

General Information

Year of Interest:	2021-2022
Date of Assessment Meeting(s):	May 19, 2022

Participants in Assessment Meeting

NAMES

Findings

Prompt: Describe, in words, overall trends in student learning during this assessment cycle for the Integrative Core Curriculum. What were the strengths? In what ways did students fail to meet the goals set for them?

Both integration and argumentation seemed to be stronger in linked courses compared to global community courses. The most likely explanation is related to the structure of the courses. Linked courses provide two instructors and twice as many contact hours as global community courses do. Two sets of eyes on the signature assignment mean elements from multiple disciplines are more likely to be included. Some of the argumentation problems stemmed from problems with the assignment design.

Response to Recommendations for the Core Committee

Prompt: Listed below are the recommendations from Assessment Day. Please indicate the how the Core Committee intends to respond.

CAPA Assessment Change and New Rubric	Changes approved; the question will also prompt students with “You might mention specific strategies you’ve learned.”
Internal Changes (to Assessment Day, Canvas, and Website)	
ISJ recommends completing the entire rubric rather than focusing on a single outcome and being allowed to assign 2s and 4s.	T. Bruce will adjust the cross-course assessment process to accommodate these requests (as much as is possible).
ISJ suggested a longer time frame, perhaps 10 to 2 with a working lunch? and not on Tuesday.	
Integration asked for information about year of study and major of students and for syllabi and assignment descriptions	
Integration asked for easier to use (and better organized) information on website and in Canvas	To simplify matters in Canvas, there will be only one rubric available in Canvas for each core category. Users can leave them blank if some assignments only address part of the rubric.
Writing asks for tools and resources (sample assignments for LINK and EGC, and models from specific disciplines) plus an overt description of writing requirements for EGC	The Core Committee will discuss this further in the fall.
Writing would like to encourage applicants to consult a committee member before submitting.	
Assignment Design and Feedback for Instructors	

ISJ recommends perhaps adding some reflection questions tied to rubric items.	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).
ISJ recommends discouraging timed exams as environment for assessment.	The Core Committee concurs. T. Bruce will add a note to the assessment communications.
Changes to Rubrics and Learning Goals	
ISJ reports problems with the language of the learning goal, as did at least one instructor	“Respect” as it appears in the rubric is difficult to measure, particularly on some sort of scale. T. Bruce will reword the rubric.
Can EGC successfully do integration?	This is a discussion that the Core Committee will continue in the fall.
Possible Workshop Topics	
From ISJ: Creating a safe learning environment, leading discussions on challenging topics	These topics will make excellent workshops in the fall. Another possible workshop topic is a discussion of how the various categories have changed over time.
From Integration: Improving integration in EGC (idea sharing from Linked instructors)	
From Writing: Assignment Design	
Other Questions	
Are Borromeo faculty represented in assessment?	Generally, yes, as are instructors in JCU’s programs in Italy. Assessment processes in PL and TRS definitely include the Borromeo faculty, and T. Bruce can confirm that PL faculty do participate. Will check on TRS. Courses in Rome have been selected for assessment in the past.

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 EGC as unfeasible, we should design next year's assessment day 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 learning and that an additional question was needed in order to better assess the category's learning 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 participation in this class this semester?
3. How has your engagement in this creative process impacted and/or changed you?
4. What do you know now about the work that goes into this creative process that you didn't know before this semester?

We propose to delete Question 3, and ask a new question before the remaining three:

- Briefly describe your participation in the creative process during this class (in other words, what did you *do*?)

We also propose to adopt the rubric below for use on future Assessment Days to measure student learning through the responses to the four questions.

Creative and Performing Arts (Experience Rubric for Indirect Assessment)

5/17/22

	Met (3)	Not Met (1)
<p>Experience the creative process / Create or perform a work</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3CAPAa</p>	<p>Responses directly address participation in a creative process or performance.</p>	<p>Responses do not address participation</p>
<p>Understand / Reflect upon the creative process</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3CAPAb</p>	<p>Responses indicate awareness of process and the need for effort in the creative process (may include mentions of effort, process, or specific strategies).</p>	<p>Responses do not demonstrate awareness and may focus on instead on "talent" or inherent ability.</p>

Rating are based upon the answers to all questions. Some students may have inconsistent across questions and will not be rated. A rating of **Exceeded** may be given for exceptionally thorough or detailed responses.

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 instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-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 of ISJ Learning Goal 5A ("Understand and respect human and cultural differences"). The fact that we have many papers designated as "1" for this category does not mean that the course did 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: Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of assessment processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All processes should useful provide data with a reasonable amount of effort.)

We think the assessment process worked fairly well procedurally. Group members found it essential to have group members initially work as a collective to norm our understanding of the rubric and our thought processes pertaining to scoring. Later, working in pairs was also beneficial in allowing the group to get through a fair number of assessments and discern our ratings.

However, we do think that there should have been more structure with respect to the number of papers to evaluate. Having some consistency and a minimum bar to achieve will make the overall assessment process more standardized. Further, it was challenging to rate the sample ISJ assignments into the forced choice of 1, 3, or 5. There were many of the sample assignments that would have been much better characterized by a 2 or a 4. Perhaps forcing the choice to 1 or 2, 3, and/or 4 or 5 would have felt more authentic to rate.

