

**General Information**

Current Semester: Spring 2016

Date of Assessment Meeting(s): May 19, 2016

**Participants in Assessment Meeting**

Peter Kvidera, Tom Pace, Brent Brossman, Tom Short, Martha Pereszlenyi-Pinter, Maria Marsilli, Roger Purdy, Mike Nichols, Sheila McGinn, Keith Nagy, Nevin Mayer, Todd Bruce, Pam Mason, Anne Kugler, Rodney Hessinger, Margaret Farrar, Marcus Gallo, John McBratney, Pam Mason, Chrystal Bruce, Tamba Nlandu

## Response to Recommendations for the Core Committee

*Prompt:* Listed below are the *recommendations from the subcommittees*. Please indicate the how the Core Committee intends to respond.

### Learning Goals, Course Requirements, and Rubrics:

Subcommittee Recommendations	Core Committee Response
Addition of argument-based assignment to EN 125 common syllabus [Writing]	Accepted
Proposed changes to the Writing Rubric ( <i>see below</i> ) [Writing]	included with Rubrics below
Need for simplification of writing (and possibly integration) rubric [EGC].	
To cover all the rubrics, especially in writing, faculty may need to cut-back on subject content. To help with writing, would be good if the template of what will be covered in the Core English/Composition courses be made available to all faculty. [EHE]	
A number of inconsistencies in the current rubrics were identified, including that the writing rubrics, particularly the dimension of source integration, require a research paper. Several instructors indicated that this may not appropriate for students at this level and in many ENW science courses, it is difficult to include a research paper in a comprehensive signature assignment that also assesses integration and QA student learning outcomes. Related to this, it may be appropriate that many science courses not have an argumentative or research-based writing assignment; perhaps changing the writing rubrics or create an additional rubric for science courses that would be more discipline specific. For example, many courses may incorporate student writing in the form of lab reports were students will use data to make argument. [ENW]	Remove “locate” from Source Integration dimensions of Writing Rubric.  Add a discussion of the role of writing in ENW to future agenda.
Recommend (jointly with QA committee) a new definition of QA “emphasis” (less than ½ of a course, or one that is outcome-based) and the types of course materials/activities that can be used to satisfy QA student learning outcomes. [ENW]	Charge ENW and QA subcommittees to develop a recommendation in fall in regard to the definition of “emphasis” and possibly selecting a subset of QA dimensions for ENW
Some discussion at the Annual Assessment meeting focused on the emphasis on QA in Exploring the Natural World (ENW) courses. The Core Committee may choose to consider options such as relaxing the QA prerequisite for ENW courses, relaxing the Writing requirement for ENW courses, modifying the QA Subcommittee’s definition of “emphasis” to equate with one credit out of six in two ENW integrated courses, and selecting a subset of the five dimensions of QA that must be represented in ENW courses. [QA]	
Change the perception that QA is “statistics-based” and propose non-statistics based course materials and activities that accomplish QA Student Learning Outcomes [ENW]	Passed along to Center for Teaching and Learning
It is also important to note that the scales for each rubric used were different. As the	Deputize Dir of Assessment to work with subcommittee directors to

Subcommittee Recommendations	Core Committee Response
<p>rubrics are further refined in the future, attempts should be made to standardize scales across the student learning outcomes. [ENW]</p>	<p>standardize all rubrics.</p>
<p>Rubric needs to be consistent in ranking. To have one set of ranking for “Writing” that is different from the “Integration,” “Critical,” and “Aesthetics” is confusing, especially since “Level 1 Writing Rubric” suggests competent, if not spectacular, achievement. A “1” in the other categories means failure to meet expectations. [EHE]</p>	
<p>Need for rubric standardization, particularly numbers and levels [EGC].</p>	
<p>Recommend studying the ENW student learning outcomes to determine whether they could be consolidated and simplified. [ENW]</p>	<p>ENW subcommittee will study and return a recommendation</p>
<p>Recommend the Core Committee and Office of Assessment develop a revised assessment plan which reduces the number of ENW student learning outcomes assessed each year [ENW]</p>	
<p>Does the “Aesthetic Appreciation” rubric really ask for students to appreciate the “work’s” aesthetics, or to analyze it? [EHE]</p>	<p>EHE and CAPA will study and return a recommendation</p>
<p>Instructor’s comments also indicated that they had difficulty in distinguishing the two integrated learning dimensions from each other. Perhaps this is discipline specific as it was reported that in the other core areas (such as EHE), this is easier to do. [ENW]</p>	<p>All three integrated subcommittees will study and return a recommendation</p>
<p>Develop at least one rubric dimension that requires students to use science content or scientific skill to achieve an outcome (i.e. integration or problem solving) [ENW]</p>	<p>ENW subcommittee will study and return a recommendation</p>
<p>To make the process of assessment easier and hopefully more meaningful, we are suggesting that the ISJ rubric be reduced to just three questions. These questions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the student “Understand human and cultural differences?” Assessed by Meets Expectations if the student “Communicates an understanding of human and cultural differences”</li> <li>b. Can the student “Examine the conditions that have given rise to injustice?” Assessed by meets expectations if the student “ Understands the historical/structural conditions that have given rise to injustice”</li> <li>c. Does the student “Understand the consequences of injustice?” Assessed by Meet expectations if the student “Recognizes an injustice and articulates the consequences of that injustice”</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted</p>

