

Minutes

Assessment Sub-Committee of the UCA Core Council

Monday, October 8th, 2018

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Listen to Scorer feedback for Diversity
 - a. Scorers present: Stephanie Vanderslice, Sonya Fritz, and Zach Smith
 - b. Sonya Fritz: The 8 hour days can be tiring, but it is helpful to see how others score these assignments, evaluate them, and otherwise interpret the rubric. It's also helpful to see how colleagues are designing assignments to assess for this area. Overall it was a rewarding and enriching process. In general, the process seems beneficial. There are issues, but there are bound to be issues with any assessment process. But having scorers work the way they currently do is good. Learned a lot about what colleagues are doing across campus.
 - i. Some issue that arose include: 1) Assignment design: Many assignments simply did not ask for or otherwise align to the outcomes they were designed or chosen to assess. Thus, scorers had to frequently assign "N/A" scores. 2) There was also a question to as whether some courses were assessing under the proper rubric. Assignments looked like they might have fit better, or more accurately under another rubric than the one for which they were submitted. 3) There was also a general rubric issue. For example, rubric C asks for "reflection." However, not all disciplines asks for students to do so since doing so is not part of what is taught in that discipline, and/or it is difficult to find common ground on what a "reflection" is. Is it simply an analysis, or does it have to be a personal reflection about how something affected the student? The question is then, is this an outcome we want to keep in the rubric given such difficulties, or if we do want to keep it, do we need to be more clear that courses in this area are supposed to be asking for and promoting students' personal reflections.
 - c. Stephanie Vanderslice: Overall the process and experience is incredibly valuable. The more faculty that participate as scorers the better. The process as a whole seemed to fit with best practices in terms of norming on the rubric.
 - i. Some issues: 1) Reiterate the problem of frequent "N/A" scores. We need more faculty development in terms of assignment design, and it needs to happen with ample time for faculty to incorporate what they learn into their classrooms, before we begin collecting assessment artifacts. 2) In faculty development need to focus on what the best process is to create an assignment. There seemed to be too much "seat of the pants" thinking going on in terms of the assignments that were submitted for assessment. Not an intentional choice. Need to iterate to faculty that this is serious, it should be treated seriously, and there is a proper process to go through to create assignments for assessment.
 - d. Zach Smith: 1) Goal B outcome 2 "curiosity" asks students to ask questions, but many assignments are written in a way to prompt students to do so, so again, many "N/A"

scores. Assign design in an issue and if this type of outcome is to be assessed the assignment needs to clearly prompt the student to provide the performance that we are going to assess. In addition, it would be helpful to be able to see that assignment when scoring these artifacts. It might help to determine if the project as a whole is in fact a response to a question the student was supposed to ask.

- e. One general issue raised with the process in general was brought up by Bernard Chen. Dr. Chen inquired as to how long it took to score an individual artifact. His point was that when it comes to Oral Comm this upcoming cycle, we may need to hire more scorers since presentations can run upward of 15-20 minutes in some cases, and these can't be skimmed. So evaluating them will take considerably longer than scoring traditional written artifacts as in years past.
 - f. In addition, participation this time was under 50%, often due to faculty or chairs intentionally refusing or otherwise neglecting to turn in artifacts, even after repeated reminders from the office of assessment and the director of the UCA Core. Low response rate in addition to high frequencies of "N/A" scores needs to be taken into account as the narrative of the evaluative brief is promulgated across campus. But participation in the assessment process also needs to be handled. The committee discussed the problem of non-participation and determined that this might be a determining factor in who does or does not get to provide courses in the Core.
- 3) Diversity Evaluative Brief Distributed
- a. Tableau and new data visualizations available
 - i. Dr. Held showed the committee how data visualizations have been created in tableau for responsible living and diversity. This data is currently behind a password on the assessment homepage. Held indicated that the information is to be distributed but protocols have to be put in place to limit access to appropriate stakeholders to make sure the info is not "weaponized" or otherwise used politically while still being made available so it can be informative to faculty, chairs, and deans. The info is extant, and distribution is being worked on presently.
- 4) Discussion of the LD Core Responsible Living Review process
- a. Goals determined for each course
 - i. The Core AMAP can be used to determine for each course if it falls under goal A or B.
 - b. Additional info required: The audit process is clearly going to be more involved than at first thought. If the goal is to determine curricular coherence under the goal for which a course is approved, then we need much more information for each course and section than a simple syllabus can provide. Since the standards speak about 50 percent of course content, we need to know about what assignments are given in the course, the textbook and lecture/discussion material, and basically any info that can help us evaluate the course as a whole educational experience.
 - c. Dr. Chen recommended taking 3 courses and evaluating them at the next meeting. We could do this systematically and hopefully have the audit completed by the end of the academic year. The committee discussed which 3 courses should be first and determined that they would choose ACAD 1300 as well as two that seemed

representative of the goals under which they are placed: PHIL 2325, and EXSS 1320. These would be good test cases and provide a baseline for how we are going to evaluate courses through this process. Dr. Held indicated that he would work to acquire what material the committee needed to make a proper assessment.

- 5) Questions or Concerns
- 6) Adjournment

Our next meeting will be Thursday, November 8th at x-period in Wingo 214