

Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes

April 30, 2024

Committee Members: Kelly McClendon, Jennifer Ball, Christa Smith, Josh Huston, Molly Pierson/Teresa Clouch, Kara Kendall-Morwick, Tara Lindahl, Eric Mosier, Ben Reed, Chris Jones, Jericho Hocket, Debbie Isaacson, Michael McGuire, Kwok-Pong Tso, Gloria Dye, Rhonda Boeckman, Bassima Schbley, Emily Grant, Steve Hageman, Tom Hickman, Valerie Ortega-Borunda

Members in Attendance: Bassima Schbley, Joshua Huston, Bobby Tso, Gloria Dye, Paul Mallory, Tara Lindahl, Jennifer Ball, Michael McGuire, Rhonda Boeckman, Kara Kendall-Morwick, Steve Hageman, Molly Pierson, Emily Grant, Tom Hickman, Chris Jones

1. Call to order and approve March meeting minutes (attached below). Minutes are approved
Introduction of new members: Molly Pierson and Paul Mallory
2. Awards Subcommittee report: Two departmental awards of \$500 were awarded to Philosophy and Religious Studies and Leadership Institute
-Idea: Rubric for awards is somewhat complex; Kelly proposes a change to involve nominees in the process of what goes into making a decision for the awards; this could include a form for nominees to fill out
-Report of awarded assessment grants
3. Grant Committee report
4. Assessment Committee Members for 2024-2025
-Michael Rettig will replace Gloria Dye on the committee after her retirement
5. QSRL and IB areas – revision of documents
-It is discussed to use a rubric for assessment (will not be used for artifact rating or rating USLO's)
-Suggestions and comments from subcommittee are discussed
-This could be adopted in the future, but is not yet an official rubric
-USLO assessment, analyzes major social systems and power structures, two rubrics assessing diversity and inclusion, this can be shared with gen ed, credit: Intercultural Knowledge and Competence & Global Learning Rubrics, AAC Value Rubrics
-Only one rubric
-Cultural Self Awareness, level 2; “exhibiting” rather than “noting”
-Committee endorses rubric; adopts for reference purposes
-No rubric for QSR now
-Assessment team will research a test which will replace prior test
-Goal is to find a university wide test for QSR for next year
6. Assessment software update-Student Learning and Licensure (Watermark)

-Summer classes will be pilot group

7. USLO assessment schedule reminder

8. Assessment Extravaganza 2025

-Theme: Fall in Love with Assessment, Feb. 11th

Meeting Adjourned

Kelly McClendon, 2:27 pm

	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Cultural self-awareness	Formulates insights into own cultural rules and biases as a result of learning from diversity of cultures (e.g., aware of how personal experiences have shaped these rules and biases).	Evaluates new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer).	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g., with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others).	Expresses minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (e.g., uncomfortable identifying possible cultural differences with others).
Curiosity and Openness	Asks complex questions about other cultures; seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect learning about diversity of communities and cultures.	Asks open-minded questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned about diversity of communities and cultures.	Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned about diversity of communities and cultures.	Exhibits indifference or resistance to what can be learned about diversity of communities and cultures.
Perspective Taking	Synthesizes diverse perspectives to complex topics, issues, and/or problems in the face of multiple and even conflicting positions (i.e., cultural, disciplinary, and ethical.)	Applies diverse perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when investigating topics, issues, and/or problems.	Identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when investigating topics, issues, and/or problems.	Identifies multiple perspectives while maintaining a value preference for own positioning (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).
Understanding Social Systems	Thoroughly analyzes the historic and contemporary role and differential effects of social systems and power structures on people and communities.	Analyzes some major elements of social systems and power structures, including their historic and contemporary interconnections and differential effects on people and communities.	Identifies some elements of social systems and power structures and their differential effects on people and communities.	Acknowledges basic role of some social institutions in impacting people and communities but attributes social problems primarily to individual actions and choices.