Application and Course Development Processes:

Subcommittee Recommendations	Core Committee Response
<p>Recommend revisions to ENW application forms to make them less intimidating - onerous, to provide clear instructions and requirements for the application criteria and that reduce the number of required tasks for course approval [ENW, similar comments from EGC]</p>	<p>Will be addressed by other work (above) and new forms</p>
<p>The [application] form needs to be simplified both in the way its questions are expressed as well as its digital format. [EHE]</p>	
<p>There was general consensus at the meeting that the ENW course application was the most difficult and intimidating of all integrated course applications. This was attributed to a number of factors including the number of requirements (student learning outcomes, QA and writing components) and some found the application form somewhat redundant where signature assignments were asked to be proposed in multiple sections. [ENW]</p>	
<p>A simplification of the core approval forms seems to be needed. A closer coaching of applicants to new core designation might help. Flexibility of deadlines in the application process. Give more support to faculty applying for core designation. There is the need to present faculty interested in applying with a timeline of what needs to be done to get their class running, so they can properly plan. There is the need for more specific details (as in positive feedback) given to applicants to review their applications. They need to know how to improve their applications. [EGC]</p>	<p>Will be discussed in the core strategic meeting (deadlines should be added to website and calendar; include names on core website; move Core website parallel to CAS and Boler, committee minutes should be posted more publically)</p>
<p>Faculty need clarification how and who to submit applications to. Deadlines need to be observed. A clear time-frame needs to be established so the sub-committee budget sufficient time [EHE]</p>	
<p>Deadlines should be flexible [EGC]</p>	
<p>Create a check-list of requirements that include points of emphasis to accompany course applications [ENW]</p>	
<p>Make clear to the campus community the names of Subcommittee Directors and Members for faculty to contact them formally or informally. Several colleagues do not know who directors and subcommittee members are. [EGC]</p>	
<p>Complaint was made that the requirements were like a moving target. An assignment or outcome that had been approved on a previous application was disapproved on second application. [EHE]</p>	

Subcommittee Recommendations	Core Committee Response
Recommend that a systematic process be developed and implemented to aid interested faculty in finding partners to develop ENW integrated course pairs [ENW, similar concerns for EGC and learning communities]	Passed along to Center for Teaching and Learning
Recommend that the Core Committee and Administration consider creating writing liaison positions for each department to help faculty with the development of writing portions of integrated courses [ENW]	The Writing Committee, English department, and Dean's office will study this issue.
Recommend increased funding for course development grants to reflect the complexity of developing integrated core courses [ENW]	In the fall, develop policies and recommendations concerning course development grants. These grants are still absolutely essential, and the committee believes there will always be a need for grants (but perhaps in smaller numbers).
We hope that the Core Committee will continue to support development grants and workshops for QA. These will give faculty preparing proposals and courses opportunities to interact with the QA Subcommittee in order to provide students with the best chance for success while being respectful of the Integrative Core document. We hope that the Core Committee will continue to mediate the tension between the QA Subcommittee and individual faculty and departments who disagree with interpretations and policies. [QA]	
This information [about crafting careful, clear prompts for integration assignments] should be included in course development grant workshops, and a separate "helpful hints" document that could be developed to accompany course applications. A specialized workshop focusing on integration and providing models in several disciplines would also be recommended. [ENW]	
Identify additional professional development opportunities, particularly in the early stages of course development that would be of use to faculty developing ENW courses. Suggestions include development of signature assignments, integration, and models of integration. [ENW]	
Faculty need to be reminded that they should not tell students that a class has Core designation until the class is actually approved. [EGC]	
Are there some courses that due to the content of the course do not meet the spirit of an Issue in Social Justice course? What are these courses and how will they be identified may need to be addressed. [ISJ]	The ISJ subcommittee will study and return a recommendation.
A proposal is forthcoming to have a single course with multiple section received ISJ designation. Is this acceptable? [ISJ]	There is no current policy opposing this.

