**UCA Core Council Assessment Sub-Committee**

**Minutes/Notes**

**October 25, 2017**

1. Jacob Held, Chair, reiterates the charge of the committee.
	1. *Charge*: To review Core assessment data, provide a cogent interpretation of the data to the Core Council, and recommend interventions or developmental opportunities based on recent assessment data.
2. Feedback from the Responsible Living scorers
	1. Goal A: Ethics (Donna Bowman and Jacob Held discuss their experiences as Rubric A scorers)
		1. The norming process was valuable. Helped to orient the scorers and calibrate their expectations. Helped to clarify that assignment design is crucial in terms of setting student expectation and demonstrating competence. For example, if an assignment only allows for or asks that a student “describe” issues then that performance will probably only be able to reach a one or two on the rubric. In addition, after calibration and through the process as a whole, one was affirmed in their confidence to score these artifacts/student work even in areas outside of one’s area of content specialty.
		2. The rubric is well-designed.
		3. In terms of questions moving forward there was ambivalence on whether or not having the student’s assignment would be valuable. Judging the artifact alone as evidence was seen as beneficial because we had a simple performance to evaluate so faculty expectations weren’t a factor and couldn’t affect or taint the process. However, at times it would’ve been nice to know what the student had been asked to do, what were the teacher’s expectations, the assignment requirements, and so forth. Faculty can fill in some of this info with the survey, however.
	2. Goal B: Well-Being (Rebekah Lindsey Luong and Mike Casey discuss their experiences as Rubric B scorers)
		1. Key issue raised was assignment design. One of the main issues the scorers faced was receiving student work/artifacts that did not address the learning outcomes of the rubric. Thus, the scorer was unable to apply the rubric to the assignment. Insofar as assessment is about evaluating student learning against our expectations represented by the rubrics, this was problematic since it failed to provide us with an adequate response and so a basis upon which to evaluate our students’ performances and progress. Assignment design and alignment is thus a crucial element to this process and needs to be addressed. Faculty teaching in these areas should receive development opportunities well in advance of the assessment cycle so they can adequately design, align, and place assignments in their courses. Dr. Held mentioned that this is being done with respect to Diversity this cycle, and Communication for next year. See point 3 below.
		2. The rubric was acknowledged as well designed. It would be beneficial for faculty to consider the rubric as they design assignments within their disciplines.
		3. Again the norming process was highly valued, and scorers felt confident that they were competent in evaluating all student work under that rubric even outside of their home discipline.
		4. The same ambivalence was noted with regard to whether the scorer should have the student assignment before them as they score. See point ii under Goal A Ethics above.
		5. Terri Rine via email “I recognize the plan to spend much more time with faculty addressing the clarity of the task and the design of appropriate assignments.  While doing so, I would offer  them the consideration that the lengthy semester-long cumulative assignments had a greater chance of being skimmed as opposed to the shorter, more concise ones.  Thus, the laborious task of a scorer having to dig through many pages for the content, lessens the potential for a thorough read and possibly inconsistent scoring.”
	3. As a general observation it was noted that going through this process as a scorer was beneficial. From an instructor’s point of view it helped clarify what they ought to be doing in their own courses. It offered them insights into the Core, and assignment design that they could bring back to their departments or educational units.
3. Training already scheduled for Communication in Spring 2018.
	1. See schedule below (all sessions scheduled for Burdick 215)

**For Rubric A (Oral Comm)**

Faciltators: Jacob Held, Stacy Fritzges, and Nelle Bedner

Days and times:

Tuesday, April 17, 2018 at x-period

Thursday, April 19, 2018 at x-period

Friday, April 20, 2018 at 3:00 pm.

**For Rubric B (Written Comm)**

Facilitators: Jacob Held, Carey Clark, Jen Talbot

Days and times:

Monday, April 09, 2018, at 3:00 pm.

Tuesday, April 10, 2018 at x-period

Thursday April 12, 2018 at x-period

**For Rubric C (Collaboration)**

Facilitators: Jacob Held

Monday April 02, 2018 at 3:00 pm

Wednesday, April 4, 2018 at 3:00 pm

Thursday, April 05, 2018 at x-period.

Dr. Brandon Combs will facilitate when available.

All sessions will be between 50-60 minutes.

* 1. These session will include instruction on the rubric, how to interpret the rubric, design and align assignments to it, as well as the process of submitting surveys and students work/artifacts to the Office of Assessment. Content experts have been chosen to facilitate the discussion, and all faculty teaching under the rubric will be invited and encouraged to attend. A list of faculty will be generated from ARGOS using course attribution.
1. Schedule monthly meeting time. The next meeting of the sub-committee will be November, after Thanksgiving Break, or early December, depending on member availability.
	1. Homework for November meeting:
		1. Review the Director of Assessment’s Evaluative Brief
		2. Review the Scorers’ feedback
		3. Consider further information/clarifications needed on the data
			1. What questions do we have?
			2. What data would be we need to answer them?
		4. Consider possible development opportunities/interventions
			1. What should we consider in terms of curriculum?
			2. What should we consider in terms of faculty development?
			3. What should we think about in terms of student need/education?
2. General Issues noted:
	1. Scaffolding: Is it a problem or a matter of concern that we don’t guarantee or otherwise insure that students who take, for example, Rubric A at the lower level, later take Rubric A at the upper level?
		1. NB: We’re not assessing students individually but progress of students as graduates of UCA, so we can use general data and mark trends to inform our endeavors.
		2. Do we want to consider consolidating rubrics at some point, if they are significantly similar?
	2. Although this round of data was not as “clean” as we’d prefer, it does demonstrate general trends or patterns, one of which is lack of significant growth in several learning outcomes. Note Rubric A Row 3 and Rubric B Row 3.
	3. All of this ties back to the Core Handbook, the standards of Core courses, and insuring our students get the education we promise them, namely, instruction in and development of the 4 Core competencies.
3. Adjourn