Final Report, College-Wide Assessment Committee

Academic Year 2017-2018

Date of Wrap-Up Meeting: April 27, 2018

**Members Present**: Michelle Abreu, Chad Atkinson, Debbie Atkinson, Janeil Bernheisel, Nadine Cichy, Michelle Cox, Jared Cutler, Jennifer Day, Greg Dudash, Angela Fernandez, Emily Garber, Cari Gigliotti, Shaun Huang, Bill Kamil, Larraine Kapka, Matt Massie, Heidi McGrew, Jessica McKinley, Reece Newman, Derek Petrey, Jennifer Romero, Anne Soltysiak, David Stott, Scott Yancy

**Members Absent**: Kara Brown, Pam Chambers, Dona Fletcher, Michelle Kinzeler, Candace Moody, Jackie Myers, John Porter, James Sosebee

**Agenda Items**:

1. **Curriculum and Assessment Track** – The track will run May 9th -11th from 12-4 pm. After targeted emails sent to programs facing review next spring, enrollment is robust.
2. **Welcome to Matt Massie** – Matt has agreed to join the Assessment Coordinator’s Team to represent the Staff side of the college. The plan is to work together to address assessment of Co-Curricular offerings as suggested by HLC.
3. **Offering for Fall Faculty Professional Development Day** – The committee would like to have several offerings. Michelle Cox mentioned she has heard from faculty in HS that they would like less “Philosophy”/ theory and more practical, how-to workshops. Heidi McGrew is on the FFPD day team and will remind us of the deadline for submissions. Derek Petrey presented a template to be used when creating new “Profiles in Assessment” Thumbnails on the CTL website. Profiles will enable faculty and staff to highlight assessment projects and will be similar to the “Profiles in Service Learning” thumbnails already on the site.
4. **Action Item Team Reports** – See Attached.
5. **Suggestions for Action Items** – Anne Soltysiak suggested the committee address concerns of offsite CCP faculty using the Gen. Ed. rubrics. It was decided CCP concerns are larger than just the rubrics at present and are therefore not yet the purview of this committee. Michelle Cox suggested finding a way to deliver a shortened version of the track to be delivered at department meetings. The coordinators facilitating the track May9-11th will look into ways of meaningfully condensing the sessions for use as workshops in the fall.
6. Adjourn

Submitted by Chuck Freeland, Chair

**Team Reports**

Team One: Team Leader (Michelle Abreu) Annual Report AY 17-18

**Team Focus/Goals 2017-18**

* 1. Team One of the Assessment Committee worked closely over the summer with members of the Sociology, Geography, and Social Work department to completely re-work the Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship outcomes and rubric in an effort to make them more manageable and more consistent with what is being done in the field and at other comparable institutions. This work arose out of last year’s piloting of the rubric and a call by those who ran the pilot for improvements and updates.
  2. Team One will oversee an expansion of the pilot this academic year to the departments of Psychology, Humanities, and Art with the intent to assess as many students as possible with the new CDGC rubric and to bring the new outcomes to the Curriculum Committee and, eventually, Instructional Council for discussion and approval.

Team’s Leader: Michelle Abreu

Team Members: Deborah Atkinson, Angela Fernandez, Jamie Fries, Bill Kamil, Michelle Kinzeler, Anne Soltysiak, and Davis Stott

**Actions for #1:**

* Held four meetings and have an additional meeting scheduled for Wednesday, May 16, 2018, to review the pilot data from spring 2018.
* A workshop “CD&GC General Education Objective and Rubric Rewrite” was submitted and approved by the CTL to run on Wednesday, May 17, 2017, from 8:30 am – 2:30 pm. Sociology, Geography, and Social Work department this summer to revamp the CD&GC rubric for final approval by the Curriculum Committee and Instructional Council fall 2017.
  + During this session, the team rewrote the current CD&GC Objectives and revised the CD&GC rubric, and planned for next steps to present to Instruction Council and the Curriculum Committee during their first 2017 fall meeting. After this meeting several faculty continued to work on the rubric to fine tune the content and ensure that the content could meet the objectives.
  + Several courses were selected to run the new CD&GC General Education objectives rubric pilot for fall 2017 and spring 2018.

