

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Writing (in Integrated Courses)
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Tom Pace, Nevin Mayer, Patrick Moony, Karen Wilson, and Maria Soriano

Courses Offered in Fall 2016

Foundational

EN 120 Developmental Writing I (2 sections)
EN 125 Seminar on Academic Writing (29 sections)
HP 101 Honors Colloquium: Life of the Mind (3 sections)

Additional

MN 202 Business Communication (10 sections)
SC 260 Consumer Culture and Society

Courses Offered in Spring 2017

Foundational

EN 121 Developmental Writing II (2 sections)
EN 125 Seminar on Academic Writing (13 sections)

Additional

MN 202 Business Communication (9 sections)
SC 285 Aging, Health, and Society
SC 390 Health & Healing in East Asia

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 2017 meeting is writing in the integrated courses.** 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

During the 2016-2018 academic year, sub-committee work occurred during the spring semester only, looking at student work sampled from all previously offered courses not already assessed by the subcommittee.

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s), Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard.

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?

The subcommittee learned the following about student learning this academic year, specifically from the assessment work we completed on writing in the integrated courses: The main strengths are that instructors and the writing committee are closely matched in their assessment of student writing when

it comes to the three categories: exceeded, met, not met. Overall, the majority of categories for writing fall between “met” and “exceeded,” at least in EHE and EGC courses. For ENW, however, the data show that instructors rated students more successful overall in writing than the sub-committee did. Still, the subcommittee’s ratings ranged between met and not met; very few exceeded.

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.

The subcommittee suggests to all instructors in integrated courses that assignments sheets be provided that include all necessary information from citation style to the assignment’s purpose and evaluation criteria. This inclusion of assignment sheets will assist the subcommittee in scoring based on the instructor’s expectations.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

This year, the subcommittee calibrated the writing rubric, something we had not done the previous year. As such, the calibration process ensured that subcommittee members shared a similar standard for assessing essays individually.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee’s evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (The subcommittee should function efficiently and effectively.)

The subcommittee split up into three teams of two to more effectively respond to and evaluate core applications in a timely way. While the subcommittee shared these responsibilities, the subcommittee director still read and evaluated all the applications.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

Two that come to mind: One, continue updating and working on making OnBase software more user friendly. Specifically, we suggest 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. Two, and we have no specific recommendation here, but we 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. Three, the subcommittee will create a shared Google Doc for individual committee members to record core application feedback to create more dialogue between committee members. Finally, the subcommittee recommends that IT provide tutorials on OnBase to familiarize faculty with its operational features.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

Our suggestion is a general one. We suggest the core committee, in addition to the writing subcommittee, 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.

Final Notes:

In response to feedback on the Foundational Writing Survey:

One respondent noted that the writing subcommittee needs to advertise the feedback loop more clearly. Last year, the subcommittee closed the feedback loop by implementing an additional assignment in EN 125, based on assessment data. This is something the subcommittee director can do during the annual first-year writing orientation meeting in August.

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Oral Communication
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Brent Brossmann, chair; Jackie Schmidt, OP subcommittee member, Karen Gygli, Dale Heinen, Peter Manos, John Hannon

Courses Offered in Fall 2016

Foundational Oral Expression

CO 125 Speech Communication (29 sections)

Oral Presentation (Major Requirement)

MN 202 Business Communication (10 sections)

Courses Offered in Spring 2017

Foundational Oral Expression

CO 125 Speech Communication (20 sections)

Oral Presentation (Major Requirement)

MN 202 Business Communication (9 sections)

Typical Assessment Process

Faculty members teaching a class in this category complete the committee-approved rubrics for three of the assignments and then provide the scores as well as a recording of the persuasive speech to the Director. Periodically, the CO departmental assessment committee assesses a sample of the persuasive speeches. **The focus for the 2017 meeting is Persuasive.** 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 and the results of a survey of instructors. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

Deviations from the Assessment Process

None

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s), Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard; additional data attached

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?

The focus of this review is the persuasive speech in CO 125. This is the final presentation in that course. A list of the university's learning goals, including their operationalization in CO 125, is attached. A data set of findings is also attached.

There is still inconsistency between assessment and grading. There is fairly strong consistency between the faculty survey data and the assessment team analysis from 2015. However, there is a huge discrepancy between that data and the Canvas rubrics. For example, faculty surveys for the last two semesters suggest that 16.7% of students exceed expectations for providing adequate support for their

ideas. This is very consistent with the assessment team data which found 16.2% of students exceeding expectations in supporting ideas. However, when used in the grading/assessment rubric, 71.6% of students were found to exceed those expectations over the last two years. The committee discussed reasons this may be the case, including a desire to please students, meeting student expectations of grades, fear of confrontation with unhappy students, and confusion in trying to channel an art into a numbered sequence. Perhaps most importantly is an assumption that a basic presentation should result in a good to great grade. The data may be skewed by the fact that five sections (of 28) in the fall resulted in 61 of the 120 A grades that were earned by CO 125 students in the fall. Given that assessment and grading are tied, too many good grades skews the assessment data. There is a question of whether that data is skewed because of FITW, although we do not have that data. Also, since the distinction for at risk was the propensity to leave the college, not an academic challenge, the FITW distinction may not explain the difference.

There are multiple areas in need of additional focus. According to the faculty survey data, support (12.5% not met v 16.7% exceeded); organization (8% not met v 12% exceeded); verbal delivery (24% not met v 12% exceeded); and nonverbal delivery (24% not met v 8% exceeded) are areas in need of additional focus.

Technology scores are very high. This may be due to a variety of factors. We have only the Canvas rubric data to examine; there is some suspicion that it is a dumping ground for points; that the expectations may be too vague; and that problems with technology issues have contributed. There has been a question of how to either change or remove that element from the rubric. There was a strong desire to remove the distance speech because of technology problems, a negative impact of eye contact (because of looking at the camera, not the audience), and the ability of students to read speeches by hiding the script above the camera. There is a fear that the distance element of the assignment may be counterproductive.

There was a consistent conversation about the difficulty in getting too objective. At some point, the final call is a gut check, although it is grounded in theory. Ways to improve consistency, including creating demonstration videos of A and C level speeches as a way to demonstrate expectations, both to faculty and students. There was consensus on a need to continue the process of working through the rubric with a demonstration speech in the summer meeting. There is an increased need to build common expectations on what constitutes an effective speech within and between all CO 125 faculty and students.

The committee also suggests changing the date requirement on resources from a six month time frame to a one year time frame, but agrees to remind all faculty to enforce the one year standard.

The importance of Q&A was stressed. It is a nice example of consistency of assessment, grading and expectations.

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.

