment for assessment should explicitly seek to address the three ISJ learning goals.

Overall, the participants in the assessment day felt that this kind of review of assignments was a useful activity. They all agreed that this process made them reflect on how they taught their courses and if they were writing assignment instructions that explicitly asked students to address the stated learning goals. Having an opportunity to engage with faculty from across JCU was also enjoyable and much more entertaining than they had anticipated.

## CAPA Assessment Day Report

Report written by Karen Gygli (Theatre), Russert Dept of Communication and Theatre

**May 15, 2018**

Present: Johnny Cochran (Music), Cynthia Caporella (Music), Mary Coffey (Visual Arts)

The committee decided, after some discussion, to change the format of assessment evidence collected each semester. Currently, videos of performances are uploaded, along with a spreadsheet of assessment scores on each student. The committee decided that while most of them digitally record performances and would provide them for perusal if necessary, a written survey with focused questions might more accurately communicate what students learn from these courses. This is especially the case because the skill levels and prior experience with the arts is so variable in an average class.

Individual instructors could have students do this survey in the form of a short paper, or it could be done as a survey in class, although it would be necessary of course to collect them in a digital format. A one-credit class might find it more appropriate to do this as a survey in class, whereas a three-credit class might require the short paper. But either version would use the following questions which rephrase the learning goals of CAPA courses.

This is a draft of what we came up with:

Reflective Paper or Short survey (whatever instructor thinks is most appropriate) with prompts-- Give time in class to complete. Have students bring laptops and email it or they can write it out and the instructor can scan it.

John Carroll has identified certain learning goals as important for our graduates, including developing habits of aesthetic appreciation and engagements in the arts. Now that you have engaged in a CP, reflect upon your experience in the following ways:

1. Having engaged in the creative process of \_\_\_\_\_ [what the student studied this semester as creative act], what you learned about yourself this semester when faced with this new endeavor?
2. Appreciation--What do you know now about the work process that goes into \_\_\_\_\_ that you didn't know before your work this semester?
3. Understanding--How has your understanding of \_\_\_\_\_ expanded as the result of your participation in this class this semester?
4. Consideration and Engagement--How has your engagement in the \_\_\_\_\_ impacted and/or changed you?

In discussing the challenges in teaching CAPA courses, the committee discussed the following:

- Frustrated about obstacles in the way of providing individual applied instructions in music (such as individual piano lessons). There is an interest in this type of instruction from students, but there seems to be no way to adapt the enrollment and tuition systems to do this.
- Inability to accurately reflect levels of instruction in course descriptions, and what students should come in with to be able to take an advanced class. What experience students should have before enrolling needs to be clearly articulated in course descriptions.
- Lab Fees for art supplies. How best to ensure that students have adequate visual arts supplies in order to participate in the course. Lab fee? Bookstore? Amazon link? Blinks? Right now, instructors are supplementing these supplies out of their own pockets.
- We need more promotion of the arts as essential to learning and life.
- Space continues to be an issue for instruction.
- Rehearsal and homework practice--the need to realize that there is an expectation of outside class rehearsal or practicing skill needed. And that it is part of the total commitment outside of class that should be balanced by the instructor realization that you had.