**Actions for #2:**

* Rubric was approved by both the Curriculum Committee and Instructional Council fall 2017
* Reviewed courses identified in each of the 4 areas and discussed the best course of action in meeting with the Chairs and instructors tasked with the pilot assessment work.
* Oversaw the continuation and expansion of the CD&GC rubric pilot in four courses:
  + - 1 Sociology (SOC 1101) - Pilot ran in the spring. Michelle meet with Dona Fletcher and her team 12/01/17 from (3:15 pm – 4:00pm).
    - 2 Psychology – Run pilot in the fall (PSY 2180 and PSY 2225) UPDATE Anne met with Jennifer and we will review rubric data during the spring semester to run in PSY 1100.
    - 2 each in Humanities and Arts – Ran pilot in the fall online HUM1125. Jamie & Michelle met and we will review rubric data during the spring semester. Art – run a spring pilot Chuck Freeland met with Kelly Joslin 11/15/17 and after much review the section did not run due to low enrollment.
* Monitored CD&GC pilots occurring in all four areas to determine the best route for scaling up/out. With the goal to get the rubric approved for use in high enrollment courses.
* CD&GC Pilot Rubric Results Review of HUM 1125 (Online sections) fall 2017 on 2/15/18
  + The rubric results were reviewed and the passing levels identified include both Competent and Proficient sections.
  + HUM 1125 (online) assesses a single end of semester course project. The rubric was linked to the gradebook but not used for grading just for tracking assessment data.
  + Jamie used the rubric as it was in the Gen. Ed. Rubric Repository. She will be making adjustments to the criterion (center portion of the rubric) to better meet her assignment needs for future course assessment gathering.
  + It took her about 1 hour per section to initially fill out the rubrics for each student for 4 sections. However, moving forward she believes that she can get the time down to 30 minutes per section.
  + The students can pass the course without completing the assignment because it worth about 10% of the final grade.
  + The N/A section (noting 16 students) of this rubric was used to identify the students that did not complete the assignment. All but 2-3 out of approx. 120 students forgot to complete the assignment but passed the course. It is believed that the other 13-14 students dropped the course or quit attending and did not pass the class.
  + Students could have also done excellent on the assignment but not passed the class.
* Other Pilots being Run Spring 2018:UPDATE on Culture and Diversity (CD) and Global Citizenship (GC).
  + HUM 1125 (Online): 6 Sections (A-Term: Jamie and Amanda): Jamie reported via email the pilot is going well.
  + PSY 1100: 5 Sections (Face-to-Face) with 4 faculty: Anne reported no update going well.
  + SOC 1101: 5 Sections (Face-to-Face): Dona Fletcher reported going well.
* Pilots that did not run Spring 2018
* PSY 2180 and 2225
* ART: Low enrollment course: Did not run
* UPDATE on Fall 2018 Courses to Pilot
  + HUM 1125 (Face-to-Face): Usually run 12 -15 sections per semester however, there is not standard curriculum per section. Bill and Jamie will work with 5 (face-to-face) faculty members on ideas for assignments to assess CD&GC within their course. They will be encouraged to place the rubric into their face-to-face course for piloting.
  + PSY 1100 (All sections): Adjuncts met in January for a training on eLearn and the CD&GC Rubric to be placed in the course. There will be another training session this summer and we are hopeful that the rubric will be gathering data in all sections.
    - The rubric is written however, the criterion has been changed to match the assignment being assessed. The rubric will be assessed within three assignments:
      * 1st Assignment = Criteria #1
      * 2nd Assignment = Criteria #2 & 3
      * 3rd Assignment = Criteria #4
    - The standard assessments are used and must be completed in order for the student to pass the class.
    - The rubrics are placed in the gradebook to gather assessment data but do not grade the assignment.
  + SOC 1101 (All sections)
* Other Business
  + How should the N/A column of the rubric to be used?
    - If a student does not complete the assignment a rubric should not be filled out for that student. If it is a graded rubric a zero will just need placed in the gradebook. The only time the N/A column should be used is if the assignment does not meet the criteria and the criteria will be assessed in another assignment.
  + If the student completes the assignment and is assessed but does not pass the course should this be noted?
    - No
  + If the student does not complete the assignment but passes the class should this be noted? (See additional info below)
    - No
  + If the course does not focus on the CD&GC outcome should the course be placed on the list for courses that will assess this Gen. Ed.?
    - No
  + If the course is placed on the list to meet the Gen. Ed. outcome of CD&GC can the student pass the course without completing the assignment/assignments used to assess the outcome?
    - No
      * If the course is listed as a gen. ed. course that assesses the CD&GC assessment outcome then the assignment must be worth enough points that the student cannot pass the course without completing the assignment or it has to be a statement in the syllabus that all assignments must be completed within the course shell to pass the course.
      * Concerns came up regarding the following points discussed 02/15/18:
    - If the course does not focus on the CD&GC outcome should the course be placed on the list for courses that will assess this Gen. Ed.?
      * No
    - If the course is placed on the list to meet the Gen. Ed. outcome of CD&GC can the student pass the course without completing the assignment/assignments used to assess the outcome?
      * No
        + If the course is listed as a gen. ed. course that assesses the CD&GC assessment outcome then the assignment must be worth enough points that the student cannot pass the course without completing the assignment or it has to be a statement in the syllabus that all assignments must be completed or attempted within the course shell to pass the course.
  + Anne reported that she discussed with some of the psych faculty the requirements for incorporating GenEd assessments into their courses. “There were some questions about the requirements to fail a student who didn’t complete the relevant CDGC assignments, and the extent to which a course must be “focused” on the particular GenEd assessment for it to count as a GenEd course. Also, there were 4 bulleted points on our last meeting agenda related to the performance of students on the GenEd assignments, and whether they should pass the course being dependent on those particular assignments and I wonder if you could tell me where those decisions came from?”
  + My current response: The initial bulleted items were decided by the main assessment committee. However, this was discussed in further detail 4/13/18, because of the many concerns with requiring students or putting something in the syllabus that states they fail if they don’t complete certain assignments. So it was decided that we are going to discuss the situation further after we look at the psychology, sociology, and HUM pilot data results during the week of May 14th. The committee wants to get a better understanding of how many students we would be talking about that didn’t complete a section or an assignment link to the CDGC rubric.