While we understand that it's cumbersome to assess multiple criteria from the ISJ rubric, only looking at one criteria felt very narrow, like we weren't able to get the whole picture. This is especially true since we spent the time reading the paper, we were in a position to assess more criteria with ease. The assignment *could* have been a great way to assess a different aspect of the ISJ rubric, but we wouldn't know that.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

This model works well in general. However, we should be given a target number of papers to complete in the given time frame and ensure that we have an entire hour for that portion as well as sufficient time to norm the papers, which we found a particularly important part of the exercise.

While we like the three-hour format of the day, perhaps having one additional hour (perhaps with lunch in hand) to complete the AAR would be an improvement. Additionally, perhaps a

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 students “communicated understanding of and respect for differences among individuals and groups” is much harder to assess than the Core Committee might have imagined.

In particular we struggled with the “communicated *respect*” part of the criteria. We discussed modifying the language to reflect some assessment of student *growth* in their understanding of differences among individuals and groups. Respect is a very difficult concept to assess and we weren’t sure it was actually what *should* be assessed.

We believe the Core Committee could look at an application of this goal and purpose within the bounds of the answers students provided. We also suggest students be given an essay (outside of a timed exam) that would allow students more time to think and process this particular ISJ goal and purpose. To be clear, for example, faculty could be encouraged to build-in a 5-point assignment in which students write 300 words or 2 paragraphs about each rubric item, taken in turn. This activity would have the benefit of enabling us to identify more clearly whether the course in its entirety met the goals and would also allow students to reflect upon different aspects of the course (reading, lectures, experiences, assignments, films, etc) to answer the question.

Many student’s answers were based on the course requirements for achieving a high grade (i.e. their explanation of knowledge, analysis, personal opinion, etc), not for communicating an understanding of and respect for differences among individuals and groups.

We found that many students demonstrated great knowledge and understanding of their topics and assignments, but that this did not directly address the ISJ focus of communicating an understanding of and respect for differences among individuals and groups.

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-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 a joint EGC/LINK group is looking at Integration.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

Participants in Assessment Meeting

Matt Berg, Marcus Gallo, Megan Wilson-Reitz, Donna Rumenik, Sheila McGinn, Rodney Hessinger, Colin Swearingen

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?

56% met (40% met + 16% exceeded); 44% not met.

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.

EGC courses scored overwhelmingly did not meet the integration criterion. Can EGC courses succeed in this goal? Instructors should (and we expect *do*) model different disciplinary approaches; not necessarily successfully. Links have been more successful; explicit scaffolding takes place regularly. While this certainly can and does happen with EGC courses, greater intentionality is required in general. Perhaps a workshop where EGC and Linked instructors share assignments and brainstorm?

Evaluation of Assessment Processes

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

We did not consistently identify prompts for assignments across all groups. Core Committee should be more deliberate about ensuring the prompts are available for each group/each instructor or instructor pair. We are confident that instructors are acting with intention; can't always guarantee that students will translate into action.

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

Make sure specific rubric applicable to the course is pushed out to the instructors ahead of the semester (either in email or on Canvas). Also, try to better organize them within Canvas, so they are more easily accessed. This material should also be easily accessible on JCU's website.

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.

Would be helpful to have the syllabus for each individual course in the case of EGC, and for both courses in Links. Not all the subfolders had the prompts; these definitely are helpful for assessment.

Would it be possible to know the year of study and major of our anonymous student samples? That may help us appreciate level or preparation.

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.

If we aren't able to affect positive outcomes through another couple of cycles of fine tuning (via development sessions, etc.), we should give serious consideration to removing integration from EGC learning outcomes.

Can we ensure that relevant faculty from Borromeo are represented in assessment?

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-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 a joint EGC/LINK group is looking at writing.** Afterward, the assessment meeting focuses on data from this work and instructors' work from previous semesters. (Preliminary instructor-produced data for the current semester is also examined when available.)

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 such as “address,” “discuss,” or “write a paper.”

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

Works Well: The original norming session worked well. Partners felt prepared to work together assessing the papers.

Needs Improvement: We may need to spend more time on the nuances of some of the rubric language, i.e. "appropriately complex." We need to find a balance between too few and too many papers to assess. What are our standards for statistically valid samples?

Evaluation of Application and Other Operational Processes

Prompt: Describe, in words, your group's evaluation of application and other operational processes. What works well? What needs improvement? (All institutional processes should function efficiently and effectively.)

The Core website should provide a more overt description of the writing requirements for the EGC designation. The website details writing requirements and the writing processes for the linked courses but not for EGC courses.

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.

N/A

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 recommend that the Core Committee provide a clear place Core website where instructors can find all the required information for writing requirements for the EGC courses, including a Canvas page that includes sample assignments, syllabi, and other resources for instructors in EGC, Linked, and AW courses..

We also suggest that before instructors submit an application, they are encouraged to consult the committee member that oversees the different specific designation: Writing, ISJ, Linked, etc for initial feedback before submitting the final application to the full Core Curriculum.