Core Curriculum Meeting
18-Nov-19
Sign In

Angélique M Blackburn
Deborah Seago
[illegible]
W J Nolen
JESSE SHAW
Patricia Martin
Sean Madden
Fex Luo.
Kameron Jorgensen
Kimber Palmer
Andy Hilburn
Jestine Holmgreen
Bernice Sanchez

Core Curriculum Meeting

November 18, 2019

2 p.m. KL 330

In attendance-

Dr. Stephen Duffy

Dr. David Allen

Dr. Debra Scaggs

Kameron Jorgensen

Kimber Palmer

Jessie Shaw

Fei Luo

Dr. Lynne Manganaro

Destine Holmgreen

Jonathan Murphy

Angelique Blackburn

William Nolen

Dr. Duffy- Thank you for your time. I will save the cycle updates for the end. So the main thing today is to talk about the core curriculum assessment plan or process plan that I have come up with. It's for your perusal, see if you agree with this so that we can implement this. As we discussed before, the main problem with the old plan that is posted is that it doesn't work. It doesn't work because it is not realistic. It's not realistic because it has got all sorts of stuff that we never implemented and we never will. I came up with a more direct process that I think is viable and that doesn't involve any new aggravation by forming any committees or trying to get anybody course releases.

Identify core classes and instructors for the semester. That should be fairly straight-forward. If chairs can't assess a class in the spring, we can put it off until the fall. There is always flexibility in that as long we know we can do it. What we don't want is a process that we are waiting on data that never arrives because I forgot. As long as we have that squared away, we can operate on this schedule. There is flexibility.

Second step is to identify assignments appropriate to the rubrics. At the moment, we are in the redevelopment stage of people identifying the appropriate assignment to generate data. We want to submit it as we get along. We want to get longitudinal data. We want to make sure that the assignments are appropriate for the rubrics. That they are not misaligned. That would be up to the instructors, the chairs and the departments or areas. Just make sure that whatever it is that the

instructors want to use, that when you go down a rubric, you can actually address those issues. It's not necessarily taken for granted.

Basic orientation for the rubrics and for AEFIS. This is going to be the realm of the prof center and OIT. David and I will work out how many sessions we will need. We will speak with Kevin and Pat Abrego or Brian and get these set up. The thing about this is, we are going to need a whole lot of AEFIS orientation in the spring. Although, I think, people are already getting trained on this for other reasons. Essentially what we want for this is partly to get them oriented and partly also like a workshop so that we have people in the room that can ensure the rubrics are aligned correctly with Blackboard. So we have somebody in the room that can actually say' this is how you link the rubric to the AEFIS stuff that has been an ongoing process that has been going on for a while. Dave and I were discussing it, probably people would be more comfortable if they go to an AEFIS training get their rubrics set up rather than do it themselves. We need to track the data collection that is going into AEFIS. That is what Dave and I will do for Institutional Assessment. Having got that material, we will packaged form and return it to the departments chairs. Probably, most appropriately to the department chairs. AEFIS has a dashboard so that people can see, but there is no guarantee that people are going to read it correctly.

Document department discussion of data. When I say departments, it refers mostly to COAS. We need this documentation from University College and the School of Business. UC and School of Business have very few courses. You can probably just do it. This can be at a department meeting. The agenda item at a department meeting. If you want to invite either Dave or myself or both of us, that is great. We can go to those meeting and talk to people about it. What we want is an agenda item that says Core Curriculum Assessment. The minutes to say that the people in the room talked about it. Now what they really talk about is the analysis of what does the data tells them. Which maybe David and I come in to help people interpret the data. They need to talk about some form of action plan based on whatever it is this data is telling them, what are they going to do with that? If the data comes in and they look at the data and say great, everything looks fine we going to continue to do that. That's fine by us at the moment, but we need it documented. If they look at the data and say something is wrong with it, what should we do with it? That's obviously a more detailed action plan and we need to have it documented as to what they suggest doing. What we want is that documentation. After they have had that discussion, send us the minutes for our records for SACS. That will be a closure of the first loop. Which is the departmental level. Which in many ways is the most important level. We will have that on record. They saw the data, talked about it and then decided what to do next. After that, this is a COAS issue, because COAS is so large, we want some kind of documentation of a discussion as a college level to what the CORE as a whole looks like to the college. We want multiple points of view. The quality of the critical thinking should be as important to the chair of biology as it is the chair of humanities.

Dr. Scaggs- Let me understand, we also want to discuss results in a college meeting?

Dr. Duffy- Well Business won't, COAS does. Consequently, if you can put it as an agenda at your college meeting then that is great, it would cover your division. Whatever it is on your part that is fine. COAS we have everything apart from Economics to UNIV. We need a bigger picture on that. We can do that at the chair's meeting, there can be an agenda item where Claudia puts in on her regularly scheduled meeting.

Dr. Manganaro-When do you think Data Core will be finished?