We are also asking questions about what is an appropriate sample size because we realize that we’re not going to gather data from every student. After we review the data, it is still yet to be determined on how we’re going to create the list of courses that meet the GEN Ed outcome. But, what I do want to reiterate again is that if the department doesn’t feel that they can pick up the majority of their students with this outcome it is OK not to list the course as meeting the requirement.

**Team Focus for Next Year:**

* Create a process to identify and approve general education and/or program/department courses that will meet the CD&GC outcomes. Identified courses will be required to provide evidence/artifacts, and assessment data to demonstrate mastery of this outcome in order to be approved.
* Release the updated objectives and rubric to all Sinclair faculty through the repository with a list of the general education courses that meet the outcome and work with programs/departments who do not have a general education course that meets the outcome.

**Resources Needed:**

* Several of the following questions remain:
  + - * What will be our process to review courses that may meet the CD&GC outcomes? (Course syllabus, project rubrics, etc.)
      * Can we explore how many Sinclair students take the pilot courses to meet the outcome?
      * How will we train faculty on the use of the final CD&GC rubric in courses that we identify which could meet the outcome?

Q&A tool for use?

CTL Workshops?

Team Two: Team Leader (Larraine Kapka) Annual Report AY 17-18

Charge: Team One – Oversee continuing pilots for written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and computer literacy. Identify specific strategies to expand and / or evaluate effectiveness of critical thinking and computer literacy pilots.

* Completed Computer Literacy pilots. Final module has been deployed to the following courses:
  + MET 1131 – all sections for summer 2018
  + ALH 1100 – all sections for summer 2018
  + BIS 1120 – CBE sections for summer 2018, remaining sections for fall 2018.
  + A module is available to programs not using one of the three listed courses in the eLearn Gen Ed Rubric Community. This consists of:
    - Computer Ethics PowerPoint lesson.
    - Computer Ethics quiz with question bank. Quiz is 10 questions and the test bank has over 30 questions.
    - A rubric is customizable by the program for the required computer software in the program and either the ethics quiz provided or an alternate ethics assessment.
    - Instructions for incorporating the lesson, quiz and rubric into a course.
* Written and Oral Communication pilots are complete, and written and oral communication general education assessment is now being done in all sections of English 1101 (written) and Oral Communication (COM 2206 and 2211).
* Critical Thinking pilot in mathematics was assessed and a new critical thinking rubric developed. The new rubric was piloted this spring in a computer programming class, a psychology class and a chemistry class. Results will be evaluated this summer and the modified rubric will be presented for review next fall.
* This team expects to continue working on the critical thinking rubric next year and would be willing to work on deployment of information literacy to more general education courses.

Team Three: Team Leader (Jackie Myers) Annual Report AY 17-18

**Action Item 3:**

1. Communicate with chairs and program coordinators to identify additional courses that can actually meet the Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship General Education Outcome using the new rubric. Create a comprehensive list.

Team’s Leader: Jackie Myers

Team Members: Janeil Bernheisel, Pam Chambers, Dona Fletcher, Emily Garber

**Actions completed:**

* Held initial meeting in FA17 to discuss our action item.
  + Question arose as to if we were soliciting OTM General Education courses. Discussion with Assessment Committee team was no, only solicit the programs who designated a program course (instead of a TAG or OTM course) to fulfill this General Education Outcome.
* Janeil Bernheisel prepared a list of all the programs that had included the course used to assess Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship in the 16-17 Annual Update and prepared a draft of the email to be sent to chairpersons/program coordinators regarding using the new Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship rubric to determine if the course chosen would meet all the outcomes.
* Email with the new rubric was sent January 29, 2018 requesting response by March 1, 2018
* Responses received were assimilated in an Excel spreadsheet and forwarded to the subcommittee members.
* Final Excel spreadsheet was completed with a compiled list of the courses that do meet the Cultural Diversity and Global Citizenship General Education Outcome rubric.

**Resources Needed:**

* None