Core Curriculum Meeting

October 21, 2019

2 p.m. KL 330

In attendance-

Dr. Stephen Duffy

Dr. David Allen

Dr. Debra Scaggs

Dr. Jeff Brown

Ms. Kimber Palmer

Dr. Michael Kidd

Jessie Shaw

Kameron Jorgensen

William Nolen

Fei Luo

Jee Eun Ahn

Andy Hilburn

Dr. Duffy- sent two item invitations one for this meeting and one for next week. Make sure that you attend at least one meeting. The main issue is the core curriculum assessment cycle, it needs to be implemented this fall. We have to have a complete cycle before full report is submitted (5 year report). We are a little bit behind the curve. We have some flexibility as to what we need to assess. we aren't going to be fussy this semester. We need to get the ball rolling. Starting in the spring, we need more structure but by then we will have more structure. By the close of business tomorrow, I will send out to this committee and to all the department chairs involved, an email package that will have some general instructions as to how we are going to get things done and also what rubrics that need to be used. These are all the classes that are going to be reviewed, we need assessment material from this semester. These are all the classes that are going to be reviewed. We need assessment material for this semester. So this is communication, these are the all the classes that need to be reviewed. The classes down here, I will divide them up for the department chairs so that they are user friendly for them. Just put generic thing for the artifact. I am being flexible this time. Essentially for the communication, we need a written assignment or an oral presentation. What exactly it's on and that kind of stuff I am not concerned about this time. I just need the data back from that. So don't be so caught about what has to be for this specific assignment. Anything that will fit the bill will work this time around. They will be using the rubrics right here. Also this list has the communication skills objective. This is what the Coordinating Board says that this is what we are

supposed to be aiming for. Whatever assignment addresses this kind of objective or outcome is what we are looking for.

Teamwork is a tricky one, as we all know. We are supposed to be assessing how they go about putting the presentation, not assessing the presentation. I understand that in some of these cases- Astronomy and astrology we would not be doing a teamwork appropriate type deal.

There is that list I will be sending out. I will be send out links for the core rubrics. These are the links for the rubrics that are based on the value rubrics. Unfortunately, because we still working on getting AEFIS together. Which will solve a lot of problems right after it starts creating problems. We will have to use the Survey Monkey scheme (which I don't like). It's going to give us what we want for the time being. If you look at the communication rubric for instance, obviously we need the department, we need some of this information. The class and the section we definitely need. Now this is what caused so much aggravation in the past-the student I.D. numbers. I was speaking to Dr. David Allen, and we believe that we don't need that information. So I will put them in the instructions, it is too late to change the survey monkey, but we will for the spring. You can tell the people involved in collecting or inputting the data that they don't need to worry about this data.

Dr. Scaggs-Section numbers are they possibly listed on the forms? They were not in the past. There are a lot more than that. Dr. Duffy asks David "Can you add it to the survey monkey?" He replies that they can be added. Students level of attainment? Do we need this information?

Dr. Allen replies: It depends on what type of data do we need? Are we going to do any longitudinal look at the data? Realistically, juniors and seniors do not take core classes. I do not think we are going to report that information. Once in AEFIS, we can track any kind of information.

Dr. Duffy: Can we make this optional?

Dr. Allen: Either optional or remove it?

Dr. Duffy: Remove it. That is an option we can work on, but, for this semester, remove it. We will get what we can. I would rather have a high participation rate, than worry about specifics for longitudinal studies.

Anything else?

Dr. Duffy: We will sort it out and send it out. Hopefully, we can get this done before Tuesday at the end of business, before I go.

A large part of this assessment has to do with the Coordinating Board and SACS. We have to report core curriculum data to both those entities. Certain things in life that I strive to achieve:

Explain to people that Coordinating Board and SACS are two different things. We have to report to both in different ways. Nevertheless, this is becoming a big deal. This is becoming a Core Celebra. In regards to Coordinating Board and SACS, we are going to try to do our best to get it right. David- a few words on the imperatives we are dealing with.