One suggestion was a suggested meeting in the middle of the semester. There was a recognized difficulty in finding a meeting time, but there was a lot we could learn from that. Timely reminders and support on assessment and grading would be appreciated.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

The faculty survey data is useful and helps to identify issues. The summer meetings are also very helpful in generating common perspectives, but as noted, there is a need to have more meetings for follow-up. That consistency should help in assessment. There is also a need to make sure that all faculty are using the assessment rubrics. While response rates to the faculty survey are good, they could be better. Getting the survey sent out earlier might help that process.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (The subcommittee should function efficiently and effectively.)

Generally, it works well. It is useful that our sections are highlighted to find the relevant information. Our criteria are clear, at least to us, which makes it easier to see which applications meet the criteria. It is difficult to search an entire syllabus for a specific section dedicated to OP, so highlighting it or providing the relevant section in On-Base could help speed the process. We are thrilled to have Desmond Kwan and his meticulous analysis as part of the committee.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

We still need to establish a rotation for assessment. We need to ensure that all OP faculty are recording on a three year cycle, and using the core approved assessment rubric when assessing. We also need to spend some time explaining the importance of the recording process, as documentation, as an assessment tool, to provide artifacts for student portfolios, and to help students and faculty understand the nuances of oral presentation through self-critique. That self-critique is NOT a requirement for assessment, but is impossible for students absent recording.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

The program works well when you have good access to directors of areas. The process has become easier as we have refined the core and streamlined the process. The combination of capstone, AW and OP designations further streamlined the process. There as a clear understanding that that process was too difficult early on. As one member noted, Keep It Simple, Core Committee.

University Learning Goals for CO 125 – Oral Presentation

The Integrative Core document lists nine learning goals for all students at John Carroll University. The three which are specific to the Oral Expression foundational competency are numbers 2, 3 and 4. They are:

2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
3. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression
4. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas (p. 13)

With those three learning goals in mind, the foundational course in oral expression introduces students to a variety of concepts in efforts to foster the following learning outcomes:

1. To speak in public effectively. To do so, the student must:

Create speeches which are meaningful and appropriate to a particular audience
Demonstrate polished delivery including effective eye contact, vocal variety, gestures and movement
Display skill in answering public questions about a presentation

2. To speak in public ethically. To do so, students must:

Employ the notion of a “good person speaking well” by demonstrating ethical responsibility in all areas of speaking, including goals, research, language choice and presentation
Avoid plagiarizing sources.

3. To develop habits of critical analysis. To do so, students must:

Articulate a defensible thesis in argumentative, informative and persuasive speeches
Support the speeches with appropriate, credible evidence
Understand differences in audiences and occasions and adapt the content, structure, language choice and delivery of the presentation appropriately
Develop critical listening skills for the purpose of evaluating presentations

4. To develop habits of aesthetic appreciation. To do so, students must:

Employ design principles in creating appropriate and effective visual aids
Employ stylistic principles in wording speeches

5. In addition to these learning outcomes, students will be introduced to an integration of public speaking and technology. Students will be introduced to:

Understand the role of technology in creating and presenting effective visual aids to augment speeches
Demonstrate visual aids during a presentation using their own technological devices as the display medium
Use appropriate databases and internet sites to access a wide variety of resources
Speak effectively to a distant audience via a visual medium

Learning Goal	Learning Outcome	Assessment Mechanism
2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation	To develop habits of critical analysis. To do so, students must: Articulate a defensible thesis in argumentative, informative and persuasive speeches	Argumentative, informative and persuasive speeches.
	Support the speeches with appropriate, credible evidence	Argumentative, informative and persuasive speeches
	Understand differences in audiences and occasions and adapt the content, structure, language choice and delivery of the presentation appropriately	Argumentative, informative and persuasive speeches.
	Develop critical listening skills for the purpose of evaluating presentations	Critiques of self and/or others' speeches.
4. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression	To speak in public effectively. To do so, the student must: Create speeches which are meaningful and appropriate to a particular audience	Argumentative, informative and persuasive speeches.
	Demonstrate polished delivery including effective eye contact, vocal variety, gestures and movement	Argumentative, informative and persuasive speeches.
	Display skill in answering public questions about a presentation	Q&A sessions which follow the informative and persuasive speeches
7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas	To speak ethically in public. To do so, students must: Employ the notion of a "good person speaking well" by demonstrating ethical responsibility in all areas of speaking, including goals, research, language choice and presentation	Annual review of persuasive speeches. Concerns for any speech as identified by instructor.
	Avoid plagiarizing sources.	Assessed in all speeches and written work.

Goals for the Persuasive Speech: Data

Topic & Thesis:

A speaker should choose and narrow their topics appropriately for the audience and occasion by clearly revealing the topic's importance and the best interest of the audience; focusing arguments in a meaningful way; making the speech's purpose clear at the appropriate time; and demonstrating detailed knowledge of the topic.

Faculty Survey Data

Q1 - How well did your students choose and narrow their topics appropriately for the audience and occasion?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	16	1	6.3%	10	62.5%	5	31.3%
S 17	11	0	0.0%	5	45.5%	6	54.5%
Total	27	1	3.7%	15	55.6%	11	40.7%

Q2 - How well did your students communicate their theses/specific purposes in a manner appropriate for the audience and occasion?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	14	1	7.1%	10	71.4%	3	21.4%
S 17	11	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	4	36.4%
Total	25	1	4.0%	17	68.0%	7	28.0%

Canvas Data

Topic & Thesis	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	4.5%	15.5%	80.0%
S16	2.1%	16.0%	81.9%
F16	4.0%	21.0%	75.0%
S17	2.5%	15.6%	82.0%
Total	3.4%	17.1%	79.5%

Assessment Team Data

These data are from the Spring 2015 review of CO 100. The review of CO 125 persuasive speeches will take place this summer. The data are from assessment team reviews of randomly selected persuasive speeches delivered between Fall 2013 and Spring 2015.

	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Choose & Narrow	9 24.3%	22 59.5%	6 16.2%
Communicates Thesis	7 18.9%	20 54.1%	10 27.0%

SUPPORT:

A speaker should provide supporting material appropriate for the audience and occasion by using the required number of sources; making sure the sources are qualified, recent, unbiased, relevant and used appropriately; and are cited correctly within the speech or visual aid.

Faculty Survey Data

Q3 - How well did your students provide supporting material appropriate for the audience and occasion?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	13	1	7.7%	10	76.9%	2	15.4%
S 17	11	2	18.2%	7	63.6%	2	18.2%
Total	24	3	12.5%	17	70.8%	4	16.7%

Canvas Data

Support	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	8.2%	24.5%	67.4%
S16	3.5%	18.8%	77.8%
F16	2.6%	29.9%	67.4%
S17	2.0%	21.1%	76.9%
Total	4.5%	23.9%	71.6%

Assessment Team Data

These data are from the Spring 2015 review of CO 100. The review of CO 125 persuasive speeches will take place this summer. The data are from assessment team reviews of randomly selected persuasive speeches delivered between Fall 2013 and Spring 2015.