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 16 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Quantitative Literacy (QL)—also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR)—is a “habit of mind,” competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

Quantitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

Current trends in general education reform demonstrate that faculty are recognizing the steadily growing importance of Quantitative Literacy (QL) in an increasingly quantitative and data-dense world. AAC&U’s recent survey showed that concerns about QL skills are shared by employers, who recognize that many of today’s students will need a wide range of high-level quantitative skills to complete their work responsibilities. Virtually all of today’s students, regardless of career choice, will need basic QL skills such as the ability to draw information from charts, graphs, and geometric figures, and the ability to accurately complete straightforward estimations and calculations.

Preliminary efforts to find student work products which demonstrate QL skills proved a challenge in this rubric creation process. It’s possible to find pages of mathematical problems, but what those problem sets don’t demonstrate is whether the student was able to think about and understand the meaning of her work. It’s possible to find research papers that include quantitative information, but those papers often don’t provide evidence that allows the evaluator to see how much of the thinking was done by the original source (often carefully cited in the paper) and how much was done by the student herself, or whether conclusions drawn from analysis of the source material are even accurate.

Given widespread agreement about the importance of QL, it becomes incumbent on faculty to develop new kinds of assignments which give students substantive, contextualized experience in using such skills as analyzing quantitative information, representing quantitative information in appropriate forms, completing calculations to answer meaningful questions, making judgments based on quantitative data and communicating the results of that work for various purposes and audiences. As students gain experience with those skills, faculty must develop assignments that require students to create work products which reveal their thought processes and demonstrate the range of their QL skills.

This rubric provides for faculty a definition for QL and a rubric describing four levels of QL achievement which might be observed in work products within work samples or collections of work. Members of AAC&U’s rubric development team for QL hope that these materials will aid in the assessment of QL—but, equally important, we hope that they will help institutions and individuals in the effort to more thoroughly embed QL across the curriculum of colleges and universities.

Framing Language

This rubric has been designed for the evaluation of work that addresses quantitative literacy (QL) in a substantive way. QL is not just computation, not just the citing of someone else's data. QL is a habit of mind, a way of thinking about the world that relies on data and on the mathematical analysis of data to make connections and draw conclusions. Teaching QL requires us to design assignments that address authentic, data-based problems. Such assignments may call for the traditional written paper, but we can imagine other alternatives: a video of a PowerPoint presentation, perhaps, or a well-designed series of web pages. In any case, a successful demonstration of QL will place the mathematical work in the context of a full and robust discussion of the underlying issues addressed by the assignment.

Finally, QL skills can be applied to a wide array of problems of varying difficulty, confounding the use of this rubric. For example, the same student might demonstrate high levels of QL achievement when working on a simplistic problem and low levels of QL achievement when working on a very complex problem. Thus, to accurately assess a student's QL achievement, it may be necessary to measure QL achievement within the context of problem complexity, much as is done in diving competitions where two scores are given, one for the difficulty of the dive, and the other for the skill in accomplishing the dive. In this context, that would mean giving one score for the complexity of the problem and another score for the QL achievement in solving the problem.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Interpretation <i>Ability to explain information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</i>	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information. <i>For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.</i>	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. <i>For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph.</i>	Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. <i>For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line.</i>	Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means. <i>For example, attempts to explain the trend data shown in a graph, but will frequently misinterpret the nature of that trend, perhaps by confusing positive and negative trends.</i>
Representation <i>Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</i>	Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.	Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.	Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.	Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is inappropriate or inaccurate.
Calculation	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.)	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.	Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.	Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and are not comprehensive.
Application/Analysis <i>Ability to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis</i>	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for workmanlike (without inspiration or nuance, ordinary) judgments, drawing plausible conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for tentative, basic judgments, although is hesitant or uncertain about drawing conclusions from this work.
Assumptions <i>Ability to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis</i>	Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.	Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.	Explicitly describes assumptions.	Attempts to describe assumptions.
Communication <i>Expressing quantitative evidence in support of the argument or purpose of the work (in terms of what evidence is used and how it is formatted, presented, and contextualized)</i>	Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, presents it in an effective format, and explicates it with consistently high quality.	Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.	Uses quantitative information but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.	Presents an argument for which quantitative evidence is pertinent but does not provide adequate explicit numerical support. (May use quasi-quantitative words such as “many,” “few,” “increasing,” “small,” and the like in place of actual quantities.)

PROBLEM SOLVING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Problem solving is the process of designing, evaluating and implementing a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal.

