

<p>ISJ recommends perhaps adding some reflection questions tied to rubric items.</p>	<p>While this could be valuable for instructors, it moves from direct assessment (a student demonstrates that they have achieved an outcome) to indirect assessment (a student tells whether or not they have achieved an outcome).</p>
<p>ISJ recommends discouraging timed exams as environment for assessment.</p>	<p>The Core Committee concurs. T. Bruce will add a note to the assessment communications.</p>

Changes to Rubrics and Learning Goals

We need to find a balance between too few and too many papers to assess. What are our standards for statistically valid samples?

We are not conducting research. For assessment, we need only so much rigor as is required to have confidence in the outcomes. For example, if we are seriously considering removing integration from carefully to ensure we have enough confidence in the results to make that sort of a change. If our likely outcome is faculty development workshops and adjustments to wording in rubrics and learning goals, then less rigor is required.

Additional Core Committee Actions

Prompt: Please use this space to discuss any further actions the Core Committee intends to take based on 1) the data contained in the sub-committee reports, 2) the sub-committee meetings themselves, or 3) this meeting.

Meta-assessment da

Changes to the CAPA Assessment Plan

All students in CAPA courses are asked four reflective questions as part of their course evaluations. The working group found that responses to one of the questions were not useful in evaluating student goals.

The current questions are

1. Having engaged in this creative process, what did you learn about yourself this semester when faced with this new endeavor?
2. How else has your understanding of this creative process expanded as the result of your

General Information

Core Categories Discussed:	Issues in Social Justice
Current Semester:	Spring 2022
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 17, 2022

Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of 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. Annually, a small group of instructors assesses a sample of student work from the previous year focusing on work connected to the specific learning goal(s) listed in the core assessment schedule. **This year the focus is the Diversity outcome.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and -produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Kenneth Sean Chaplin, Kris Ehrhardt, Michele Stopera Freyhauf, Tracy Masterson, Sara Schiavoni, Jen Ziemke

Findings

Prompt: Describe, in words, what your group 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?

Perhaps we are cruel meanies, but we ranked a large number (45.6%) of papers as 1 (did not meet). We did not think the work itself was bad, but many examples did not address the issues

not fulfill this criteria, but that the prompt was not explicitly asked, perhaps because of the sensitivity of the topic?

While we were tasked with evaluating *one* component (5A) of the larger rubric, when looking at the entire rubric, we collectively concluded that any single assignment given for the ISJ course would be hard-pressed to meet all or even most of the criteria.

These findings lead directly to our suggestions for instructors outlined below.

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 Core 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.

Our biggest suggestion is for instructors to create writing prompts that direct students to discuss the ISJ learning goals more clearly. In many cases, we found ourselves giving 1s to student work because they did not meet the requirements of 5A, yet the essay prompts were not aligned to actually encourage students to write about their understanding of cultural differences.

We would suggest that rather than tying existing class assessment to ISJ goals, that instructors include an assignment that asks students to directly address the ISJ goals in relation to the material they learned in the class. For example, one of us adapted an assignment this semester to include the following question on a final project write-up:

One of the learning objectives for this class is for you to analyze the origins, functions, and consequences of cultural stereotyping and scapegoating from multiple instances in the ancient world how has this class and this project contributed to this? (this answer should be at least 300 words long).

Additionally, compared to other learning objectives within the core, ISJ goals are more likely to entail sensitive topics (e.g., prejudice, discrimination, systemic racism, etc.); as such, it will be essential for instructors to create environments and opportunities for students to feel comfortable discussing said topics in class. Perhaps a workshop for faculty on how to facilitate sensitive discussions and create safe classroom environments may be beneficial for instructors teaching ISJ courses.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

Prompt:

later (10am?) start- time is better. Next year, please be sure to schedule the assessment day a few days after final exam grades are due, not just a few hours after grades are due because many of us are exhausted, and from reading papers in particular.

Recommendations for Internal Changes

Prompt: This section pertains to changes that can be made by the category director and/or the assessment office. What changes, if any, need to be made to the 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 recommend that you change the OnBase platform as it is cumbersome. There are so many different conceptualizations of the core and different rubrics that are all over both the web and Canvas, which makes it very confusing for instructors to find the authoritative current source.

Having applied for an ISJ designation for multiple courses the process felt very different depending on who was sitting on the committee. Making sure there is consistency despite the makeup of the committee is important.

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, need to be made 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.

We believe the intention of the Core Committee is virtuous, noble, and exemplary, however the application of whether or not stu

General Information

Core Categories Discussed:	Engaging the Global Community Linked Courses
Current Semester:	Spring 2022
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 17, 2022

Typical Assessment Process

Each semester, a random sample of 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 faculty member compo(m)19(b)-(omm18)-2(t)-79.9)-79.9ad i4.39 493.9 224.57 reW* nBT/F5 12 T

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Tom Pace, Jacqueline Schmidt, Jean Feerick, Martha Pereszlenyi-Pinter, Paul Nietupski, Peter Kvidera, Dan Kilbride

Findings

Prompt: Describe, in words, what your group 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?

Strengths: The majority of the papers under discussion met the learning outcome for articulating an argument. Most students showed strong topic choice; student writers came to these assignments seemingly prepared from their foundational courses in writing; we found a direct correlation between clear assignment design and articulation of an argument in student work; many papers used appropriate evidence to support their arguments.

Failures to Meet Goals: Not all students used their evidence to adequately explain how the evidence developed their arguments; more vague, unclear assignments tended to produce papers that did not meet the learning objectives for articulating an argument. These assignments often did not clarify an argument had to be made, often used vague verbs su

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 Core 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.

Assignment design: The Core Writing Director at JCU should continue to work with instructors to design clear assignments that specify the goals and purpose of the assignment and to build in process-based activities that lead to stronger writing; instructors should be more cognizant of the language used to define what kind of argument they want students to make, of the genre in which they want the students to write, and of how to stress the importance of teaching students to use evidence to explain and develop an argument.

More tools and resources for instructors: We stressed the importance of providing sample assignments from other linked and EGC courses to help instructors better design their own assignments. We can provide sample assignments and other resources on the core website, including assignments that have been particularly successful for students and how other instructors have scaffolded assignments that help students build appropriate arguments.

Discipline-Specific Assignments: Provide model assignments from specific disciplines.

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

Prompt:

improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)