	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory		Excellent	
Support	16	43.2%	15	40.5%	6	16.2%

Organization:

A speaker should use organizational patterns appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion and purpose by having an effective introduction and conclusion and by effectively focusing a few main ideas which are clearly identified and developed.

Faculty Survey Data

Q4 - How well did your students use organizational patterns appropriate to the topic, audience, occasion, and purpose?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	14	1	7.1%	12	85.7%	1	7.1%
S 17	11	1	9.1%	8	72.7%	2	18.2%
Total	25	2	8.0%	20	80.0%	3	12.0%

Canvas Data

Organization	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	6.8%	28.1%	65.1%
S16	6.6%	25.1%	68.3%
F16	10.4%	36.0%	53.6%
S17	4.2%	18.3%	77.5%
Total	7.3%	27.9%	64.8%

Assessment Team Data

These data are from the Spring 2015 review of CO 100. The review of CO 125 persuasive speeches will take place this summer. The data are from assessment team reviews of randomly selected persuasive speeches delivered between Fall 2013 and Spring 2015.

Organization	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
	15 40.5%	20 54.1%	2 5.4%

Technology:

A speaker should use technology effectively by connecting efficiently, navigating visual aids fluidly, and recording accurately.

Faculty Survey Data

There are no faculty survey data on this item.

Canvas Data

Technology	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	2.7%	8.7%	88.6%
S16	1.1%	4.8%	94.1%
F16	1.3%	11.5%	81.2%
S17	1.5%	3.0%	95.5%
Total	1.8%	7.5%	90.7%

Assessment Team Data

There are no assessment team data on this item.

Delivery:

A speaker should use vocal variety; a conversational style; excellent eye contact; facial expressions which are consistent with and add meaning to the content; and physical movements and gestures which add to the speech.

Faculty Survey Data

Q6 - How well did your students use vocal variety in rate, pitch and intensity to heighten and maintain interest appropriate to the audience and occasion?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	14	2	14.3%	10	71.4%	2	14.3%
S 17	11	4	36.4%	6	54.5%	1	9.1%
Total	25	6	24.0%	16	64.0%	3	12.0%

Q8 - How well did your students use physical behaviors that support the verbal message?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	14	4	28.6%	8	57.1%	2	14.3%
S 17	11	2	18.2%	8	72.7%	0	0.0%
Total	25	6	24.0%	16	64.0%	2	8.0%

Canvas Data

Delivery	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	6.2%	37.8%	56.0%
S16	5.2%	39.1%	55.7%
F16	6.9%	40.1%	53.0%
S17	8.5%	38.7%	52.8%
Total	6.6%	38.9%	54.6%

Assessment Team Data

These data are from the Spring 2015 review of CO 100. The review of CO 125 persuasive speeches will take place this summer. The data are from assessment team reviews of randomly selected persuasive speeches delivered between Fall 2013 and Spring 2015.

	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory		Excellent	
Vocal Variety	2	5.4%	31	83.8%	4	10.8%
Physical Behavior	16	43.2%	18	48.6%	3	8.1%

Language:

A speaker should use accurate and effective language appropriate to the audience and occasion.

Faculty Survey Data

Q5 - How well did your students use language appropriate to the audience and occasion?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	14	0	0.0%	6	42.9%	8	57.1%
S 17	11	0	0.0%	6	54.5%	5	45.5%
Total	25	0	0.0%	12	48.0%	13	52.0%

Canvas Data

Language	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	0.0%	28.1%	71.9%
S16	0.7%	11.8%	87.5%
F16	0.7%	20.0%	79.3%
S17	0.0%	15.6%	84.4%
Total	0.4%	19.9%	79.7%

Assessment Team Data

These data are from the Spring 2015 review of CO 100. The review of CO 125 persuasive speeches will take place this summer. The data are from assessment team reviews of randomly selected persuasive speeches delivered between Fall 2013 and Spring 2015.

	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory		Excellent	
Language	3	8.1%	28	75.7%	6	16.2%

Visual Aids:

Speakers should use electronic and/or non-electronic presentation aids which are effective, aesthetic, used well, and enhance the speaker's credibility.

Faculty Survey Data

Q9 - How well did your students provide electronic and/or non-electronic presentation aids appropriate for the audience and occasion?

Semester	Responses	Not Met	Not%	Met	Met%	Exceed	Exceed%
F 16	14	0	0.0%	9	64.3%	5	35.7%
S 17	11	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	4	36.4%
Total	25	0	0.0%	16	64.0%	9	36.0%

Canvas Data

Visual Aids	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	5.4%	21.6%	73.0%
S16	1.5%	28.8%	69.7%
F16	5.3%	25.7%	69.1%
S17	7.5%	17.1%	75.4%
Total	4.8%	23.6%	71.6%

Assessment Team Data

There are no data about use or design of visual aids from the assessment team.

Questions and Answers:

A speaker should answers questions accurately, confidently, and appropriately with a tone consistent with expectations of the audience and occasion.

Faculty Survey Data

There are no faculty survey data on this item.

Canvas Data

Q&A	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
F15	1.6%	18.9%	79.5%
S16	0.4%	13.3%	86.4%
F16	30.0%	15.5%	84.2%
S17	0.5%	4.5%	95.0%
Total	0.8%	14.2%	86.0%

Assessment Team Data

There are no assessment team data on this item.

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Quantitative Analysis
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Andy Welki, Linda Seiter

Courses Offered in Fall 2016

EC 208 Business and Economics Statistics 2 (4 sections)
ED 101 Making Sense of Data
ER 115 Quantitative Analysis in Science, Business, and Humanities
MT 122 Elementary Statistics (6 sections)
MT 228 Statistics for Biological Sciences (2 sections)
PO 105 Political Analysis
SPS 122 Statistics in Sports (2 sections)

Courses Offered in Spring 2017

CH 261 Analytical Chemistry
DATA 100 Introduction to Data Science
EC 208 Business and Economics Statistics 2 (5 sections)
ED 101 Making Sense of Data
MT 119 Quantitative Analysis
MT 122 Elementary Statistics (6 sections)
MT 221 Statistics for Middle School Mathematics
MT 228 Statistics for Biological Sciences (3 sections)
MT 229 Probability and Statistics

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 for at least 10 students 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 2017 meeting is critical thinking and sources of error.** 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

During the 2016-2018 academic year, sub-committee work occurred during the spring semester only, looking at student work sampled from all previously offered courses not already assessed by the subcommittee.

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s), Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard.

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?

The student learning process was pretty consistent across the different teacher and across the semesters. Students exceeding expectations were a significant proportion.

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.

The area of finding and posing questions that were quantitative in nature is an area that might need additional attention. Many faculty often use textbook problems and this does not offer a situation where thought is needed as to both type of questions and how they would be answered. Might be a brainstorming exercise.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

Discovered that the wide latitude of QA courses on the front end creates assessment challenges on the back end because of specialized content and concepts not commonly known to individuals asked to assess. The analogy is asking the people who evaluate the speeches/communication skills and the speeches being assessed deliver their speech in sign language. The ability to evaluate is seriously compromised.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (The subcommittee should function efficiently and effectively.)