Framing Language

Problem-solving covers a wide range of activities that may vary significantly across disciplines. Activities that encompass problem-solving by students may involve problems that range from well-defined to ambiguous in a simulated or laboratory context, or in real-world settings. This rubric distills the common elements of most problem-solving contexts and is designed to function across all disciplines. It is broad-based enough to allow for individual differences among learners, yet is concise and descriptive in its scope to determine how well students have maximized their respective abilities to practice thinking through problems in order to reach solutions.

This rubric is designed to measure the quality of a **process**, rather than the quality of an **end-product**. As a result, work samples or collections of work will need to include some evidence of the individual's thinking about a problem-solving task (e.g., reflections on the process from problem to proposed solution; steps in a problem-based learning assignment; record of think-aloud protocol while solving a problem). The final product of an assignment that required problem resolution is insufficient without insight into the student's problem-solving process. Because the focus is on institutional level assessment, scoring team projects, such as those developed in capstone courses, may be appropriate as well.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Contextual Factors: Constraints (such as limits on cost), resources, attitudes (such as biases) and desired additional knowledge which affect how the problem can be best solved in the real world or simulated setting.
- Critique: Involves analysis and synthesis of a full range of perspectives.
- Feasible: Workable, in consideration of time-frame, functionality, available resources, necessary buy-in, and limits of the assignment or task.
- “Off the shelf” solution: A simplistic option that is familiar from everyday experience but not tailored to the problem at hand (e.g. holding a bake sale to "save" an underfunded public library).
- Solution: An appropriate response to a challenge or a problem.
- Strategy: A plan of action or an approach designed to arrive at a solution. (If the problem is a river that needs to be crossed, there could be a construction-oriented, cooperative (build a bridge with your community) approach and a personally oriented, physical (swim across alone) approach. An approach that partially applies would be a personal, physical approach for someone who doesn't know how to swim.
- Support: Specific rationale, evidence, etc. for solution or selection of solution.

PROBLEM SOLVING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Problem solving is the process of designing, evaluating, and implementing a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Define Problem	Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.	Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement is adequately detailed.	Begins to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement is superficial.	Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors.
Identify Strategies	Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context.	Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, only some of which apply within a specific context.	Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does apply within a specific context.	Identifies one or more approaches for solving the problem that do not apply within a specific context.
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	Proposes one or more solutions/ hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem. Solution/ hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as all of the following: ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem.	Proposes one or more solutions/ hypotheses that indicates comprehension of the problem. Solutions/ hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as the one of the following: ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions of the problem.	Proposes one solution/ hypothesis that is “off the shelf” rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.	Proposes a solution/ hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.
Evaluate Potential Solutions	Evaluation of solutions is deep and elegant (for example, contains thorough and insightful explanation) and includes, deeply and thoroughly, all of the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/ reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.	Evaluation of solutions is adequate (for example, contains thorough explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/ reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.	Evaluation of solutions is brief (for example, explanation lacks depth) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/ reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.	Evaluation of solutions is superficial (for example, contains cursory, surface level explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/ reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.
Implement Solution	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a surface manner.	Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.	Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.
Evaluate Outcomes	Reviews results relative to the problem defined with thorough, specific considerations of need for further work.	Reviews results relative to the problem defined with some consideration of need for further work.	Reviews results in terms of the problem defined with little, if any, consideration of need for further work.	Reviews results superficially in terms of the problem defined with no consideration of need for further work

Assessment Achiever Awards: Description, Eligibility Criteria, Award Details, Scoring Rubric, & Process

Description: The Assessment Achiever Awards are intended to recognize the work of departments whose faculty have made consistent achievements in assessment practices. Awards will be provided to the departments with the two highest rubric scores.

Eligibility Criteria: Washburn University Assessment Director identifies programs who are eligible for assessment awards. To be eligible, departments must 1. respond by deadline to requests for syllabi for Criterion 1; 2. have Program Assessment materials a. submitted for at least 50% of all programs the **prior two years in Taskstream AMS**, and b. with average scores of “Target” or “Developing” on Assessment Plans and Reports for Criterion 2; 3. have at least 1 faculty member who has earned a CTEL Certificate of Teaching and Learning. Preference will be given to departments who have not received an Assessment award in the prior three years.