Dr. Allen-The Coordinating Board and SACS unfortunately don't line up perfectly well. The Coordinating Board we move to a ten-year cycle. Unfortunately, the question that was brought up to the President of SACS at one of our meetings. She said it was fine. You do not have to do it but once

every ten years. We still want it every three (3) years. We will need to do it more frequently than what the state requires. If we want to stay in compliance with SACS. I've got one of the things that will need to be included:

Principles of Accreditation are what we are held accountable for. They have a resource manual to help you understand what needs to get done for this. So the parts that pertain to general education, I have got them all here in this nice little ten page document that will be included in what we send out. Anything you want to know about it, I do not want to read it to everyone. Anything having to do with general education for SACS purposes is like any other program before January 18th all we had to do is to report that we had general education assessment. Now we have to close the loop like every other program. We need to collect data, as a group we need to analyze data and come up with a plan as to how we are going to come up with a plan for improvements to general education on our campus. We have to implement those improvements, collect data and see if it made any difference. A lot more work than what we had to do before and a lot more frequently. Everything has to be done on a three year cycle.

Dr. Duffy-It is a lot more stringent. Potentially what Dave and I are going to do on an institutional level is put together an AIRE for the Core Curriculum. So that we will have a report that essentially looks the same as a program report. Except it is going to be university wide and it is going to be the core. We will suggest to Deans and Chairs to do the same at the college and department level for the areas that they are concerned with. Simply because it's going to be a more direct and accessible way to collect and store materials for when we have to do big time reporting. We are familiar with the AIRE, it's something we do anyway. It's a format that we can implement without having to come up with something fancy. The thing about it is, it's like any other form of assessment the only difference about dealing with the core on an institutional level is simply the scale of the amount of data that we have to collect. How we go about collecting it and analyzing and closing the loop should not be any different than when we do with program assessment. It is a question of making sure the data is there, making sure that we can access it, making sure we talk about it, making sure that we then say this is what we have seen and this is what we are going to do about it. Good luck with that!

William Nolen-I have two questions. The department level is there going to be an AIRE report on their level or are you going to do it on an institutional level?

Dr. Duffy-We are going to be doing the AIRE on an institutional level for the core curriculum so that we can do our reporting to the coordinating board and SACS or whatever. That institutional level is what this committee is dealing with. What we are suggesting is that there is also an AIRE on the departmental and college level to make it easier for them to show they are closing the loop as well on that level. The way they want this thing assessed. The way they want this loop closed it operates downwards.

2nd question-Will the department chairs have access to the scores when they get punched into survey monkey?

Dr. Duffy-We are going to revise the information feedback loop so that people actually get the information back and goes for WIN. I am tired of hunting down data.

Andy Hilburn-Do we know what we have in terms of the whole field of data?

Dr. Duffy-Will circulate paper on core curriculum he did last year. We did not collect anything last year while we were working out what to do next. Which is what we are doing now. We have a comprehensive view of what we collected in the previous four years or more. The problem is it is comprehensive. The problem is what we have is not good enough for what we need in the future.

Can stuff by added? Geography-I know I have done stuff. Is there a sheet that say that this is there and this is not?

Dr. Duffy-There are various sheets. Some of which I have obtained from my colleague over there-Dr. Scaggs. There does not seem be a complete version. There seems to be several different versions that were made by different people at different times. Some of which have more information than others. There is a live link to the original syllabus. In your particular case, if you know what classes you are looking at we maybe able to go back to the original syllabus that was submitted and find that there. There could be that avenue.