We are unsure, but wonder if copies of assignments used and some evaluation of what constitutes meets versus exceeds might help. In addition, when multiple choice questions are used it was found that on some submitted materials both student and corrections created a situation when it was unclear what answer belonged to whom.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

When committee returns to full strength a richer conversation of better operational efficiencies can be explored.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

In some areas that may be very content driven, the group/individual doing the oversight might lack the background to understand and evaluate exactly what they are reading.

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Engaging the Global Community
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Dr. Maria Marsilli, Dr. Marcus Gallo, Dr. Wendy Weidenhofs

Courses Offered in Fall 2016

Peacebuilding (EN 299F/HS 231)

Silk Road (AH 399A/TRS 351)

Cultural Encounters

EN 299G Special Topics: English as a Global Language

HS 201 World Civilization (2 sections)

Globalization

EN 299B Special Topics: Indian Colonial and Postcolonial Literature

HS 295B Special Topics: Global Capitalism in the USA

World Art, Culture, and History

AH 201 Introduction to World Art (6 sections)

HS 279 Pre-Modern East Asian History

Courses Offered in Spring 2017

Berlin Seminar (HS 332/PO 351)

Global Debt (PO 297/SC 195)

Silk Road (AH 399A/TRS 351)

Cultural Encounters

HS 202 World Civilization (2 sections)

PO 241 History, Culture, and Politics (Central Asia and the New Silk Road)

Globalization

HS 270 Introduction to Latin American History and Cultures

HS 396 Imperialism (2 sections)

SC 205 Conflict and Cooperation: Global Perspectives on Warfare and Peace-Building

SC 353 Latina/o Transnational Experience

Power and Identity

HS 280 Modern East Asian History

HS 297A Contested Seas: Exploration and Resistance in the Caribbean Basin

SP 314 Perspectives on the National and Cultures of Latin America

HS297D/TRS 329 The History of Christianity in Latin America

Storytelling

HS 333 History on Film

IC 231 Short Fiction since 1900: Russian, Slovak, Czech

World Art, Culture, and History

AH 201 Introduction to World Art (8 sections)

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 2017 meeting is writing.** 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

During the 2016-2018 academic year, sub-committee work occurred during the spring semester only, looking at student work sampled from all previously offered courses not already assessed by the subcommittee.

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s), Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard.

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?

General assessments indicate that most students taking EGC classes are meeting and exceeding the assessed Learning Goals (in the areas of Writing, Integration, and Global Awareness). Of particular significance is the “Knowledge about Diverse World” where 94% of students are reported to have met and exceed said requirement.

A closely related LG, “Evaluates systems in context,” also ranked very high, with over 90% of students reported as meeting and exceeding it.

“Integration”, also indicates a high numbers of students successfully achieving it (88%), and experienced some fluctuation from Fall 16 into Spring 16. In F16, only 9.7% was reported not meeting it, while in SP16 was 15%. This indicates an improvement in a key aspect of EGC.

Learning goals related to writing (which were assessed both by instructors and committee) revealed apparently more problematic: specifically, “Plagiarism and citation” and “Surface features”, where in each category 23% of students did not met. As a matter of fact, all categories in the area of writing indicated that student achievement deteriorated from Spring 16 into Fall 16 (particularly 4B4).

Finally, all categories of “Global Awareness” also ranked very well. However, it might be important to note that in all three categories the number of students “not meeting” expectations slightly increased from Spring 16 into Fall 16.

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.

While there was in improvement in “Integration”, “Writing” needs additional attention. This might need more central solutions, for everything indicates that, in the overall, instructors are actively working on helping students to improve their writing skills. One alternative, of course, might be to increase the number of English introductory classes. Another might be to organize faculty workshops to help colleagues consider writing classroom activities that are both efficient and not so taxing on time that needs to be used on other Learning Goals. Additionally, special workshops on citations might be conducted within classes, or with the help of the library.

Also, the increasing trend of students “not meeting” categories of “Global Awareness” indicate the need of some preventive work.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

Assessment completed by the committee did not present significant variations from that reported by EGC instructors.

However, it is problematic that, while 100% of EGC instructors submitted assessment data in Fall 16, the committee could assess only 16% of student samples for Spring 16 and 3% for Fall 16. We need to have more "man power" to assist us in the assessment process.

The EGC director recruited some committed colleagues to do it this time, and we are deeply grateful to them. However, incentives from the administration are crucial in this matter.

Also, rubrics should have a uniform number system, so as to foster consistency in the process.

At the level of instructors, when entering rubric scores, instructors oftentimes lose their data because the "save" button is not clearly visible.

Additionally, the use of many categories in the different rubrics used might be simplified, 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".

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (The subcommittee should function efficiently and effectively.)

The online application via OnBase constitutes an improvement over last year process. However, applicants had a hard time getting comments from the subcommittee. This prompted some colleagues to keep using Canvas or send additional materials directly to the subcommittee director, thus creating unnecessary confusion.

Also, the reviewing of one application pass every operational deadline posed significant stress upon both the subcommittee and this individual colleague. The same case derived into further notions of exceptionalism that unnecessarily complicated the whole process. The EGC subcommittee strongly suggests to avoid situations like this in the future.

Two years into the implementation of the New Core, there are still colleagues who are not familiar with some Core Learning Goals, and crucial tools, like the notion of "signature assignment".

There is some lack of clarity about the process by which new courses join an existing Learning Community.

The application rubric and the assessment rubric should be uniformed, so if there are changes to the assessment rubric, this should also apply to the one used for application.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

We need incentives to recruit colleagues to help us with assessment. For instance, we can randomly assign groups of papers to instructors teaching EGC classes that particular semester. Also, we could hold elections early in the year for specifically New Core assessment duties. Finally, we can have assessment positions for an end-of-the-year workshop that should carry a stipend or some form of considerations for annual evaluations.

Colleagues needs to have clarification in terms of: a. operational size of Learning Communities, b. internal organization of existing Learning Communities, c. protocol by which to create a new Learning Community.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

Application deadlines need to be upheld by the Core Committee.

Additional CTL workshops may help those colleagues still unfamiliar with key requirements/tools/goals to the Core.

The Core Committee should 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.

The Core Committee should also develop standards by 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.

The Core Committee should 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.

Since assessment indicates that roughly a quarter of students are struggling with the surface features of writing and implementing citations, we suggest considering an additional foundational writing requirement. For example, we could require a specific one-credit hour course on different citation styles, or on peer reviewing/editing papers –or on both.

