

Minutes of the Core Council  
9/26/16

1. Information session for the CAACs and other interested parties. Handouts included.
2. Issues from discussion:
  - No requirement to have same assignment in every class as long as they meet the learning outcomes
  - Use multiple artifacts to answer different learning outcomes
  - Don't have to use the same artifact for each learning objective
  - Credit by exam for Pre-Calculus was discussed
3. Minutes from 9/19/2016 were approved. Mark Funk moved and Joe Felan seconded.

**Core Council Members**

- Belinda Blevins-Knabe
- Mark Funk
- Joe Felan
- Nickolas Jovanovic
- Tusty ten Bensel
- Brian Mitchell
- Elizabeth Sloan Davidson
- Becki Streett
- Linda Stauffer

**Ex Officio**

Ross Bradley

**Guests**

- Carol Macheak
- Linda Stipsky
- Jeremy Ecke
- Marian Douglas
- Eric Kaufmann
- Melissa Hardeman
- Alois Adams
- Carl Moneyhon
- Sarah Quintanar
- Olaf Hoerschelmann
- Daryl Rice

- Joanne Matson
- Mary Elizabeth Moore
- Denise LeGrand
- Shuzhen Deng
- Stacy Pendergraft
- Brian Ray
- Ed Anson

Handout

## Assessment Information Session

Core Council

9-26-16

### 1. Next Tasks

Fall 2016 -Collect knowledge data, pilot Skills 1 rubric (for Communication Written and Communication Speech it is Skills 2)

Spring 2017- Report knowledge data, collect Skills 1 data

Fall 2017 –Report Skills 1 data

Report Dates:

Spring Feb 17, 2017

Fall Sept 22, 2017

All syllabi for core courses should include the relevant learning objectives submitted to the Core Council in their syllabi. Syllabi will also include the goals and outcomes or a link to them. The spring and fall reports will include a syllabus analysis.

### 2. Rubric Development-Development of Common Rubrics

Value 1- Ethical	History, Communication-Written
Value 2-Civic responsibility	Communication-Speech, US Traditions
Value 3: Global and Cultural	Fine Arts, Social Sciences
Skills 2 Critical Thinking	Humanities, Math
Skills 3 Information Technology	Science

Oct 24 –Each CAAC will attend the Core Council meeting and present their rubric to all other CAACs. The entire group will select a common rubric from the choices. Each CAAC can decide whether to use the common rubric or develop one.

#### FAQ

1. How many student artifacts do we need to assess?

Answer. Make sure to assess all modalities (online, face to face, high school concurrent, etc.). Student work needs to be collected from a minimum of one section per modality. Random selection of sections and of student work within sections is important. A rule of thumb for the total number for each discipline is 20% of the enrollment or if that is too high a number then use 50. However, the decision about how many is up to each curricular area. The report will include an explanation of how you chose the number and each group should be comfortable making and defending curriculum changes based on the data they collected.

Our goal is to get a picture of how the core as a whole is functioning. Each curricular area will compile data across all courses and the Core Council will compile data across all curricular areas.

2. Can we change learning outcomes and learning objectives?

Both proposed changes in learning objectives and learning outcomes require submitting a new application for the course to the Core Council. If the Core Council approves then the changes go to the Faculty Senate.

3. How do we store our assessment data and rubrics?

Rhetoric and Writing has had success with Google Docs. Another alternative is Blackboard-although it is not as flexible as Google Docs.

#### 4. Why are we doing this?

The goal of the assessment efforts is to understand more about what our students are learning. We are interested in how students are performing in the core as a whole. We are not interested in comparing curricular areas to see “who is better.” Looking at the core as a whole will allow us to find areas of strengths and areas for improvement. Each discipline and each curricular area needs to use the data to evaluate their curriculum and how it could be improved.

#### 5. What are you (we) looking for?

We are particularly interested in:

- a. what each group discovers about student learning
- b. how each group plans to use the assessment data in their curriculum plans
- c. how the assessment process itself is working

#### 6. What protections exist for student and faculty privacy?

The Faculty Senate passed the following

Motion FS\_2016\_5. Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Identification on Assessment Data

No information identifying a student may be recorded in student evaluations of teaching or programmatic assessment data.

No information identifying the course instructor, including section information, may be recorded in programmatic assessment data.

The intent of the Core Council is that student learning outcomes data is not used to evaluate faculty members. It is appropriate for annual evaluations to recognize faculty participation in assessment.

Faculty members may also want to consider how their assessment results and experiences can result in scholarship in the area of teaching and learning (SOTL) –keeping in mind of course any necessary IRB applications.

7. What do the anchor points on rubrics mean?

The beginning point is a minimal level of performance on the student learning outcomes and the highest level is where you expect performance on the student learning outcomes to be at the end of the course.

8. Resources:

AAC & U Value Rubrics <https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics>

Measuring College Student Learning-especially relevant for biology, business, communication, economics, history, and sociology.

<http://highered.ssrc.org/projects/measuring-college-learning-project/>

Core Council 2015-2016 report:

<http://ualr.edu/facultysenate/archives/ay15-16/documents-ay-15-16/>

(5-6-16 part 1, part 2, part 3, part 4)

Core Council Web page: <http://ualr.edu/facultysenate/councils-and-committees-of-the-faculty-senate/council-on-core-curriculum-and-policies/>