

**Core Curriculum Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes
November 9, 2017**

Organization

SHSU Core Curriculum Assessment Committee

Type of Meeting

Core Curriculum Assessment Committee Meeting

Time

9:00-10:00 am

Location

LSC 319

Chairman

Jeff Roberts, Director of Academic Planning and Assessment

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

Agenda Item	Comments	Recommendations, Actions, Follow-up
Introductions	Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and their respective departments/colleges/divisions.	
Core Objective Sub-Committee Membership	<p>The Core Objective Sub-Committee Memberships are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Critical Thinking – Daphne Johnson, Marcus Gillespie, Glenn Sanford ○ Communication – Emily Roper, David McTier, Lisa Muftic ○ Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning – Zijun Luo, Holly Miller ○ Teamwork – Sandra Stewart, Art Wolfskill ○ Personal Responsibility – Stephen Brown, Wayne Barrett ○ Social Responsibility – Daughn Pruitt, Kurt Jesswein, Stephen Rapp <p>Jeff Roberts was able to assign each member to his or her first or second choice. These designations are in no particular order.</p>	
Deliverables from Core Objective Sub-Committee	<p>Sub-committees are asked to come up with “shoot for the moon” recommendations on ways to explore the data to take to CAD/CAAD and Academic Affairs leadership. Some things to consider are differences in performance by group (i.e. male vs. female, ethnicity, Pell eligibility, etc.). Regarding running stats, it should not be more difficult than basic regressions. The end goal is to recommend ways to improve student learning, student retention, and student graduation.</p> <p>We have gaps in our assessment plan, primarily in regard to oral and visual communication – more data is needed. Is something being collected around campus in core courses that we can use? Multiple sources are preferable.</p> <p>Stephen Rapp asked about the kind of data we have. Jeff Roberts gave an overall explanation of the general data on our website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Thinking – Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT). Foundations of Science (FOS) and end of experience seniors take this exam, and typically the FOS students score higher than seniors. Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS). • Written Communication – Assessment of Written Communication (AWC) • Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning – Double-dip with CAT and TACTS looking at specific questions • Teamwork – National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data (indirect). Teamwork Self-Reflection Instrument (TSRI) – currently a pilot project with CHSS and COBA, based off the Teamwork AAC&U rubric. OAPA can’t speak to its reliability and validity at this time, but hoping to receive 300-400 responses. The hypotheses are that students with more teamwork experiences will score higher, and that seniors will 	<p>Lisa Muftic and Zijun Luo are statisticians who can assist with this.</p> <p>Jeff Roberts will email additional resources to the group to include a data dictionary, our list of variables that we request from IE, raw data, the link to our core curriculum projects and results websites.</p>

	<p>score higher than freshman. OAPA will also run a factor analysis of the data to determine internal consistency of the instrument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal and Social Responsibility – Lots of indirect data from NSSE (a sub-module for this objective was used in the 2016 administration). ACE courses (reflections). Course-embedded questions in POLS intro courses (pre-/post-tests). PHIL – Contemporary Moral Issues pre-/post-tests <p>Jeff Roberts is exploring using IDEA data (indirect) – pulling out broad data to see if it can correlate with the six core learning objectives, but it could only be used in aggregate to protect the instructor, and it would be imperfect, secondary data.</p> <p>Sub-committees are charged with providing broad-scale recommendation, taking into consideration the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the strengths and weaknesses of the data? What are we doing with our data? Jeff Roberts will be submitting reports to SACSCOC and THECB for our 2019 Reaffirmation. The data doesn't have to work – we just have to TRY to improve. 	
Timeline for Review and Reporting?	<p>Jeff Roberts asked if the group found it reasonable to report preliminary findings from their respective sub-committees by spring break, and if final reports from each sub-committee could be ready for CAD/CAAD and Academic Affairs leadership by the end of the spring semester. The group agreed that this timeline is reasonable.</p>	<p>Sub-committees will report preliminary findings to the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee by Spring Break.</p> <p>Sub-committees will submit final reports that will go to CAD/CAAD/Academic Affairs leadership by the end of the spring semester.</p>
Environmental Scan of Current Core Curriculum Courses	<p>The purpose of the scan is to make sure core courses are doing what they're supposed to do in relation to the six core objectives. Per THECB requirements, depending on which component area it belongs to, each core course is to fulfill one or more of the six objectives (the assignments to the component areas are state-mandated).</p> <p>Approximately 150 courses have been randomly selected for review across all component areas (Approximately 25% of core courses for Fall 2017). Original Course proposals are also available for review/comparison to current course syllabi.</p> <p>We are looking for minimal compliance in this process, the course section either addresses the intended objective(s) or it doesn't, regardless of one section having much more of the objective than another section. Jeff Roberts will take any questions/concerns that are</p>	<p>OAPA will create an inventory/cover sheet with check boxes to ensure everything is being addressed (ex. Teamwork is found in ENGL 1301 by reviewing the current syllabi).</p> <p>OAPA will divide the list of course sections equitably, with one reviewer per course.</p>

	<p>found and meet with Somer Franklin to contact appropriate Deans and Associate Deans to determine if the objective is being covered, but that it wasn't clear in the syllabi.</p> <p>Who will review? It was agreed by the group that Daughn Pruitt and Zijun Luo will not participate since neither are Associate Deans nor tenured faculty. OAPA will also not participate as it could send the wrong tone and would not be meaningful. Reviewers will be anonymous – only Jeff Roberts will know who is reviewing which course section, unless the reviewer outs themselves.</p> <p>To ensure that reviewers have an equal number of courses, they may end up reviewing courses within their respective colleges.</p> <p>Everyone agreed that the reviews could be completed by the end of the spring semester.</p>	<p>Jeff Roberts will email the files to each reviewer along with the cover sheet.</p> <p>Reviewers will complete the reviews by the end of the spring semester.</p>
--	--	---