Core Curriculum Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes September 27, 2017

Organization

SHSU Core Curriculum Assessment Committee

Type of Meeting

Core Curriculum Assessment Committee Meeting

Time

3:00-4:00 pm

Location LSC 308

Chairman

Jeff Roberts, Director of Academic Planning and Assessment

Present	Not Present	
Glenn Sanford, College of Humanities and Social	Holly Miller, College of Criminal Justice	
Sciences	Emily Roper, College of Health Sciences	
Sandra Stewart, College of Education	Art Wolfskill, College of Science and Engineering	
Wayne Barrett, College of Fine Arts and Mass	Technology	
Communication	David McTier, College of Fine Arts and Mass	
Kurt Jesswein, College of Business Administration	Communication	
Marcus Gillespie, College of Science and Engineering	Stephen Rapp, College of Humanities and Social	
Technology	Sciences	
Jeff Roberts, Office of Academic Planning and	Daphne Johnson, College of Education	
Assessment		
Daughn Pruitt, Division of Student Affairs		
Stephen Brown, College of Health Sciences		
Zijun Luo, College of Business Administration		
Lisa Muftic, College of Criminal Justice		

Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations, Actions, Follow-up
Introductions	Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and their respective	
	departments/colleges/divisions.	
Purpose of the	Jeff Roberts reviewed the purpose of the committee with the group:	
Committee	Review and recommend changes, as needed, to the core	
	curriculum assessment process at SHSU to ensure that they are	
	sufficient to satisfy the requirements set forth by the Texas Higher	
	Education Coordinating Board (THECB) and the Southern	
	Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.	

- Help facilitate the assessment of the THECB's Core Learning Objectives, both within their respective colleges and across the University.
- Review all collected assessment data regarding the Core Learning Objectives and provide recommendations for ways to improve student learning across the University.
- In advisory capacity, review the core assessment portions of both proposed and existing core curriculum courses to ensure adequate coverage of the THECB's Core Learning Objectives.

Overview of SACSCOC and THECB Core Assessment Requirements

Jeff Roberts provided information and materials to the committee regarding SACSCOC and THECB requirements regarding expectations for assessing and reporting on general education outcomes. SACSCOC has recently revised the standard related to general education:

Revised Standard 8.2. – The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results in the areas below:

b. student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies of its undergraduate degree programs.

Materials were supplied to the committee related to THECB requirements for core curriculum courses and gen ed/core learning outcomes assessment:

- TAC Rule 4.28 Core Curriculum
- Foundational Component Area Matrix
- Guide for The Teas Core Curriculum Assessment and Assessment Report

Discussion took place regarding the need to make sure that all courses within SHSU's core curriculum are addressing each of the required core learning objectives for their component areas.

Discussion took place regarding the assessment of the core learning objectives. Although the core objectives are being introduced within core courses, and emphasized across the curriculum and co-curricular activities, the reporting of assessment is focused on student attainment of the objectives themselves. Jeff Roberts noted that SHSU's assessment plan is composed of a mixture of course-level and end-of-experience assessments, using a mixture of direct and indirect measures for each objective, to try to capture a fuller picture of student learning.

Currently, core curriculum assessment efforts would benefit from more course-level data, particularly from courses within the core that see large numbers of students. SHSU will be submitting reports related to general education/core learning objectives to both SACSCOC and the THECB in September, 2018.

More data is particularly needed with regards to oral communication, visual communication, and teamwork. These areas will be of particular focus for 2017-2018.

Committee members were asked to help identify potential areas where course-level assessment of the core objectives might be taking place that could be incorporated into the larger assessment plan.

Committee members were asked to help identify any actions that are being taken at the course, program, department, or college level in response to data related to the core learning objectives for inclusion within both the THECB and SACSCOC Reports.

Analyzing Available Core Data/Core Objective Sub-Committees

Discussion took place regarding requirements from both SACSCOC and THECB for institutions to take actions to improve student learning based on collected assessment data. The Office of Academic Planning and Assessment Collects large amounts of data through various assessment measures across the institution; however, their staff are not in a position to develop and implement actions or interventions for improvement.

Jeff Roberts proposed the creation of sub-committees for each core learning objective to review existing data, explore the data further in conjunction with OAPA, and to develop recommendations for actions that could be taken to College and University leadership.

Jeff Roberts will issue a call to the committee members to solicit their preferences regarding which core objective subcommittee(s) they wish to be members of.

Sub-committees will work throughout the fall and spring semesters to review data and provide recommendations.

Environmental Scan of Current Core Curriculum Courses

The need for courses to address all required core learning objectives for their component area was again addressed. The importance of this was emphasized as these courses provide foundational preparation for students as they continue into their majors and approach graduation. Each course that was approved for inclusion within the core was required to submit sample syllabi and information regarding how the required core learning objectives would be addressed and student learning would be assessed, within the course. The consensus of the committee members in attendance was that courses within the core are generally accomplishing this, but improvements could probably be made to ensure full coverage.

Jeff Roberts proposed that the committee conduct an environmental scan of a sample of 2016-2017 core curriculum course syllabi in order to determine if evidence is available of courses covering these topics. All materials necessary for this review can be made available. Current course syllabi are available through the HB 2504 website. Furthermore, copies of the core course proposals can be made available for comparison. This review would accomplish several important tasks.

- Help confirm that courses are addressing the required core objectives for their component areas.
- Help identify potential sources of assessment data that could be incorporated into the larger core assessment process
- Identify any areas where coverage is unclear from the reviewed documents so further data could be collected

Zijun Luo also suggested that IDEA data might also be used, in aggregate form so as to protect individual faculty members, to determine coverage of the different learning objectives. These data could also potentially serve as a secondary source of data regarding student perceptions of their own attainment and progress which could complement other forms of direct data.

Jeff Roberts will develop a straw-man process for review, which will be presented at the next meeting of the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee. Further discussion will take place at that time regarding how the review environmental scan will proceed.

Jeff Roberts will also explore how IDEA data could also be used to complement these efforts and present options to the committee for using these data in aggregate form at the component area level so as to protect individual faculty members.