

MEMBERS¹: CAFES – Richard Cavaletto, Marc Horney; CAED – Mark Cabrinha, Jason Hailer; OCOB – Jean-Francois Coget, Hong Thi Hoang; CENG – Eric Mehiel, Faculty Rep – Vacant; CLA – Debra Valencia-Laver (CHAIR), Matthew Moore; CSM – Kellie Green Hall, Beth Chance; School of Education – Kevin Taylor, Virginia McMunn, Andrew Byrne; Academic Programs & Planning – Mary Pedersen, Bruno Giberti, Shannon Sullivan-Danser (minutes); Library – Katherine O’Clair; Institutional Research – Mauricio Saavedra; CTLT – Patrick O’Sullivan; Student Affairs – Kevin Grant; GE Governance Board – Gary Laver; ITS – Brett Heenan; Writing Center – Dawn Janke; PCS/Career Services – Vacant; ASI – Angelina Lopez

Debra Valencia-Laver, Chair of the Academic Assessment Council (AAC), began the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

1. The minutes from April 19, 2019 were approved as submitted.

2. Announcements

- A. Dawn Janke provided an update on a grant approved by Mary Pedersen for high DFW classes. Dawn will be working with programs to create individual assessments for those courses and to evaluate how well they’re working.

- B. Dawn also updated the AAC on the GWR Advisory Board. There are representatives from every college on the Board, except from OCOB. They have already approved 9 courses outside of English that will offer GWR-designated courses sometime next year. Those departments are Dairy Science, Chemistry, Biology, History (multiple courses), WGS/ES, and Communications. To have 9 approved the first time is a great testament to writing through the discipline. It was also great to see what people are already including in terms of upper division writing.

3. Key Findings from *We Have a Rubric for That* | Debra Valencia-Laver

- A. Debra presented on the *We Have a Rubric for That* monograph. She summarized how the rubrics were developed in the first place ten years ago as well as the research and best practices that have developed as a result.

The best assessment for authentic student learning tends to be in their core curriculum. Cal Poly is assessing some sophisticated artifacts – it’s not just one cookie-cutter artifact for each competency or learning outcome. Multiple assessment and multiple ways of assessing over time is essential to true evaluation. Perhaps as Cal Poly changes LMS platforms, there will be a cleaner way to track these assessments from a data management standpoint. One way to track

¹ Attendance is confirmed through the highlight of a person’s name.

this could be through an ePortfolio, which AAC&U believes is part of the next wave of assessment best practices. The goal for AAC would be to inform the progress and inform the pedagogy of assessment at Cal Poly.

The rubrics contain a lot of information, including a glossary and background of the development of the rubric. Each rubric is designed to provide a foundation to schools; each school is invited to modify as appropriate for their own needs.

Kevin Grant shared that VALUE rubrics are used a lot in Student Affairs, especially in General Education. We've combined information from their rubrics to our homegrown ones to fit our context more appropriately.

Katherine O'Clair shared that the information literacy rubric is used a lot in class and in the development of Cal Poly's rubric for that competency.

Debra concluded by commending the AAC and Cal Poly for already implementing the recommendations for AAC&U, such as triangulating the results with various forms of assessment and emphasizing course design as a key outcome of the assessment. Assignment design, too, is a really important piece in using these rubrics effectively.

Bruno discussed how course design is a key input and output for assessment. Cal Poly went through a few cycles where we assessed assignments that didn't address the rubric. Each learning community for the core competencies begins with rubric development, which goes on to inform assignment design, and the evaluation of the artifacts tends to lead to a larger discussion on course design and curriculum mapping.

Debra encouraged AAC members to read the full report and is happy to lend the book to whomever is interested.

4. Role of Faculty Representatives and Current Vacancies / Goals for AY 2019-20

- A. Bruno Giberti presented an overview of the goals for the College Assessment Committees (CAC), which would mirror the work that the AAC does at the university level. Each department would have a representative on the CAC and should be the department's assessment coordinator or a member of the department's assessment committee. A faculty member from the CAC would be nominated to be the faculty representative for the AAC.

The faculty member who represents the college at the university level should have a big role at the college level. Bruno said that he believes there are only two colleges with active assessment councils at the moment. It would be a worthy goal for the AAC to work on building the shared

governance aspect of assessment between the two groups.

To help encourage faculty participation, the AAC agreed to review the charge by the Academic Senate (AS-735-11 “Resolution on Coordinated Campus Assessment Efforts”) and understand the goals of the Council each year beyond research and core competency planning.

Mark Cabrinha recommended considering solely reviewing department assessment reports or reaching for a more aspirational goal to share best practices from across campus. It would be incredibly beneficial for the faculty representatives, especially if we follow the CAC model, to have that information and share it back with their colleges.

Katherine O’Clair also endorsed the CAC model, especially as a way of identifying faculty representatives. It would show that the person is versed in assessment and committed to developing and evaluating student learning. That person would be a true leader and connection between this council and their college assessment efforts.

Bruno added that it would be a powerful and effective model to have faculty and administration working together on assessment, and the faculty participation on this council would improve.

Matthew Moore shared his experience as a faculty representative on the AAC. The charge of late has been vague, but that has been in large part because our assessment culture and practice has changed dramatically. During The ULO Project, Cal Poly didn’t even have a Director of Academic Assessment. Any improvement to assessment at Cal Poly over the last few years has happened because of this committee. It has been nice to share with our colleagues at the college-level the value in assessment and how we can generalize based on the work of other departments. However, it’s hard to see, too, what this committee should focus on for the upcoming year.

Beth Chance also shared her experience as a faculty representative. It’s important to have faculty on AAC to provide that experience and voice for faculty. Part of it is having the chance to explain how faculty might respond to a request. This committee is good, too, since so many college committees suffer from turnover or inconsistent meetings. She also mentioned the benefit in having a newsletter again related to assessment to help departments and colleges stay in the loop.

Virginia McMunn suggested looking at a statement of purpose that’s more visionary toward the charge of the AAC and not just focused on the pragmatic tasks the group undertakes.

Bruno added that the AAC was not meant to be a review committee for departments but a steering committee to help focus and refine our university assessments, such as with CLA+ and NSSE – both of which will be administered AY 2019-20.

Debra recommended another meeting in August for the AAC to discuss goal-setting for the year and to really spend time reviewing AS-735-11 to see if it is still relevant. Especially since the AAC will not be reviewing annual assessment reports anymore (Associate Deans will be doing that), it is timely to review the resolution and consider if the Council needs to propose a new one.

Bruno mentioned that the new DLO resolution should have been sent to the AAC for review before going to the Senate. He added that, since there is a Director of Academic Assessment now, it makes sense to revise the resolution to show the shared governance between faculty and the director in regards to assessment.

Kevin Grant said that there are various assessment committees in Student Affairs (Career Services and University Housing, for example), and it makes sense for the AAC to grapple with more meta-level conversations on assessment. He said that it would be great if there was an Academic Affairs representative on those committees, too.

Katherine said that the AAC could consider the curriculum committee model, where the Senate Executive Committee looks to the colleges for recommendations to confirm the appointment. Bruno asked Katherine to send him her thoughts; it could be something that the Associate Deans look at next year.

Debra concluded the meeting by thanking Matthew Moore for his service on the Council; she also said that she will be planning a meeting later in the summer to discuss some of these planning concerns, especially in regards to reviewing AS-735-11. She thanked the Council for their effort this year and wished everyone a wonderful summer.

Meeting concluded at 12:01 p.m.