DCAC Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 7, 2013

(Chair's note: A majority of DCAC representatives met (some met two or three times) with the Teagle assessment group (Blaich and Wise) during their September visit; these informal interactions replaced the regular September meeting, and informed the discussion that follows)

Present: Bruce Gilbert (Chair), Eric Manley, Todd Hodgkinson, Kevin Saunders, Stephanie Majeran, Carrie Dunham-LaGree, Marcia Keyser

Convened at 1 p.m.

1) First draft of Teagle memo: Kevin is still working with them for the final version. Thank you to those who were able to attend those meetings. The final version will be shared with the group once it has reached the Provost.

   a. There are good assessment activities happening. Things like the critical thinking workshops and the work from Student Life and Athletics were cited in the memo.
   b. Challenges: complexity of General Education program and trying to assess that; lack of resources; climate/culture/clarity on goals of assessment.
   c. Recommend that we continue to build faculty/staff development based on assessment; endorsed and encouraged the idea of a teaching and learning center.
   d. Suggested doing broad student focus groups to look for themes to bring back to DCAC to help refine the focus.
   e. Important that Drake continues to recognize and value the efforts that are happening currently
   f. Kevin, Stephanie, and Art are supportive of their comments and see them as helpful to DCAC's new charge.
   g. Hope to have a final version to Provost this week and then will disseminate broadly.
   h. Important to coordinate with UCC regarding information discovered in focus groups.
   i. Question: was there anything in the memo suggesting that the current system is unsustainable? They talked about the number of courses, AOIs, and outcomes as being unsustainable to assess, but that it is common across other institutions.
   j. Emphasized the impact on changing practice and student learning and to not let the process get in the way of the end point.

2) Updated charge: discussion at Sept. Faculty Senate meeting about two charges (UCC and DCAC), the DCAC one did not engender much discussion. The updated charge is available: https://facultysenate.drake.edu/files/2012/09/DCAC-Charge_Sept2013.pdf

   a. Reactions: several of the bulleted charges would be very difficult to do on our own without establishing a framework with UCC because what they are doing will impact where we are going. Would be difficult to accomplish all of this in a year.

  i. UCC is due to give recommendations by February
  ii. Curriculum and assessment go hand in hand
  iii. Senate would like UCC to reimagine AOIs- more "inspirational"
  iv. UCC subcommittees will look at other institution's General Education models

b. Priorities: will certainly continue to have some sort of learning outcomes and a need to capture/organize student work and to have a level of student demonstration/reflection of what they have learned.
  i. Explore possible resources such as external evaluation or software and look at common practices.
  ii. Consider how the new General Education curriculum will be supported with resources and look for a more efficient way of doing assessment.
  iii. Coordinate UCC and DCAC to make sure they don't go in different directions.
  iv. First step: look at peer institution General Education programs for ideas. Bruce and Stephanie can share some information after they attend IUPUI conference at the end of October.
  v. Another first step: investigate tools to see what is available.
  vi. Determine what tools are already being used on campus and to what extent; a brief conversation yielded awareness of these:
   1. School of Education uses LiveText for teacher portfolios
   2. Law School is implementing in-house portfolio system
   3. Pharmacy uses e-Value
   4. Journalism has students collect work into portfolios, but more for getting jobs than as a tool for assessment.
  vii. College-wide portfolios were piloted in the past. Mandatory eportfolios were proposed at one point, but were not approved by UCC. Rather than mandate eportfolios, DCAC's emphasis could be to recommend a specific platform, with emphasis on both assessment and the benefits for students.
  viii. For "revisions of current assessment processes" bullet, student focus groups could support this and the work of UCC.

c. Will have another meeting in November to see where we are in the process.

3) Info Lit evaluation and process: have a revised rubric and some examples of student work from AOI courses; will be applying the rubric to these and bring back to DCAC for recommendations.

4) Adjourned at 1:45 p.m.