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Examining the Human Experience
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Roger Purdy (sub-committee chair)
Dan Kilbride

Course Pairs Offered in Fall 2016

Beat Generation (AH 399B/EN 299D)
Communication + Writing (CO 200/EN 277)
Empire (EN 299A/HS 277)
Japanese History & Literature (EN 288/HS 381)
Religious Enthusiasm (HS 240/TRS 329A)
Rome (AH 399/HS 296B)

Course Pairs Offered in Spring 2017

American Media (CO 220/HS 212)
Atlantic (EN 299G/HS 251)
Communication + Writing (CO 200/EN 277)
Ireland (EN 299A/PL 399)
Japanese History & Society (HS 297B/ SC 250)
Pop Culture (EN 299H/PL 398)
Real Game of Thrones (EN 222/HS 296A)
Soul Food (IC 208/TRS 272)

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 2017 meeting is writing.** 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

During the 2016-2018 academic year, sub-committee work occurred during the spring semester only, looking at student work sampled from all previously offered courses not already assessed by the subcommittee.

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s), Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard.

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?

While “not met” has declined over the four semesters, there is concern that the “above expectations” is too high.

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.

Nothing from the data. An evaluation from one EHE linked course, however, found a definite split in student opinion of the back-to-back class sessions. Nearly ½ was OK with the 2-hour block schedule and the other ½ was not. Only a slim margin had “no opinion.” Instructors with the second section should take note.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

Instructors give fewer “exceeds expectations” and more “met expectations.” The assessment committee, however, seems more severe in “exceeds” and “not met” than in “met” expectations.

Perhaps this is a moot issue, given that the EHE sub-committee has been discontinued. Attention needs to be paid to leaves of absence. 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.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee’s evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (The subcommittee should function efficiently and effectively.)

During assessment of the Fall 2016 papers, 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.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

The committee is unclear on the assessment of “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?

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.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

To ensure thoughtful recommendations of submissions and assessment of student outcome, the EHE sub-committee recommends that its replacement committee have representatives from all three distribution divisions: the humanities, the social sciences, the sciences. While reluctant to expand the size of University committees, it might be worthwhile to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of adding additional members from these divisions to make sure that applications are reviewed by faculty competent in the humanities, social sciences, or natural sciences.

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Exploring the Natural World
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Jean Feerick, Michael Nichols, Katie Doud (excused), Chrystal Bruce (on leave)

Course Pairs Offered in Fall 2016

Environment (BL 137/EN 291)
Inquiry (CH 108/PH 108)
Origins (BL 135/PL 398)
Science & Innovation (EP 201/ER 201)

Course Pairs Offered in Spring 2017

Childhood (HS 260/PS 260)
Ideas & Health (ER 201/CH 171)
Language and Linguistics (BL 136/EN 299C)
Melancholy (BL 140A/EN 299F)

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 2017 meeting is writing.** 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

During the 2016-2018 academic year, sub-committee work occurred during the spring semester only, looking at student work sampled from all previously offered courses not already assessed by the subcommittee.

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s), Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard.

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?

The ENW subcommittee evaluated writing samples from Spring 16 (norming set, 5 each) and Fall 16 semesters (evaluation set, 7 each).

- We found that the percentages of not met decreased from Spring 16 to Fall 16 and the percentages of exceeded increased. The Spring 16 courses were the first one ever offered and were completely composed of 1st year students. The students in the Fall 16 courses had more college and writing experiences and the distribution of not met, met and exceeded was more in*

line with our expectations. It would appear that the more writing and college experience students have, the more their writing met the expectations for ENW courses.

- *There were significant differences in the evaluations of the subcommittee and the instructors, particularly in the categories of source integration and plagiarism and citation, where the committee evaluated the sample papers significantly lower than the instructors. This was due in part to the sample papers that came from one course pair (ER-PH).*
- *Qualitatively, in both the norming and evaluation sets of papers, we found that students performed best in the areas of selecting a topic (4B1a) and placing it in the context of the course (4B1b).*
- *The students had more difficulty in meeting expectations in the areas of writing mechanics (surface features), source integration, and plagiarism and citation. Most of the students in these courses were at most only 2nd year students at the time, so their writing is still developing, so issues in writing mechanics are to be expected. Many of the issues with source integration and citation resulted from a lack of consistency in citing material that is not common knowledge.*

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.

- *Perhaps the writing subcommittee / core committee could develop workshops to help instructors provide better support for writing mechanics, source integration and citation to improve their students' performance in these areas.*
- *Alternatively, instructors may need to devote more time for the development of writing, source integration, and citation skills in their courses – perhaps including samples illustrating common errors for students to correct.*
- *The subcommittee had a difficult time in evaluating writing signature assignments from two course pairs – ER/CH and ER/PH. The first pair of courses had a poster presentation as its signature assignment. We found that the amount of actual writing and citation to be too small to assess student performance relative to the writing outcomes. The second pair of courses had an extremely short “pitch” for a product/service as its writing signature assignment. There was not enough writing and NO citations included in these papers. We recommend that these types of assignments not be used for evaluating writing in the future. We do suggest both sets of courses create or use a more traditional research paper as the signature assignment. The research portion could simply be explaining the science behind the product/service as background material.*

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

We were very happy with the efficiency and effectiveness of evaluating 5 assignments for norming, followed by 7 assignments for evaluation. It allowed us to discover the issues with the rubrics and develop consistent standards among the subcommittee members for evaluating the work for assessments.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (The subcommittee should function efficiently and effectively.)

After 3.5 years, the process has developed into one that is efficient and effective, when the subcommittee receives the application materials. The evaluation form that is currently used to provide feedback is the right length and provides that efficiently. What needs improvement is the OnBase system to provide the application to the ENW subcommittee in a timely manner.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

- *In the survey of core processes, there were a number of comments on the difficulty of preparing and submitting applications. Many of these were valid, some were exaggerated, and some unreasonable. We recommend that the core committee fix the issues with OnBase application system and know those are in progress. The ENW director and subcommittee members have always been available to help faculty in developing courses and filling out applications. We suggest that the core committee director stress to faculty that the Directors and subcommittee members are available and willing to help faculty in any way possible. To the faculty who commented that the expectations were just too hard to develop these courses, the now retired ENW director asks whether they would accept that excuse from their students in their courses.*

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

- *Given the difficulty that we had evaluating student writing in poster and short "pitch" papers, we would suggest that the writing subcommittee / core committee establish expectations of the amount of writing that should be included in the signature assignment. 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 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.*
- *During the ENW subcommittee's norming process, we found a number of inconsistencies and inadequacies in the current writing rubrics. These are documented in our norming report, which is attached as an appendix, as are some suggestions for revising the rubrics.*

ENW Subcommittee Norming of Writing Assignments Report

Individual Norming of Initial Assignments. The ENW Subcommittee, Jean Feerick, Katie Doud and Mike Nichols, individually scored 5 identical writing assignments from Spring 2017 courses. We met to norm our values on Friday, March 17, 2017. Three pieces of student work were written papers and two were poster presentations. There was some disagreement on the scoring of 4 of the 5 criteria. These differences were discussed, and we decided on standards that we would use for 3 of the 4 in the next round of scoring, with the other being scored according to our own perspectives. This will be discussed below. We had difficulty in differentiating between the levels for the first two criteria (Articulate an Argument), and we will preview suggestions that we will be making during assessment week. Overall, only one EXCEEDED score was reported for all criteria and student work. We had a difficult time imagining what an exceptional piece of work would look like and also found it unlikely that second semester, first-year students taking these courses would produce such work.