Award Details: \$500 stipend to general department fund for the following fiscal year, announced at CTEL Celebration of Teaching

Scoring Rubric: For use by the University Assessment Committee after eligible programs are determined.

Department:				
Criterion	Target (3)	Benchmark (2)	Beginning (1)	Score
Course-Level Assessment				
1. Number, measurability, and course-relevance of course-embedded SLOs on 3 representative syllabi across curricula in the department (as provided by department upon request)	There are at least 3 SLOs relevant to the course provided on all 3 syllabi. All SLOs are clearly stated in measurable terms on all 3 syllabi.	There are at least 3 SLOs relevant to the course provided on at least 2 syllabi. Most SLOs (50%+) are stated in measurable terms across all 3 syllabi.	There are fewer than 3 SLOs that are relevant to the course provided on at least two syllabi. Less than 50% of SLOs are stated in measurable terms across all 3 syllabi.	
Program-Level Assessment				
2. Reviewer scores on Program Assessment Plans and Reports in Taskstream AMS	Reviewer scores on Program Assessment Plans and Reports in Taskstream AMS are consistently on or approaching “Target” (Avg. = 2.75 - 3), as observed across the prior two academic years <u>for all department programs.</u>	Reviewer scores on Program Assessment Plans and Reports in Taskstream AMS are consistently on “Developing” to “Target” (Avg. = 2-3) as observed across the prior two academic years <u>for 75% or more of department programs.</u>	Reviewer scores on Program Assessment Plans and Reports in Taskstream AMS are consistently on “Developing” to “Target” (Avg. = 2-3) as observed across the prior two academic years <u>for 50-74% of department programs.</u>	
University-Level Assessment				
3. Participation in teaching and learning professional development through CTEL and Assessment	40% of FTE faculty in the department earned a CTEL Certificate of Teaching and Learning for at least one of the last two years.	20-39% of FTE faculty in the department earned a CTEL Certificate of Teaching and Learning for at least one of the last two years.	Less than 20% of FTE faculty in the department earned a CTEL Certificate of Teaching and Learning for both of the last two years.	
4. Innovations in Assessment	At least one member of the department has been awarded an Assessment Grant OR has won the CTEL Assessment Pillar Innovation Award in each of the last two academic years.	At least one member of the department has been awarded an Assessment Grant OR has won the CTEL Assessment Pillar Innovation Award in one of the last two academic years.	At least one member of the department applied for an Assessment Grant OR was nominated for the CTEL Assessment Pillar Innovation Award in one of the last two academic years.	
TOTAL				

Process:

1. Criterion 2. In the last week of February, Assessment Director compiles list by program of “Target” and “Developing” scores on Plan and Reports (average score for each report is 2.0 or above) in each of last 2 years.
2. **Criterion 3 & 4.** In the first week of March identify departments identified in step 1 that meet eligibility for Criterion 3 & 4: the average (number certificates divided by number FTE faculty in departments) number of CTEL Certificate of Teaching and Learning (*Note, a person will automatically receive this certificate if they also received Certificate of Inclusive Teaching, so we only focus on numbers for the one certificate), as well as the number of applications/awards for Assessment Grants, and nominations/awards for CTEL Assessment Pillar Innovation Awards in each of the last 2 years (*Note, because of timing, this information will be for the two academic years BEFORE the current academic year). Sue Taylor-Owens can provide information regarding the number of certificates for each eligible department. Details regarding the number of FTE faculty in each department can be found in the Faculty & Staff Factbook: <https://www.washburn.edu/about/facts/institutional-research/index.html>
3. Criterion 1. In the first week of March, request from department chairs & admins (email both) 3 representative syllabi from the prior two years, across curricula in the department, that demonstrate the department’s approach to writing and documenting course-level SLOs. To be returned by the end of March.
4. Awards subcommittee is sent materials immediately after March 31, and reviews materials and scores eligible departments on rubrics for decision by mid-April. Preference should be given to departments who have not received an Assessment award in the prior three years. In the event of a tie between three or more departments, the subcommittee should evaluate all criteria and determine the two departments who are exemplar.
5. Awards announced at CTEL Celebration of Teaching in April/May, and funds will be made available to the departments after July 1