Dr. Duffy-We will get to that in a bit. After that, David-Action plans from everyone concerned for documented discussion and calibration comes to us. So we get those minutes from the department meetings and COAS college meeting. Then we talk about what it tells our institutional level. We look at it and see if there is outliers and stuff. If there are trends in certain areas where scores are higher than other areas. We can look at it and do some calibration. That way we can police it. We can look at it to make sure it makes sense to us. If we have outliers we can work out why those outliers are there. It keeps us honest working with the rubric. After that, Dave and I will put together the AIER for the Core Curriculum and I will write a white paper, a small report (four or five pages) that will give a context. I have already done one, it will be an adaptation of that. Then we will post it on the Institutional Assessment website. After that is done, then we will make a presentation to the Executive Council and to the Faculty Senate. After that should be everything taken care of. There should not be anyone around who hasn't gotten some kind of exposure to this exercise. Any questions about the process? Does it make sense? I think that we can close all those loops without having any extra committees, without having any extra meetings. All we have to do is get these things as agenda items. Necessary people can talk about it. I think that, that will work well. I checked with David as far as direct process is concerned, this is acceptable as far as SACS is concerned. There's one caveat. We can tweak it later on if we need to. The caveat is that with SACS not only do we have to close the loop we have to reopen it again. We close it but it's not the end of it. We have to reopen it. Part of that reopening process is analyzing the impact of the core curriculum activities and implementing improvements. After we have closed the loop, done that stuff with the executive council and faculty senate, we then have to sit down and start again. What does this tell us, are there things that we have to do differently with our process or with our rubrics or with our class assignments or whatever it need be? That's what we are supposed to be doing.

Lynne you had a question about time-frame? Dave can you give us an idea about data collection and returning?

Dr. Allen-The day before Thanksgiving is an appropriate time. Just kidding! What we would like to do is have things collected as to where we can have a meeting in April, the whole group. If you go back to Duffy's path that he had up there. If we can get back together as a university level and take a look at the data. We are looking to do that as a preliminary in April, so if we collect the data. If you are still collecting, that is fine, keep collecting. We would like to at least have a preliminary look at it in April to see if we are on the right track. Is our process working?

Dr. Duffy-Specifically what we are going to do right now when he says April we will be looking specifically at the material collected this fall. The spring is different. I want to do a trial run. This will encompass a whole year. I want to do it because we are renewing this thing. I want to do a trial run just on the fall data so up through, basically up through nine just on the fall. Just to make sure that if the process is working where the weak points are. See if we need any tweaking on it.

When you say full data? What is that?

Dr. Allen-The data that are being collected right now.

Dr. Duffy-The data that is being collected right now is for this semester, it's for fall of 19. Now we are going to look at it in the spring.

So we would like for everybody to submit into Survey Monkey by January. Ok.

January 31st is reasonable.

Dr. Allen-It will give us time to download it and do some analysis on it.

Dr. Duffy-Say January 31st because the WINN data is also due on January 31st. I want to look at these steps. Just looking at the fall data just so that we can get used to looking at it and work out where the head falls off. Once we have this squared away, in the future, it would go back as a regular cycle. Then we would look at it across the whole year. For the moment, we have to get used to people looking at the data. I am not convinced that we can put data in front of people and departments and them know what they are looking at. I can say come up with an action plan. I am not sure that when I say that, the people that are listening understand what the action plan should entail. We need some training. We need to work out what their level of engagement is and they need some guidance on what to do. That's what we are going to do with this.

When do we look at the data we collected in the spring? In the fall. Then after that we will just do it like a whole annual thing. When we look at the data collected in the spring then we will look at the whole year and aggregate it. It's like a training exercise. We will look at it properly again. What we would do once a year, we are going to do twice a year this time around. Just so to make sure we work out how to do it right.

Professor-The packaged data? Are the department chairs in charge of that?

Dr. Duffy-We will send it to the department chairs.

Dr. Allen-We will package it from survey monkey and get it out to the department chairs.

Professor-They kind of prepare it in time for the discussion with the department?

Dr. Duffy-They will get the data and it gets on the agenda.

Professor-Then they discuss it with the department. Then whenever comes out of the minutes, we send to you?

Dr. Duffy-They have to send us the minutes where they had this discussion.

Professor- As far as the action plan, whatever action plans come out, they put it on the minutes. Do they have a template?

Dr. Duffy- At the moment, they can point them whichever way. I am looking for a path to follow. As we go through this, as we find out the level of engagement, we find out the level of awareness, we find out what is going to be the best practices. Then we can say, this is great, everyone is going to use the same format.

Professor-What if you are dealing with a minor that has only one faculty member in it?

Dr. Duffy-Then it's a good time for the whole department to look at it. We have the assessment for it. It is the core curriculum. All the faculty should have some type of opinion on what the data tell on critical thinking. Or social responsibility, or whatever it may be. SACS wants multi-disciplinary involvement. So if you have like Andy with Geography, that's fine, we are not talking about content,

we are talking about performance. You could look at it by each individual area, but what you really want to look at is across the board. What is the level of performance in the area of social responsibility in social sciences? Regardless.

