

## General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Examining the Human Experience
Current Semester:	Spring 2016
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 17, 2016

## Participants in Assessment Meeting

R.W. Purdy (HS), sub-committee chair  
Dan Kilbride (HS)  
Paul Lauritzen (TRS)  
John McBratney (EN)

## Courses Offered in Fall 2015

EN	299D	51	Special Topics: Literature of the British Empire	J. McBratney
HS	277	51	Empire of Paper: The Spanish Colonial Empire	M. Marsilli Cardozo

## Courses Offered in Spring 2016

AH	399B	51	Special Topics: The Beat Generation and the Rise of the '60s	L. Curtis
EN	299E	51	Special Topics: Beat Generation and the Rise of the '60s	G. Bilgere
CO	200	53	Interpersonal Communication	J. Schmidt
EN	277	52	Major American Writers	P. Kvidera
EN	299A	51	Special Topics: Irish Literature and Film	P. Metres
PL	399B	51	Special Topics: Conflict in Northern Ireland	D. Taylor
EN	299B	51	Special Topics: Introduction to Popular Culture	T. Pace
PL	398B	51	Special Topics: Philosophy and Pop Culture	S. Kaye
EN	299G	51	Special Topics: Atlantic Crossings	J. Feerick
HS	251	51	Atlantic World to 1700	M. Gallo
HS	240	51	Spiritual Awakenings in Early America	R. Hessinger
TRS	329	51	Special Topics: Religious Enthusiasm	K. Tobey
IC	208	51	Food for the Soul, Soul Food	M. Pereszlenyi-Pinter
TRS	272	51	Soul Food and Food for the Soul	C. Wilson
PL	298	51	Special Topics: Philosophy and the Pursuit of Happiness	P. Mooney
PO	296	51	Special Topics: Plato's Republic	D. Hahn

## Typical Assessment Process

Faculty members teaching a class in this category are asked to select at least one assignment that addresses each learning goal (with the possibility that one assignment may address multiple goals). As part of (or parallel to) grading those assignments, the faculty member completes the committee-approved rubric and then provides the scores as well as the original student work to the Core Committee. Each semester, the category sub-committee assesses a sample of student work from the previous semester focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **The focus for the 2016 meeting is Integration.** The assessment meeting, held at the end of the Spring semester each year, focuses on data from the previous spring semester and the most recent fall semester. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

## Deviations from the Assessment Process

Because fall 2015 was the first semester of the new integrative core, there were no integrative core classes offered in spring 2015. There were only one EHE course in fall 2015, for which no data was reported; therefore, this meeting will only be able to make use preliminary data from spring 2016.

## Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

EHE Rubrics; EHE Instructor Data 2016; EHE Feedback 2016, EHE Preliminary Data 2016

## Findings

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, what your sub-committee has learned about student learning during this assessment cycle. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

Students made an earnest effort to meet goals. Strengths and weaknesses were all over the map and hard to generalize. Also, because rankings are instructor-generated, unsure of consistency of ranking between courses.

## Suggestions for Instructors

*Prompt:* Do any of your findings translate into helpful suggestions for all instructors teaching courses with this designation? Are there areas that need more emphasis? What would be the best mechanism for delivering this feedback? (Possible mechanisms might include an e-mail from the committee, a message delivered at a fall orientation session, a faculty development workshop.) If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings and these suggestions.

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.

## Evaluation of Processes

*Prompt:* Describe, in words, your sub-committee's evaluation of application and assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

The EHE subcommittee felt it worked well through electronic exchange, but will try to meet face-to-face at the beginning of Fall to review and norm the rubrics.

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

## Recommendations for Internal Changes

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that can be made by the sub-committee and the assessment office. What changes, if any, do you need to make to your application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation? If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluation and these recommendations.

The form needs to be simplified both in the way its questions are expressed as well as its digital format.

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.

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.

Does the "Aesthetic Appreciation" rubric really ask for students to *appreciate* the "work's" aesthetics, or to analyze it?

## **Recommendations for the Core Committee**

*Prompt:* This section pertains to changes that will require action by the entire core committee (and potentially the faculty). What changes, if any, do you need to make to application or assessment processes or to other aspects of the core designation, including learning goals, rubrics, and curricular requirements and/or structures. If not obvious, please explain the connection between your findings/evaluation and these recommendations.

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.

Core Committee too large to really be effective in decision making, especially when time is a serious factor.