

**KU Core Assessment Breakout Session Notes**  
**Student Learning Symposium, 4 March 2016**

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 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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
  - Importance of long-term sustainability; goal is to minimize problems early on
  - 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)
  - 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
  - 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
  - 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
  - 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
    - The committee will use the feedback and provide more resources
- Discussion (session 2)
  - Assessment rubrics are useful—departments can originate their methods to the extent they want to
  - 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
  - Writing Center fellows are valuable resources—they worked with 20 approved courses last year (shows focus on student writing)
  - Courses that were initially fast-tracked will go through the same recertification process
  - 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
  - Make it clear that the assessment doesn't impact assessment of the instructor
  - 4.1 assessment begins in Fall 2017, 4.2 the following year
  - One course likely won't meet all the subgoals
  - Cross-listed courses only need to be assessed by the department supplying the instructor
  - Info about next year will be available in April