Agreement, Comments and Changes to Standards for Criterion - Articulate an Argument: Selection and Development of Topic (4B1a). There was unanimous agreement on the scoring for each of the five examples of student work. However, we believe there are serious issues with this criterion. For each of the criteria that address articulating an argument, we find that it is difficult to identify the differences between the EXCEED, MET, and NOT MET levels. One of the issues in using these two criteria is that scientific papers usually do not make an “argument”. They present conclusions or discussions that are supported by evidence, usually experimentally obtained data and observations. Another issue is that all three levels within the criterion presume that the writer “articulates a clear argument,” limiting the point of difference between the levels to pertain only to how the argument is situated in relation to “context” or “course.” We found this a very fuzzy concept to assess and would like to see this criterion shifted toward how well the argument is being articulated (i.e., organization, logical sequencing, coherence, etc).

We agreed that we will evaluate this criterion based upon the student’s ability to construct an argument or, in the case of scientific papers, the student’s ability to develop a conclusion or discussion of results (and/or data) that is cogent, logical, etc. For example, do they state a conclusion at the beginning of the paper and then discuss the evidence that supports that conclusion in a logical and cogent way? One of the questions that was raised was which criterion would be used to assess the student’s ability to organize the topics of the paper. We agreed that this criterion would be used for organization.

We also found there were significant structural issues with the rubric for this criterion (4B1a and 4B1b). Some of our suggestions are given in an attachment.

Agreement, Comments and Changes to Standards for Criterion - Articulate an Argument: Context of and Purpose for Writing (4B1b). There were only small differences in scoring this criterion. We had significant difficulties in identifying the differences between the levels and between this criterion and the previous one, 4B1a. Our differences occurred in the poster presentations.

We decided that we would use this criterion to assess how well the student's command of the evidence (content material) was. For instance, are they using content that is correct, complete, and relevant to the argument and/or discussion of the topic? This could be summarized as "Responsible and Correct Use of Content" or "Command of Content".

Agreement, Comments and Changes to Standards for Criterion - Source Integration (4B2). Again, we had difficulty in distinguishing between the EXCEED, MET and NOT MET levels using the approved rubric. In particular, what is the difference between work that is "thoroughly integrated" and "integrated" with credible sources? We found this distinction rather fuzzy. In terms of our assessments of work, the largest differences were in evaluating the poster presentations. We attributed these differences to the structure and the reduction in actual writing in the poster presentations versus the written papers. In the posters there was not sufficient writing to show an adequate integration of sources for one member of the committee, while the other two judged this criterion after accounting for this limitation. The primary use of a poster presentation is as a tool in oral presentation, and we posited that it is possible for a student to show adequate source integration orally, when discussing the poster with the audience. We ultimately decided to use our own individual interpretation of the rubric criterion in assessing the next round of student work, and if posters are included, then significant differences in individual assessments can be attributed to the reduced writing provided in posters.

Agreement, Comments and Changes to Standards for Criterion - Document Ethically: Plagiarism and Citation (4B3). This criterion had the most variation in scoring. We discussed some of the weaknesses that we saw, particularly with the posters. In this case, the students did not provide citations within the text of the posters; they only provided a list of references at the end of the poster. There were two other errors in both the written papers and posters: (1) not including footnotes for figures and diagrams that clearly were copied from another source; and (2) footnote placement (e.g. beginning or end of the sentence). We decided to create a list of potential errors that includes:

- Failure to provide footnotes for figures and diagrams that are clearly copied from other sources
- Not providing footnotes for textual material that is not common knowledge or appears to be specialized knowledge
- Placing the footnote in textual material where it doesn't clearly indicate the source of the information.

We also decided to evaluate this criteria as NOT MET if students did not reference figures or textual material at all. For those cases where some references are omitted and/or the reference placement doesn't clearly indicate the source, we agreed on the following standard: Exceed would be 0 errors; MET would be 1-2 errors; and 3 or more errors will result in a NOT MET.

Agreement, Comments and Changes to Standards for Criterion - Control Surface Features: Syntax and Mechanics (4B4). There was moderate disagreement in the scoring of student work to assess this criterion and broke along disciplinary lines. After discussing some of the specific student errors in the examples, we decided to evaluate this criterion based upon

the number of errors found in each paper. The errors that we observed included: (1) spelling; (2) mismatches between singular and plural forms within a sentence; (3) omission of necessary commas; (4) formatting errors such as not subscripting numbers in chemical formulas; (4) use of the wrong word (e.g. too-two, poor-pour); (5) fragments and run on errors; and (6) if ...then errors. We decided that 1-2 errors would be assessed as EXCEEDED, 3-7 errors as MET, and 8 or more as NOT MET.

Second Norming Data Set. Our discussions about the first norming set of papers was extensive, included examining portions where there was disagreement, and development of quantitative measures for several criteria. We did not have time to score a paper from the second norming data set.

Overall Comments on the Differences Between Written Papers and Poster Presentations. We found that the amount of writing on the poster presentations was insufficient for a full assessment of the students' writing skills. Specifically, we found that the poster format doesn't allow for a full integration of source materials. This was particularly the case when students failed to include references within the textual material. It is likely that in the spring assessment at the end of this semester, the ENW subcommittee will recommend that poster presentations not be used as signature writing assignments and that a written paper be required. This could easily be a written paper used to develop the poster.

ENW Subcommittee Comments on Rubric Criteria. We have outlined several of our difficulties and concerns with the current writing rubrics for integrated courses in the previous narrative. We have attached some concerns that we have, particularly for criteria 4B1a and 4B1b and outlined how we modified and will use those criteria to evaluate the next set of student work. We anticipate not only analyzing those results in the spring assessment meeting, but also making further recommendations to the Written Expression Subcommittee for modifications to these rubric criteria.

