
The November/December meeting of DCAC convened on 25 November 2013 at 11 a.m.

PRESENT: Richardson, Dunham-LaGree, Phillips, Vaughan, Keyser, Manley, Saunders, Hilscher, Bakari, Gilbert (Chair)

Agenda /Discussion:

1) Info Lit assessment and "new" rubric (Gilbert, Saunders, Dunham-LaGree)

The latest iteration of the Information Literacy rubric was distributed by email

(<http://researchguides.drake.edu/loader.php?type=d&id=235816>). A group of the three above-listed individuals (plus Majeran) have used it to analyze different examples of student work from three different Info Lit AOI courses. Per the rubric, all report finding the latest version easier to apply. Per the work analyzed, the area where most problems seem to arise in student work is in "Organization / Application / Use of Information." Saunders reported that this was consistent with work that has been analyzed to date using the Critical Thinking rubric.

A discussion ensued on next steps: Is it worthwhile putting this rubric forward to Faculty Senate? The tenor of the discussion was not in favor of putting this forward as an "isolated" issue, as in, "Please adopt this rubric" outside of a larger context. Given that a) there are ongoing Gen Ed curricular discussions and b) there is a need to communicate and begin to discuss trends, a broader conversation seems to be in order; perhaps a "workshop-type" faculty discussion? The Chair will approach Senate Exec with the ideas from this discussion.

1b) Brief report on trends in Info Lit baseline (Dunham-LaGree)

Carrie Dunham-LaGree reported that ten sections of FYS had taken an "Info Lit baseline" instrument this Fall. This is the third year that a "pre-test" has been administered, however, this year, a more standardized tool (common to several other Iowa colleges) was used. More definitive data on strengths/weaknesses (as well as how it compares to past years) will be forthcoming.

2) Report back from Assessment Conference -

Gilbert and Majeran had attended the 2013 Assessment Institute in late Oct. (in IND). Below are some comments Majeran forwarded:

In summary, these would be the ideas that I think might be ones for Drake to think about trying in the future:

1. Mock interviews for students
2. Assignment templates: could have workshops around this to help faculty think through how best to design an assignment around particular outcomes
3. "4-step model for assessment"—maybe instead of pushing the template, just talk about the four steps that need to be done
4. Gen Ed reports: consider having departments select 1-2 Gen Ed outcomes and report back on how their department meets that outcome; each department can design their own in house rubric for outcome, if they desire.
5. Develop a course for students where they learn to do research, gather data, and report it—essentially train students to help out with assessment
6. Workshop about sharpening up Learning Outcome statements

Some general comments from Gilbert (opinions are his!):

- a) "Program Review" as a process is very widespread; almost all institutions represented at the conference seemed to be doing it. It's likely that's because Drake tends to see "Program Review" as "Program Cutting," while most institutions are also looking at NEW programs on an ongoing basis.
- b) From all the sessions I attended, I didn't get the sense that anyone "loves" their Gen Ed curriculum; it's often treated as more of a necessary evil ("everyone has to have one"). Most of the enthusiasm seemed to come from places where Gen Ed reform was new, so it's unsure whether that enthusiasm is driven by novelty. Finally, many of the Gen Ed programs viewed were similar (in structure and requirements) to Drake's.
- c) One area where I think we lag: A number of institutions (granted, this WAS an Assessment Institute!) seem to have incorporated assessment much more fully into their governance and (especially) into their efforts at curricular improvement.

3) NSSE data - a few initial thoughts (Saunders)

A general overview of the NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) data from 2012-13 was distributed. Kevin Saunders noted that we are now comparing ourselves to a "new" and more selective peer group. Detailed reviews of this will be forthcoming, however, a couple of points were discussed, including that one of the lowest reported data points was in student use of Academic Support Services. This led to a general discussion of perceived issues with students' writing skills, and the lack of awareness of Academic Support services by faculty.

4) Brief report on ongoing DCAC/UCC progress/collaboration (Gilbert, Keyser)

Marcia Keyser caught us up on where UCC was in the reform process: Sub-committees have been formed and are gathering data and examining best practices.

Gilbert reported that Senate President deLaet, UCC Chair Hodgkinson, and he have met, and plan to continue meeting, on roughly a monthly basis to compare notes and share progress and concerns, as they arise.

Meeting adjourned: 12:15 p.m.