Dr. Duffy-I went back and looked at our plan that was originally made in 2013 of how we were going to go about this process and it was like reading Lord of the Rings. Engaging, exciting, and complete myth. None of the stuff that was in there, very few parts of it, whoever put it together, what's been happening-you have several types of people (mostly administrators) who go off to workshops or whatever it is and get these best practices and come back and they say this is what we are going to do based on best practices. What they do not look at is the practical nature of how we actually operate at this institution. This thing has all these fantastic multi-disciplinary assessment teams that go around collecting and analyzing data reporting to this person and reporting to that person. They have all these different little committees that have got these chairs that are getting course releases and stuff. It's a real effort. None of that is going to happen in reality. We don't have the facilities and we don't have the to tell the truth-the faculty culture that supports that kind of activity. We have to develop a practical plan that covers the areas that SACS wants in such a way that we can get a high level of faculty buying in to participating which is to work with what faculty is more comfortable with. We also need to address the fact that deans are not handing out releases for looking into assessment data. That's not good promising people that or saying whatever because it makes it sound convoluted. We need to develop a plan, really build it from the bottom up that suits it. And as part of that going to what was said in the beginning, most disciplines have drifted away from their original assignments or forgotten what they are, some have been consistent, others have drifted away. What I would like to do is simply start from scratch and for us to go to departments and say this is what we are going to do this time because we just need data. In the future, what realistically what is it that you can as an assignment in the class that is going to do that, and then make a comprehensive list so we can then maintain. It would have it all in one place. I think that would be better for us rather than having to go back and say"Oh in History 1301 you said were going to have this and now you are doing that and you have to go back to this other thing. I would rather people in 1301 say that this is the assignment and what we are doing right now is appropriate. Each year when we do the closing review, go back to the departments and ask them if they want to keep their assignments. If they want to keep the assignment, keep it. If they say no, tell us what you want to change. That way, it is part of the assessment process. That is what we are supposed to be doing.

Dr. Allen-On the other part, using the common rubric across all courses for that particular assignment.

Dr. Duffy-The rubric that we setting up in those links, those are the ones we are using. Everyone that is doing communication, is going to use the communication rubric. When we develop the process that one of the things we need to keep. I do not care if it is the program level or the institutional level. Everybody is operating off the same rubric.

Dr. Allen-One thing about this, this is for evaluation, not necessarily measure. You can use for measurement as well. I did the evaluative part in the rubric electronically and then I had spreadsheet that I kept everything, put in a numeric grade that to me equated to the rubric score. Typically it was multiple measurement values that I would put in that one evaluative measurement. If that makes sense.

Dr. Duffy-The other thing about that is that it should be in the instructions as well. I just remembered this- you can use one artifact for multiple measures. You can use an argument paper, a position paper you could use that for communication. You can also use that for personal responsibility. You wouldn't have to have a separate assignment.

Dr. Allen-You would use both rubrics. You would use both rubrics at the same time, as you read through it once. My goal is make things as simple as possible for Faculty.

Dr. Scaggs-You are aware that there are writing intensive rubrics that are significantly different from the communication value rubrics.

Dr. Allen-Correct.

Kameron Jorgensen-Should we change the WIN rubrics to match the communication rubrics?

Dr. Allen-that would be a separate committee meeting.

Dr. Duffy-These are standardized rubrics. The reason we are using those rubrics is because those are the ones that the Coordinating Board recommend. They can't ding us on the rubrics because they are telling us to use them. As I mentioned before, we need to revise the Core Curriculum Assessment Process. We will be rebuilding it. We should have something in place hopefully by the end of the spring semester. We are doing this because of compliance issues. We mentioned before, SACS and the Coordinating Board have changed the rules on us. What we were doing in the past, was using one measure.

Dr. Allen-As far as compliance, I do not like to scare people. I like to make them aware of what could happen. One of the things (if we are not in compliance with SACS) is that they could actually pull our accreditation. If they do that, Title V funding goes away. Seventy percent plus of our students, well we would not have a university. There are potentially serious consequences to this. Quickly, they will give you enough rope to hang yourself. They are here to help. The Presidents of the universities vote on all the SACS rules. We have no one to blame but ourselves.

Dr. Duffy-QEP is moving in the right direction. Now my major priority is the Core Curriculum. Dr. Arenaz is on a SACS team and they are dinging people on the Core Curriculum. Actually, he has the results. We can ask him about results when we start rebuilding this. So, if Dr. Arenaz signs off on it, we know we are headed in the right direction.

We need to implement a new program. We used the CLAPLUS. OIT says we can't use this survey anymore. It is considerably less inexpensive than CLAPLUS.

We have licenses for a different version, ETS Heighten. It is another one of these critical thinking surveys. We have not been able to put it out there yet. We have not figured out a way to implement this. There are issues with what classes/students take part in this survey. It's about 45 minutes to an hour. We can set this up in the testing center. We need to draw certain types of students and certain types of classes from the core curriculum including signature classes to go take this test. How this is going to work, I do not know. We are going to implement in some way shape or form in the spring.

