The purpose of this breakout session is to share insights gained from the KU Core assessment thus far.

- Ted Peltier (Civil Engineering)
  - Course review was assumed with implementation of the Core, but a particular method was never specified
    - Purpose: determine whether or not courses meet goals and how they can improve
    - Review emphasizes whether or not students are meeting Core objectives
    - Review proceeds goal by goal
    - Need flexible system to cover range of courses
  - Conducted pilot last year, Goal 1 this year
    - Approx. 90 courses, review still ongoing
      - Half submitted a report and were approved
      - ¼ were asked to revise their reports
      - ¼ didn’t supply adequate information
        - Committee is taking a second look at 2nd and 3rd group

- Jeff Hall (COMS)
  - Questions about appropriate sampling procedures and assessment rubrics
    - Bigger classes need organized systems—can’t look at each student
    - Your materials, evaluation methods, and evidence need to line up
    - Grades aren’t enough to assess Core goals
    - English dept. as a model (portfolio assessment of randomly selected students)

- John Broholm (Journalism)
  - Some programs have a clear idea of what they want to do for assessment, others don’t
  - Trying to look long-term—how to improve for future
• Looking for more models, programs that can show how they’re using assessment results for course or program redesign
  • Chris Fisher, Physics
    o Importance of long-term sustainability; goal is to minimize problems early on
    o Because they weren’t given clear structure, they had to “make it up as they went along”
      ▪ Need feedback from faculty and other stakeholders
  • Discussion (session 1)
    o Hard to get data about learning outcomes, what students retain for future classes
      ▪ Student-level data isn’t tied to individuals, beyond scope of UCCC
      ▪ Individual departments can do that if they want, but it’s hard with non-major students
    o Experience-based classes (alternative breaks, internships) will be assessed in 2 years (Goal 4.2 gets its own year)
      ▪ Will likely rely on some formal measure (like a self-reflective essay) before and after
      ▪ Many of these classes already have department-level assessments
        ▪ Journalism requires an evaluation from the internship supervisor
    o Distributed draft of form of Goal 3 assessment (next year)
      ▪ Lots of courses in this goal
      ▪ Completion of the course meets Goal 3
      ▪ Assessment will be primarily recertification (expedited review)
      ▪ May request syllabus to make sure the course matches
      ▪ Gives instructors the ability to self-assess and improve
    o What do you want faculty to remember about assessment?
      ▪ Collect data, plan ahead, and educate others about assessment
        ▪ September deadline for materials—need to collect it ahead of time
          ▪ Will begin notifying instructors the year before
        ▪ Blackboard is helpful to collect and pull data
      ▪ Need to reframe how we think about and discuss assessment
        ▪ It’s not what we’re teaching; it’s what they’re learning
• Goal is to benefit students
  ▪ Ideal: continuous, self-sustaining assessment
    o The committee will use the feedback and provide more resources
• Discussion (session 2)
  o Assessment rubrics are useful—departments can originate their methods to the extent they want to
  o What to do with new courses that don’t have syllabi yet
    ▪ Depends on the goal—hard with 1 and 2
    ▪ UCCC needs as much info as possible—a general plan, course, goals, or proposed assessment system
  o Writing Center fellows are valuable resources—they worked with 20 approved courses last year (shows focus on student writing)
  o Courses that were initially fast-tracked will go through the same recertification process
  o Assessment models
    ▪ Almost all done on individual courses
    ▪ How to get nuanced assessment with large courses, lots of data
      • Be convincing—random sampling, find some common feature among classes to assess
      • Justify what you do, do something that’s useful to you
      • Ying is helpful with random sampling—be clear about your time and resource limitations when talking to her
  o Make it clear that the assessment doesn’t impact assessment of the instructor
  o 4.1 assessment begins in Fall 2017, 4.2 the following year
  o One course likely won’t meet all the subgoals
  o Cross-listed courses only need to be assessed by the department supplying the instructor
  o Info about next year will be available in April