Any other questions or issues? We have flexibility. This is the time to screw up so that we can put it right.

Core Curriculum activities in spring 20. We will sending out reminders to the chairs in December and January about core curriculum assessment so no one can say they did not know. What this reminder is going to do is say- talk to the faculty, identify assignment and report. We will keep up with that.

AEFIS orientation/training/workshopping should take place in January, or early February depending on facilities that are available.

Is AEFIS up and running?

Dr. Duffy-AEFIS is now up and running. I believe Karol was talking about that with training.

Dr. Allen-Yes. We are hoping to get this. Maybe in the spring we will start if we can through AEF IS instead of Survey Monkey.

Professor-Am sorry fall data will still go through survey monkey?

Dr. Duffy-Links sent out are the links that we will use this time around. Those links are up and should be easier to use. That's what we are collecting the data for. We don't want to rush anybody. We can get people trained in January/February through AEFIS and have the technicians set up the rubrics appropriately so that they can input the data through that. We should be able to do this. If we can get this done in January and February, we should get that done in plenty of time for them to put data in April or May. Trial run with assessment process. We need to identify the weak points and any need for adjustments. We need to be aware of that. We can develop pointers on discussion topics and action plans. We want to find out what it is what the chairs need to know to direct the discussion to interpret the data. We can't make an assumption that the chair knows automatically what they are supposed to get out of curriculum assessment. Some of them may do, some of them might not. We want to gauge that and help, so that we can get something meaningful. The thing to keep our faith in, we have to do this anyway might as well get something out of it. If we do this right, it will help us to improve.

Any questions about the assessment process or plan?

Professor-Basically, we should have the division meetings in February or March?
Dr. Duffy-In this particular case, when you have regular meetings, you can just put it on the agenda for the regular meeting. Or if Steve Sears or George wants to make special meeting for it, then that is up to them. If not, it can go in at a regular meeting. Usually there is 2, or 3 or 4.

As long as we get out results, by the end of March, we are ok so we can meet in April.

Dr. Duffy-yes. As long as we get back the documentation. Data comes in by January 31st, the latest. Dave and I get the data, package it and send it back to the chairs. That should take about two weeks, say Valentine's Day. Then they have the data, talk to us, what does it mean, blah, blah, blah. Whenever the next scheduled meeting is, put it on the agenda and it's up for discussion. We don't

care. As long as we have something documented. Where the department looked at this data and gave some analysis. Some indication of what their next steps are. We can come up with some type of format, or template that we can design based on that, that goes back to the chairs. Everything is great and next time put it one this template. At this moment, I don't know what is going to come back. I don't want to design a template that is missing something. I would rather have the thing back and look at it and design the template around that. That way we have a better deal, we have sense of ownership.

Anything else. Any updates, issues, any reason for concern? The chairs should know what is going on, the instructors should know what is going on, everyone should have the links.

We will give an update, we can send out an email or you can report back that January 31st is the deadline for that. It's also the deadline for WINN. I have notified the chairs, the WINN instructors and already have given them the deadlines. That should be doable. Observations or suggestions. That concludes our meeting. Thanks.

1: Identify Core Classes & Instructors for Semester [UC3 Schedule]
2: Identify Assignments Appropriate to Rubrics [Instructors, Chairs, & UC3 Reps]
3: Basic Orientation on Rubrics/ AEFIS [PROF & OIT]
4: Track Data Collection [Institutional Assessment]
5: Package Data & Return to Departments [Institutional Assessment]
6: Document Department Discussion of Data [COAS Departments + UC & ARSSB Meetings]
1st Loop Closed
7: Document COAS Discussion of Data [COAS Chairs Meeting]
2nd Loop Closed
8: Data/ Action Plans from COAS, UC, & ARSSB to UC3 for Documented Discussion/ Calibration
3rd Loop Closed
9: AIER & "Whitepaper" Prepared & Posted on IA Website [Institutional Assessment]
10: Presentation of Data/ Analysis to Executive Council & Faculty Senate [Chair of UC3]
Loop Completely Closed

University Core Curriculum Committee

Meeting of November 18, 2019 (KLM 330 @ 2:00 pm)

Agenda

1. Fall 19 assessment cycle updates/ check-in
2. Core Curriculum assessment process plan
   - 2.1. Initial 10-step process
   - 2.2. Closing the Loop and reopening the next cycle
     - 2.2.1. Analyzing the impact of Core Curriculum activities and implementing improvements
3. Core Curriculum assessment activities in Spring 20
   - 3.1. December & January reminders for Chairs
   - 3.2. AEFIS orientation/ training/ workshopping
   - 3.3. Trial run with assessment process with Fall 19 data
     - 3.3.1. Identify weak points and need for adjustments
     - 3.3.2. Pointers on discussion topics and action plans
4. Observations or suggestions?