Writing in the Integrated Courses (EGC, EHE, ENW) - APPROVED

	Exceeded (5)	Met (3)	Not Met (1)
Articulate an Argument: Selection and Development of Topic 4B1a	The writer selects a complex topic <i>and articulates a clear argument</i> given audience, purpose, and length requirements and effectively situates the topic in the context of the field.	The writer selects a complex topic <i>and articulates a clear argument</i> given audience, purpose, and length requirements and begins to properly situate the topic in relation to the content of the course.	The writer selects a complex topic and articulates a clear argument given audience, purpose, and length requirements but may not situate the topic in a larger context.
Articulate an Argument: Context of and Purpose for Writing 4B1b	The writer thoroughly develops and supports an argument appropriate to context, audience, and purpose	The writer develops and supports an argument appropriate to context, audience, and purpose.	The writer attempts to develop and support an argument appropriate to context, audience, and purpose.
Source Integration 4B2	The writer engages with and thoroughly integrates credible and reliable sources.	The writer engages with and integrates credible and relevant sources appropriate to the content of the course.	The writer integrates evidence into his/her own argument.
Document Ethically: Plagiarism and Citation 4B3	The writer avoids plagiarism and documents sources consistently , also demonstrating concern for ethical representation of other scholars' work.	The writer avoids plagiarism and documents sources consistently using a citation style appropriate to the course with few formatting errors.	The writer avoids plagiarism, and all important citation information is present , though documentation may contain formatting errors.
Control Surface Features: Syntax and Mechanics 4B4	The writer uses language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency , and is virtually error-free.	The writer uses straightforward language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity , with few errors.	The writer uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity , though writing may include some errors.

assumes only a complex topic & clear argument is developed.

Pink - MAN Edits

- Context is in both #1 & #2
- development is in both #1 and #2
- What does engage with credible sources mean ...
- Where does paper organization go?
- Where does accuracy of information go?

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Issues in Social Justice
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Dr. Gloria Vaquera, Dr. Anne McGinness

Courses Offered in Fall 2016

CO	321	Minorities, Stereotypes, and the Media
ED	253	School and Society (2 sections)
ED	350	Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society
EN	299E	Special Topics: Dreamworlds from Plato to Present
ER	120	Poverty and Social Entrepreneurship
ER	304	Social Entrepreneurship
HS	211	History of the U.S. to 1877 (2 sections)
HS	218	Saints and Scoundrels: Jesuits from the Renaissance
HS	235	African American History
HS	236	Native American History
HS	285	African History Through (Auto)Biography
HS	297A	Special Topics: Corruption, Scandal and the Christian Call to Change in Latin America
HS	297B	Special Topics: Women in the Contemporary World
HS	310	Women in Europe from 1500
HS	336	The Holocaust (2 sections)
IC	109	Global Community and Social Justice
IC	163	Women in Italian Society Through Literature and Film
PO	103	International Relations (3 sections)
PO	295	Special Topics: Wrongful Convictions
PO	298	Special Topics: Issues in Social Justice
PS	342	Psychology of Prejudice
SC	255	Prejudice and Discrimination
SC	273	Public Health and U.S. Society
SC	385	Poverty, Welfare, and Social Justice in the United States
WG	101	Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies (2 sections)
WG	299A	Special Topics: Gender and Violence, Local and Global

Courses Offered in Spring 2017

CL	330	Barbarians: Constructing the Self and the Other in the Ancient World
ED	253	School and Society
ED	350	Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society (2 sections)
EN	299E	Special Topics: Poverty in American Literature
ER	120	Poverty and Social Entrepreneurship
ER	304	Social Entrepreneurship
HS	297A	Contested Seas: Exploration and Resistance in the Carribean Basin
HS	220	Revolutionary Europe
HS	227	Twentieth-Century Global History
HS	237	History of Medicine in America
HS	275	Latin American Military Dictatorships
HS	307	History of the Popes
HS	395	Special Topics: Abraham Lincoln
PO	103	International Relations (3 sections)

continued

PO	298	Special Topics: Issues in Social Justice
PO	295	Special Topics: Politics of Blackness
PS	100	Introduction to Psychology: Perspectives in Social Justice (5 sections)
PS	395	Special Topics: Psychology of Genocide and Mass Killings
SC	111	Introduction to Social Justice
SC	380	Environmental Justice and Human Rights
TRS	369C	Social Justice and the Economy: Morals and Money
WG	101	Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies

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 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

During the 2016-2017 academic year, sub-committee work occurred during the spring semester only, looking at student work sampled from all previously offered courses not already assessed by the subcommittee.

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s), Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard.

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?

Based on the courses we reviewed it appears that the vast majority of the ISJ courses are meeting the learning goals. Refinement of the learning goals, we think, are helping instructors to create more directed and specific assignments that are able to address the stated learning goals. Looking at the assessment data, approximately 10% of the students failed to meet one or more of the ISJ goals. Examining the data further, committee reviewers evaluated more of the goals as having “been met” with fewer papers being evaluated as “exceeding.” Faculty members’ own evaluation of papers had a higher percentage of “exceeding.” In examining paper guidelines or essay prompts, students were not directed (for the most part) to demonstrate information that would qualify the paper to “exceed” expectations in each of the learning goals. The guidelines did, however, prompt most students to “meet” the goals. Additionally, many times the page length of papers made it difficult for students to *exceed* when you only have 4 to 6 pages to respond.

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.

The committee discussed their own experience teaching ISJ courses and compared it with survey comments from other instructors. In examining assessment for the ISJ, the committee recommends that all instructors review the learning goals and the rubric when creating assignment prompts or directions. If the goal is to have more students, “exceed” in meeting the goals then the paper prompts

or assignment instruction should be explicit in the desired outcome. For instance, in one course students were instructed to describe a circumstance of injustice instead of being asked to “**fully and clearly** describe the instance of injustice to demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the historical/structural conditions” in which it arose.

For all instructors, reviewing the learning goals and the rubric as assignments are created is a good idea. Taking the time to review expectations before the semester or before the assignment is handed out will, hopefully, mean that what students produce will be more focused on the goals. At the end of each semester, it is also good practice to reflect on how the assignments used for assessment are working. If students are not meeting the goals, then the instructor should consider revising the paper prompt or course activities in order to meet the goals.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

Our committee was provided a subsample of papers to review. The reviewers scored these documents separately and then met in person to discuss and norm the scoring. At the norming meeting, the reviewers compared scores given to the sample papers and discussed any scores that differed. After discussing discrepancies, the committee came to an agreement on each of the papers. Discrepancies largely occurred with defining papers that “met” versus papers that “exceeded.” Time was spent discussing the rubric criteria and we came to an agreement on what the language meant. After this discussion we evaluated three more papers, using our new understanding of the rubric, and found the scores on these papers to be more similar. Having gone through evaluating, comparing, and discussing these papers we felt confident that the rubric was sufficiently normed. Our committee of two, then agreed to review 64 papers, 32 each. Independently, we reviewed these papers and assigned scores on each of the learning goals.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your sub-committee’s evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (The subcommittee should function efficiently and effectively.)

This past year, transitioning new members onto the committee and also moving from using Canvas to the new Onbase system was a real challenge. Generally, the committee was notified of an ISJ proposed course and the committee chair would alert the subcommittee members that a course had been submitted. Subcommittee members were sometimes able to review the documents and other times requested assistance to access proposals. There were several times in the semester when courses that had been submitted were overlooked or missed by the committee. In the beginning of the semester there were also many courses that came in at the same time, so the committee took several weeks to respond. The delay in response time is due in large part to having an inexperienced chair that was learning the process while also having to review a large number of courses.

