Integrative Core Curriculum
Annual Assessment Report

John Carroll
UNIVERSITY

General Information

Current Semester: Spring 2017

Date of Assessment Meeting(s):   May 18, 2018

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Peter Kvidera, Todd Bruce, Maria Marsilli, Megan Wilson-Reitz, Tamba Nlandu, Nick Santilli, Mike Nichols, Anne Kugler, Sheila McGinn, Martha Pereszlenyi-Pinter, Rodney Hessinger, Roger Purdy, Brent Brossmann, Keith Nagy, Gloria Vaquera, Tom Pace, Andy Welki, Michelle Walker

---

Findings about student learning are included in Subcommittee Reports.

Response to Recommendations for the Core Committee

Prompt: Listed below are the recommendations from the sub-committees. Please indicate the how the Core Committee intends to respond.

Rubrics	
Simplify categories in the different rubrics, for some colleagues find it redundant. For instance, we currently have two categories that can be combined into one: disciplinary connections and cross-disciplinary application could be renamed "integration" and "cultures, environments, practices, or values", "global systems" and "implications of decisions" could be simplified into a single category entitled "Global Awareness". [EGC]	Develop official "combined" rubric(s) for integrated courses; consolidate Global Rubric into a single dimension [Assessment + Core Director over the summer for official vote in September]
Address inconsistencies and inadequacies in the current writing rubrics (see ENW subcommittee report's norming report and rubric markup) [ENW]	Conflate first two rows of writing rubric; lack of true "not met" on integrated writing rubric; go back to a single writing rubric for all levels; consider where organization/structure officially fits in rubric; more specificity about surface features/citations, possibly providing

Need clarity in writing rubric: committee was frustrated by two writing rubrics: "writing: selection and development of a topic" and "writing: context and purpose." These are set by the instructor so it is difficult, if not impossible, for the committee to assess if the writing sample meets expectations. Also "writing: plagiarism and citation." These were seen as two distinct points. Plagiarism is the use of others' ideas or evidence without giving credit. But, depending on the type of writing assignment, credit can be given not only through footnotes/endnotes, but also in the narrative, "according to Smith's article, …". Citation, on the other hand, is mechanical based on the instructors' directions. In some cases the source is known by the reader and does not need specific citation. In other cases, the instructors might not require more than the source's name or title. The mechanics of footnotes and endnotes is more pass or fail. We should expect accurate footnote/endnotes and bibliography formatting. So what exceeds expectations? [EHE]	models of student work and explanations for rubric; avoid overwhelming instructors with verbiage and lots of columns [Assessment + Core Director over the summer for official vote in September]
There was also some confusion over the ratings of the Fall 2016 samples. Some members rated the papers 1, 3, or 5 and did not use 2 or 4. Others rated 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. [EHE]	Possibly accounted for above
Writing	
Consider an additional foundational writing requirement (since assessment indicates that roughly a quarter of students are struggling with the surface features of writing and implementing citations). For example, we could require a specific one-credit hour course on different citation styles, or on peer reviewing/editing papers –or on both [EGC]	Initiate campus-wide two-way conversation about writing across the curriculum and support faculty across campus in teaching writing (assignment advice, class visits, conversations, etc.) [build into strategic plan]. Make clear to students/advisors that certain core classes are writing courses and part of larger model of writing across the curriculum. [Core Director] Until we have really supported the current new core model, it is too soon to change core structure.
Establish expectations of the amount of writing that should be included in the signature assignment (given the difficulty of assessing short pitches and posters for writing). This could be done in the same way that the page expectation is outlined for Additional Writing requirement for the major. Since source integration is also a writing criteria, we also would suggest that expectations for the numbers and	Develop guidelines and model assignments for writing in integrated courses based on assessment results and existing syllabi [Writing subcommittee – fall 2017]; Develop guidance for designing assignment for core [CTL?]; Explore mechanisms for faculty development (not a "workshop" approach) [Core Director]