Assessment Processes:

Subcommittee Recommendations	Core Committee Response
We will look to the Integrative Core Committee and the Director of Assessment for guidance about changes to the application and assessment processes, including consideration of implementing reviews of instructor assessments and explorations of inter-rater reliability. [QA]	Included under rubrics (above)
Some faculty felt that the assessment process took too long relative to the work required to teach and to assess within a course. There also seems to be confusion about what materials are required to accompany QA assessment submission. The QA Subcommittee must communicate requirements more clearly to faculty teaching QA courses. [QA]	
It is suggested that the distributions of the rubric results be provided in addition to average and deviation to provide a fuller picture of student learning. [ENW]	

EGC Learning Communities and Class Modalities:

Subcommittee Recommendations	Core Committee Response
Some colleagues trying to organize an EGC Learning Community have trouble identifying possible members. Activities to help them are currently done via CTL, but may be the subcommittee might be involved in the process as well.	The EGC subcommittee will study and return a recommendation
There might be the need to get more EGC team-taught classes. There may be ways to motivate faculty to offer EGC classes under that modality.	
There might not be the need to insist on the concurrent offering of classes in a given semester. Participating faculty need the freedom to decide the rotation of classes in their Learning Community without that additional constraint.	
Foster the establishment of Learning Communities that do not sunset while meeting EGC standards might be helpful. In that way, new faculty can join structures already in place. This would help to incorporate new hires more easily into the core curriculum.	
Some consideration to more flexibility to the modes of delivery of integrative courses (linked, team-taught, learning community) might be in place, so as to make it easier for interested faculty to participate.	

Other:

Subcommittee Recommendations	Core Committee Response
Needs better coordination between the Core Committee and the sub-committee. It is unclear why the Core Committee can override a sub-committee's approval [EHE]	Add to future agenda.
Core Committee too large to really be effective in decision making, especially when time is a serious factor [EHE]	
There should be a variety of ENW courses at all levels - some for non-science majors and some for junior/senior level STEM students. [ENW]	
Some faculty expressed concern about scheduling pressures due to integrated courses, and some faculty requested specific support on using Canvas to implement rubrics. There is also concern that the burden of developing related courses – such as QA and ENW courses – stretches some individual faculty members too thin. [QA]	
It is not clear what pressure the QA Subcommittee, the Core Committee, and the Assessment Office can bring on individual faculty who provide incomplete or delayed assessments. [QA]	
While we recognize the obligation to work with our colleagues, if a select course consistent fails to have its students meet the ISJ learning objectives at what point does the course lose its ISJ designation? We believe it is counterproductive to continue to label a course an ISJ course if the ISJ learning goals are not being met. [ISJ]	

**Note:** There are no recommendations from the following reports: Speaking, InfoLit, Languages, TRS, PL KR, PL VS, CAPA

### Additional Core Committee Actions

*Prompt:* Please use this space to discuss any further actions the Core Committee intends to take based on 1) the data contained in the sub-committee reports, 2) the sub-committee meetings themselves, or 3) this meeting.