Recommendations

In this coming academic year, the chair is now more experienced and more comfortable with OnBase. However, there are still some technical issues to overcome. In the fall semester, the committee would like to meet and “walk through” an OnBase application so that the committee members are confident in their use of the technology. Also, the committee will discuss the process for submitting comments back to the chair about each application. The OnBase system does not allow subcommittee members to converse with other subcommittee members about issues with applications. All of this has to be done via email or through Word documents.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

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.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

Committee members, which participated in assessment of a sample of ISJ papers for particular courses, commented that reviewing 32 papers in the middle of a current academic semester was very taxing. Perhaps moving assessment to the end of the spring semester and doing this annually would be a better idea. Also having more volunteers to be readers for the assessment would be helpful and more than 1% of ISJ courses would be reviewed. While we understand that budgets are tight, it would be nice to offer a small stipend to recruit reviewers. Just like we pay faculty to participate in summer advising, perhaps we could offer a paid workshop day to review papers.

General Information

Core Category Discussed:	Creative and Performing Arts
Current Semester:	Spring 2017
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 16, 2017

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Keith Nagy; Leslie Curtis

Courses Offered in Fall 2016

CL	250	Classical Drama in English
CO	140	Journalism Practicum
CO	150	Radio Practicum
CO	170	Theatre Practicum
CO	185	Improvisation (3 sections)
CO	190	Basic Photography for the Digital Age (3 sections)
CO	215	Fundamentals of Media Performance
CO	280	Introduction to Theatre
CO	285	Acting for the Stage
EN	301	Introduction to Poetry Writing Workshop
EN	302	Introduction to Fiction Writing Workshop
EN	303	Introduction to Creative Writing Workshop
ER	110	Creative Problem Solving (3 sections)
FA	105A	Modern Dance
FA	105B	Social/Ballroom Dance
FA	109D	University Schola Cantorum
FA	109E	University Chapel Ensemble (2 sections)
FA	110B	JCU Jazz Band
FA	110C	JCU Wind Ensemble (2 sections)
FA	110D	String Ensemble (2 sections)
FA	112A	Beginning Classroom Guitar (3 sections)
FA	112B	Intermediate Classroom Guitar
FA	115	Class Voice (2 sections)
IC	122B	Japanese Calligraphy
IC	122C	Japanese Ikebana
TRS	299B	Special Topics: Theology in Music

Courses Offered in Spring 2017

CL	250	Classical Drama in English
CO	140	Journalism Practicum
CO	150	Radio Practicum
CO	170	Theatre Practicum
CO	185	Improvisation
CO	190	Basic Photography for the Digital Age (3 sections)
CO	215	Fundamentals of Media Performance
CO	280	Introduction to Theatre
CO	285	Acting for the Stage
CO	320	Audio Production
EN	299D	Special Topics: Performing Shakespeare
EN	301	Introduction to Poetry Writing Workshop
EN	302	Introduction to Fiction Writing Workshop
ER	110	Creative Problem Solving (2 sections)
FA	115	Class Voice (2 sections)
FA	105A	Modern Dance
FA	105B	Social/Ballroom Dance
FA	109D	University Schola Cantorum (2 sections)

continued

FA	109E	University Chapel Ensemble (2 sections)
FA	110B	JCU Jazz Band (2 sections)
FA	110C	JCU Wind Ensemble (2 sections)
FA	110D	String Ensemble (2 sections)
FA	112A	Beginning Classroom Guitar (3 sections)
FA	112B	Intermediate Classroom Guitar
IC	122B	Japanese Calligraphy
IC	122C	Japanese Ikebana
TRS	299B	Theology in Music

Typical Assessment Process

Because the learning goals for this category focus on engagement in the creative process, faculty members teaching a CAPA course are asked to evaluate each student against the learning goals, drawing on their entire experience in the course. This evaluation is submitted using a Rating Form. Where relevant, faculty members may select assignments that address learning 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. **The focus for the 2017 meeting is critical/aesthetic.** 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

None

Attachments Containing Assessment Data and Instructor Feedback

Rubric(s) and Rating Form, Assessment Feedback, Operations Feedback, instructor and subcommittee data is available in the Core Assessment dashboard.

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?

There are many creative ways to get students engaged in using their minds and bodies to express creative and innovative expression. From the data samplings of the assessment form to observing classroom exercises, this has been a giant leap in the new integrative curriculum for JCU and its students to celebrate a much more rounded liberal studies education. Since this is only a year old, it was tough to see a thorough overview of what is being accomplished in achieving the learning outcomes. The outcome we were asked to focus on today was creative expression. The visual samples we observed from FA 105B (social and ballroom dance) and CO 185 showed that for the first year expectations were being met and welcomed by both the committee and the students. The only drawback is that there was not more evidence that could be viewed today.

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.

The sheets were helpful in getting instructor feedback on how they are perceiving the student learning according to the university outcomes voted by the committee and the faculty. The visual DVD's and YouTube files are just scratching the surface of evidence needed to assess. Those who have a creative and not performing component are going to need to be collecting and sharing with the committee more evidence of the signature assignments that satisfy the requirements for CAPA designation.

Evaluation of Processes

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

Not only have we observed the applications and the evaluation sheets provided to us today, we looked at samples of two classes of exercises showing students being creative within the bounds of a particular assignment. We saw students participating in dance and performance assignments in which they were asked to conjure up their creative juices and participate in exercises that also required critical thinking and ethical judgements that fit the criteria of the assignment. We saw that Carroll Students were indeed thinking and being creative and having fun while participating!

Here is the feedback from the committee of the samplings we observed:

FA 105(B)-Social and Ballroom Dancing-Saw two exercises in waltz combinations and one exercise in meringue dance where the students were to interpret and create different combinations and variations based on the basic steps and style while dancing with a partner. This was obviously a basic class. While a majority seemed to understand the basic style and steps, we saw little variation as they seemed to lack the confidence to show variations and more creative movement. It was refreshing to see our students move and observe them being challenged to do more.

CO 185-Improvisation- We observed exercises in which they were confronted with real life situations that could be used for their future. They were challenged with using prior information about themselves and their fellow classmates (analyzing your audience) to create real life situations- in this case a toast at a reception. The assignment also required them to react to unexpected prompts and curves thrown at them. The students were aptly taking these prompts and using them to create some humorous and sometimes too real situations that could happen! We also observed their final assignment in which they were being interviewed with their real resumes for their "ideal" job in the future. Again, curves and prompts were given to them by the facilitator to see if they could reasonably handle/ justify why they were the best applicant for their "dream" job. It was refreshing to see most were handling themselves in a professional way make good choices (within the confines of the exercise) that could be considered reasonable.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.

More evidence in the coming semesters of the signature assignments needed to properly assess.

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/evaluations and these recommendations.