types of sources be articulated for signature writing assignments. This should be acceptable to faculty teaching linked courses if a mechanism is included that allows the expectations to be flexible given disciplinary differences [ENW]	
Faculty Development	
Continue to work with all departments to incorporate **writing** as effectively as possible, based on the **best practices** we have established and recommended. The subcommittee believes at times that in trying to be as practical as possible with the implementation of this new core, we run the risk of compromising best practices for writing across the curriculum. The subcommittee, nevertheless, appreciates the fact that it needs to operate in conjunction with the disciplines' best writing practices. [Writing]	see Writing section above
Develop workshops to help instructors provide better support for writing mechanics, source integration and citation to improve their students' performance in these areas [ENW]	
Tutorials on **OnBase** to familiarize faculty with its operational features. [Writing]	Provide video tutorials, linked from within the form and on the email calls. [ITS + Director]
Help colleagues still unfamiliar with key requirements/tools/goals to the Core (learning goals, signature assignment) [EGC]	Website redesign may make this easier to access [*ad hoc* web committee summer 2017]. Consider ways to make things easier, especially for part-time faculty (targeted workshops, videos, peer coaching, online mini-course, brownbag lunches, visit departments). [Directors fall 2017]
OnBase	
Continue updating and working on making OnBase software more user friendly. Specifically, … making it more clear if the email notification from OnBase is serving as a reminder to enter information, or if it is a new application, or if it is a revised application that has been resent. [Writing]	Add more information to emails; add Bannerweb menu option (Start, View Yours, View Items Needing Action) [ITS]

OnBase system does not allow subcommittee members to converse with other subcommittee members about issues with applications… In order to more easily have subcommittee members be able to discuss applications sitting in OnBase, it would be nice if the form printed nicely and also was easily converted to a Word document where reviewers could type comments. Another idea is to have a window or screen available where reviewers could make comments directed only at the subcommittee members. [ISJ]	Create subcommittee notes box/discussions tab for confidential internal conversations [ITS]
Work Flow and Applications	
Application deadlines need to be upheld by the Core Committee. [EGC]	Move toward firmer deadlines [Committee]. Publicize clear deadlines (with rationale) and make clear that announcing that a class will *probably* have a designation is completely unethical; announce/ remind at chairs' meeting or CAS/BSOB calendars; get word to students that Banner is only authority on core designations [Director]
Would like to see a system where large amounts of applications do not come to subcommittees all at once at the end of the semester. [Writing]	Setting of deadlines during strategic planning should address this concern.
Highlighting the OP-relevant portion of the syllabus or providing the relevant section in On-Base could help speed the approval process [Speaking]	Color-code the AW and OP materials for the Capstone Plus application [ITS]
Attention needs to be paid to leaves of absence on subcommittees. This Spring the EHE sub-committee only had two active members out of three. While it speeded up approval, it did not help in assessment of Fall 2016 courses. [EHE]	Faculty on leave can recommend a temporary replacement to Faculty Council. A member who doesn't perform duties will be warned by the subcommittee, asked to resign by the Core Director and then FC will be notified and ask for replacement.

Review the application guidelines because so many applications lack a clear integration or global awareness approach. We suggest that applicants are encouraged to find clear ways to help the subcommittee in evaluating their applications. For instance, applicants can color code in their syllabi the integrated disciplines, alternatively, boxes can be added to the application form indicating which regions of the world the course addresses and specific disciplines that the course materials draw along. [EGC]	
Assessment Processes	
Consider moving from during semester to an assessment day (possibly stipended) [ISJ]	Strategic planning
Learning Communities	
Develop guidelines for monitoring ongoing EGC designations in the event that LC members are no longer active. The core committee should also consider processes by which renewal of EGC designations can incorporate active participation in learning communities as a requirement.	EGC subcommittee will develop a proposal for the committee in fall 2017 (consider implementing annual reporting via the core feedback survey)
Develop standards which regulate the active participation of LC members from semester to semester. In this sense, it might also be helpful to have specific rules by which a colleague can move from a LC to another--- we suggest that it should be no penalty for doing so nor it should be required to reapply for EGC designation	

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.