- Add ex-officio member from Advising
- Form a stronger relationship with Admissions (possibly a committee member to serve as a liaison or through Provost's Council)

## Rubric for Scoring Rhetorically-Effective Writing

	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
<b>Articulate an Argument</b>				
<b>Selection of Topic</b>	The writer selects a topic that is unsuitable for audience, purpose, and length requirements and <i>does not situate</i> the topic in a larger context.	The writer selects a complex topic and articulates a clear argument given audience, purpose, and length requirements but <i>may not situate</i> the topic in a larger context.	The writer selects a complex topic given audience, purpose, and length requirements and <i>begins to properly situate</i> the topic in relation to a larger context.	The writer selects a complex topic given audience, purpose, and length requirements and <i>effectively</i> situates the topic in the context of the field.
<b>Development and Support of Writing</b>	The writer <i>does not at all</i> develop or support the stated topic in relation to context, audience, and purpose.	The writer <i>attempts to</i> develop and support an argument that appeals to context, audience, and purpose.	The writer develops and supports an argument that appeals to context, audience, and purpose.	The writer <i>thoroughly</i> develops and supports an argument that appeals to context, audience, and purpose.
<b>Integrate Sources</b>				
<b>Source Integration</b>	The writer <i>does not</i> incorporate evidence, or fails to integrate evidence.	The writer locates and integrates evidence into his/her own argument.	The writer locates, engages with, and integrates <i>credible and relevant</i> sources.	The writer locates, engages with, and <i>thoroughly</i> integrates credible and reliable sources.
<b>Document Ethically</b>				
<b>Plagiarism and Citation</b>	Writer <i>omits</i> important citation information or <i>appears to have plagiarized</i> .	The writer avoids plagiarism, and all important citation information is present, though documentation may contain <i>formatting errors</i> .	The writer avoids plagiarism and documents sources <i>consistently</i> using a citation style with <i>few</i> formatting errors.	The writer avoids plagiarism and documents sources consistently, also demonstrating concern for ethical representation of others' work.
<b>Control Surface Features</b>				
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Writer uses language with major and frequent sentence-level errors that impede the reader's ability to understand the argument.	The writer uses language that <i>generally</i> conveys meaning to readers with clarity, though writing may include <i>some</i> errors.	The writer uses <i>straightforward</i> language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity, with <i>few</i> errors.	The writer uses language that <i>skillfully</i> communicates meaning to readers with clarity and <i>fluency</i> , and is <i>virtually error-free</i> .

Level 1 is the target performance level in foundational courses.  
 Level 2 is the target performance level in integrated courses and in additional writing courses (see note on next page).



**NOTE:** Integrated courses and additional writing courses use the same rubric with minor variations in the description for **Level 2**:

	<b>Level 2 (Foundational)</b>	<b>Level 2 (Integrated)</b>	<b>Level 2 (Additional)</b>
<b>Articulate an Argument</b>			
<b>Selection and Development of Topic</b>	The writer selects a complex topic given audience, purpose, and length requirements and <i>begins to properly situate</i> the topic in <u>relation to a larger context</u> .	The writer selects a complex topic given audience, purpose, and length requirements and <i>begins to situate</i> the topic in <u>relation to the content of the course</u> .	The writer selects a complex topic given audience, purpose, and length requirements and <i>begins to situate</i> the topic in <u>the context of the field</u> .
<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b>	The writer develops and supports an argument that appeals to context, audience, and purpose.	The writer develops and supports an argument appropriate to context, audience, and purpose.	The writer develops and supports an argument appropriate to context, audience, and purpose.
<b>Integrate Sources</b>			
<b>Source Integration</b>	The writer locates, engages with, and integrates <i>credible and relevant</i> sources.	The writer locates, engages with, and integrates <i>credible and relevant</i> sources <u>appropriate to the content of the course</u> .	The writer locates, engages with, and integrates <i>credible and relevant</i> sources <u>appropriate to the student's major discipline</u> .
<b>Document Ethically</b>			
<b>Plagiarism and Citation</b>	The writer avoids plagiarism and documents sources <i>consistently</i> using a citation style with <i>few</i> formatting errors.	The writer avoids plagiarism and documents sources <i>consistently</i> using a citation style <u>appropriate to the course</u> with <i>few</i> formatting errors.	The writer avoids plagiarism and documents sources <i>consistently</i> using a citation style <u>appropriate to the discipline</u> with <i>few</i> formatting errors.
<b>Control Surface Features</b>			
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	The writer uses <i>straightforward</i> language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity, with <i>few</i> errors.	The writer uses <i>straightforward</i> language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity, with <i>few</i> errors.	The writer uses <i>straightforward</i> language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity, with <i>few</i> errors.