Dr. Allen-That one is focused on critical thinking.

Dr. Duffy-We want a process that suits our reality of faculty culture and assignments that we do in the class. I would everyone involved in this, especially chairs, to get some feedback from faculty who are involved in core curriculum as to what would make the process more user friendly to them. How can we make the assessment process more meaningful? What is it that the faculty can get out of this? We are collecting this data because the Coordinating Board and SACS says we have to. We might as well use the information. How can we use it effectively? WE have to assure people that the assessment is not there to beat up on people or beat up on them. If we have low scores in certain areas, that's interesting for us to look at. We are not going to go around firing anyone. If you have low critical thinking scores, we want to know why. If there is problems with student writing, we want to know why. Lots of faculty want to complain about this, well, let us find out why.

Dr. Allen-It's not about assigning blame, it's about making positive impact on our students.

Dr. Duffy-How do we improve that. This goes back to that comprehensive report we did before, it also tells us what we are doing right. We actually scored quite well in many areas. We want to be able to praise what is positive as well to address any issues.

Dr. Duffy-Identification of assignments for assessment and sampling. I want you to go back and find out what it is that in these various classes in your area, what the assignment is that they are going to use for the assessment. We have worked out the sampling for some of the sections are big, so what we would like in the various areas, up to 30 artifacts per section. So if you have a small section, per say, 20 students in it, do them all. If you have a big section of 120 students, do only 30. Please, they need to be picked randomly.

Kimber Palmer-Do you want us to report back to you as to what the assignment is?

Dr. Duffy-Yes. I would like to get as much information as quickly as possible so that we can prepare to receive data. We will be putting the data into such a form so that we can report back. Electronic collection would be better.

William Nolen-List of artifacts that you want, is that for all different rubrics or only from this semester?

Dr. Duffy-Let's start with the ones from this semester. I want to know this semester and the areas that we are assessing so that we know what they know that they are supposed to be doing it and they know what to expect. If there is any kind of incongruity, or people have problems with it. We can address these problems. We want to get as accurate as possible. Obviously, we are dealing with

reality here. Some areas are going to be right on top of it, some areas are going to have to do a lot more work. I would rather have them participating with a broad assignment than not participating. I would rather get something.

Dr. Scaggs-Just because I have it in my head because I have previous versions. I need clarification. If you have multiple sections, how many artifacts will you need?

Dr. Allen-Is this from the lab or from the lecture?

Dr. Kidd-Both. Because the lab was separated from the lecture, we assess them separately.

William Nolen-we have a similar problem with English 1.

Dr. Duffy-30 percent

Dr. Scaggs-It used to be 35 percent up to 100 artifacts overall. If there is a class with three sections, then it would be 30 percent of the three classes.

Dr. Allen-30 percent would be fine.

Dr. Duffy-This process is still under review. We have to work it out from the get go. The other thing as well. We have more students, more sections. By the end of the spring, we should have some sort of handbook for these occasions.

Dr. Scaggs-If you want to rebuild this thing from the ground up, maybe you don't need this. If you want to see what we did before, I have a document. It would be helpful to look at. We found out that we were doing way more than what Austin was doing.

Dr. Duffy-If we get the feedback we know who to address it.

Dr. Allen-I will take a look at Banner-the courses, to get a better idea of what we need for sampling.

Dr. Duffy-We will not get all the answers in one go. We may have to continuously revise this for the next four years. There will be a meeting next week. Please advise the chairs that this is going to happen. If we don't have information by next week, at least try to have it by October.

Any questions? Dean Weitman, University College will be collecting portfolios. I would like to look into this. Thank you so much for your time.

Core curriculum Meeting (KLM 330 / OCT. 21, '19 @ 2:00pm)

S.M. [illegible]/5
Michael Kirl
JESSE SHAW
Kameron Jorgensen
W/Nolen
Deborah Scaggs
Jeff Brown
Fei Luo
Jee Eun Ahn
Andy Hilburn
Kimber Palmer
[illegible]
Patricia Martin
Angelique Blackburn