OnBase
1. OnBase: Ability to compare original submission to revisions [ITS will investigate options]
2. OnBase: Fix document naming for uploads [ITS is working on it]
3. OnBase: Notification to directors when an application is started [additional option on Bannerweb menu and digest email]

Topics for Strategic Planning
4. Need a policy for removal of courses from Learning Communities and/or Core Designation (consistent mechanism for removal even if criteria for being "in violation" are very different) [address after other Learning Community issue is resolved 2017-2018]
5. Consolidate critical thinking rubrics from EHE and ENW for new category of Linked Courses (see attached) by adding Conclusions from Problem Solving to EHE and cutting primary/secondary source language
6. Adjustments to assessment plan in response to sustainability concerns (possibly institute some sort of rotation so not every outcomes every class for every person for every semester) and need for better participation in committee assessment (possible creation of an stipend-supported "assessment day" with subcommittee meetings following, full core meeting in August?) [during 2017-2018, develop plan for sampling models]

Exploring the Natural World

ENW Critical Analysis: Demonstrate the ability to think critically about a problem

	Exceeded (5)	**Met** (3)	**Not Met** (1)
Student identifies and demonstrates an understanding of the fundamental elements of a problem or question to be considered critically. 2A1a	Articulates (clarifies and describes) the nature of the problem or question comprehensively, explaining the relevant elements (terms, key ideas, etc.) necessary for full understanding.	Can articulate (clarify or describe) the nature of the problem or question but some key elements (terms, ideas) are yet undefined and unexplored.	Cannot articulate (clarify or describe) the nature of the problem or question and its elements (terms, key ideas, etc.).
Student interprets and analyzes relevant data/evidence. 2D1a2	Uses information from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to produce a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Uses information from sources with some interpretation/evaluation to begin developing a coherent analysis or synthesis.	Takes information from sources without any interpretation/evaluation.

EHE Critical Analysis

	Exceeded (5)	**Met** (3)	**Not Met** (1)
Student identifies and understands the fundamental elements of a problem or question to be considered critically. 2A1	Can articulate (clarify and describe) the nature of the problem or question comprehensively, explaining the relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Can articulate (clarify or describe) the nature of the problem or question but some key elements (terms, ideas) are yet undefined and unexplored.	Cannot articulate (clarify or describe) the nature of the problem or question and its elements (terms, key ideas, etc.).
Student interprets relevant data/evidence. 2D1a	Takes information from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to produce a coherent analysis or synthesis; understands and demonstrates the distinctions between primary and secondary sources.	Takes information from sources with some interpretation/evaluation to begin developing a coherent analysis or synthesis; distinguishes primary and secondary sources.	Takes information from sources without any interpretation/evaluation; cannot distinguish primary and secondary sources.

ENW Problem Solving: Apply creative and innovative thinking to develop approaches to solve problems and/or answer questions

1/23/17

	Exceeded (5)	Met (3)	Not Met (1)
Propose and evaluates solutions, hypotheses, and/or solutions* 3C3	Proposes strategies, hypotheses, and/or solutions that are logical and complete; all plausible consequences are provided; and all are supported by evidence.	The strategies, hypotheses, and/or solutions proposed are sound but not complete; most of the plausible consequences are stated and most are supported with evidence.	Strategies, hypotheses, and/or solutions are either not proposed or realistic; consequences are either missing or not plausible and not supported with evidence.
Conclusions 3B5	Conclusions are logical, correct/plausible, complete, explained thoroughly and supported with evidence.	Conclusions are sound, with either minor errors, omissions, incomplete explanations and/or evidence.	Conclusions provided suffer from significant errors and omissions; explanations are incorrect and/or evidence is missing.
Creative and innovative thinking 3C5	The strategies, hypotheses, solutions, and/or conclusions include several new, novel and/or creative elements beyond those presented and/or discussed in the course(s).	The strategies, hypotheses, solutions and/or conclusions include a single new, novel and/or creative element beyond those presented and/or discussed in the course(s).	The strategies, hypotheses, solutions and/or conclusions only include material presented or discussed in the course(s).

*In science courses, student should engage scientific content, processes, evidence, etc. in their proposals, hypotheses and/or solutions.