

Drake Curriculum Analysis Committee

Sept 9, 2014 meeting

In Attendance: Tonia Land, Amy Vaughan, Chuck Phillips, Jerome Hilscher, Eric Manley, Sentwali Bakari, Bruce Gilbert, Kevin Saunders

Agenda:

1) Introductions

2) Brief overview of upcoming year, including status of Ad Hoc Senate Gen Ed Review Cmte.

- Shared information about summer meetings and areas of focus for the year [support curriculum review, continued progress on Drake Curriculum assessment]
- General information about the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Curriculum Review Committee. Group has met once to discuss study of two models – integrated core and majors/minors. Some discussion about the charge as it relates to challenges noted in the Wabash review and implications for reviewing learning outcomes. Noted that DCAC will need to partner in this process (Bruce and Kevin are members).
- General overview about Higher Learning Commission accreditation. Noted that visit will be in 2017-18. Provided a general overview of the process, areas of focus (i.e., Criteria 3: Teaching and Learning – Quality, Resources, and Support; Criteria 4: Teaching and Learning – Evaluation and Improvement). Discussion about interaction with DCAC. There are Criterion Oversight Groups that will reach out to DCAC for information.

3) Initial review of AOI Outcome spreadsheet, as compiled by Stephanie Majeran –

- Noted that HLC will likely look for direct measures and action in response to assessment information. Where do we stand on these aspects? The spreadsheet indicates room for progress.
- Asked for clarity on the methodology for Critical Thinking, specifically information about the average score for sampled papers – which papers were samples and how were they rated? Discussed additional information that is provided through the links to other tabs.
- Recommend the addition of a column in the spreadsheet to capture response to data. How are we closing the loop?
- For a number of outcomes, there are pilot assessment efforts. The cycle in these cases happened once. How do we embed assessment on a continuous basis?
- What do we want to give the Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee? What will they do with the information?
 - Look for areas of deficiency in students' achievement
 - Look for gaps in assessment information

- Recommend providing qualitative information on why not closing the loop. How can we provide information about progress and barriers/challenges.
- How will the Ad Hoc Committee move forward?
- a) Review outcomes
- b) Use current AOI to determine learning
- c) Provide recommendations for change.

a) What is most important to share with Gen Ed Cmte?

1. Provide information about existing data (spreadsheet) along with what is happening in Colleges/Schools
2. Suggest recommendations for where committee will get the most “bang for the buck.” Which information is most useful?
3. Point to areas for data (start with Critical Thinking and Writing), (Offer ideas for where to fill in data gaps)
4. Include information across campus. For example, there are several efforts to demonstrate the impact of leadership development (athletics, LEAD, disciplinary efforts, senior focus group). Add information about co-curricular assessment to the table.

b) What are most glaring gaps? How can we begin to address them?

1. Need information on where closing the loop
2. Looking for more direct measures

5) Adjourn

Action Items:

1. Revise template to include:
 - a. a column for information on response to data (closing the loop),
 - b. information on co-curricular assessment efforts that align with outcomes (leadership, athletics, senior experience)
2. Review process to indicate how DCAC will implement multiple assessment cycles in a timely manner.
3. Provide Curriculum Working Group with information from spreadsheet, focusing on sample outcomes and sharing rubric information (e.g., Critical Thinking, Written Communication)
4. Collect information about what assessment is going on in colleges and schools that aligns with the outcomes.
5. Next meeting: 21 October