Intentional Focus Area: Intentional Focus I:
Drive Transformational Learning Experiences Creating Outstanding Educational Outcomes for All.
Objective 1.3
Academic Year: 2019-20

Intentional Focus 1.3 Coordinators: Core Curriculum Committee Date: July 13, 2020

Institutional Effectiveness Oversite: Vice Provost Eitle Date:

Report on Intentional Focus 1.3: Implement successful high impact teaching and learning practices

Objectives: General education reform: reinvigorated Core curriculum and communication and integration of revised Core learning outcomes.

1. **Strategies: Core Curriculum Assessment and Improvement**

	Strategies (what was done)	**Strategy Performance Indicators**	**Assessment Criteria (Specify Target Performance Level and Timeline)**	**Assessment Measure (What artifacts or data will you collect to assess?)**
1.	Engage faculty and staff in assessment and improvement of the MSU Core	# of faculty and staff participating in Core related workshops and activities.	Establish baseline in AY19-20 and then target is to increase by 100% by 2024. AY19-20 183 faculty/staff participated in workshops or other Core related activities. Target for 2024 is 366 unique	# Participants in Core Committee and in other core related trainings and activities.

			individuals participating.	
2.	Approvals and implementation of new Core outcomes	Implement annual assessment and cycle for Core Program. AY19-20 – "Thinking and Problem Solving" AY20-21 – "Communication" AY21-22 – "Local and Global Citizenship" AY22-23 – "Perspectives" and Core Program Assessment.	Obtain Faculty Senate approval for MSU Core Qualities and complete Full cycle of assessment by 2024. Faculty Senate officially approved the MSU Core Qualities on January 29, 2020	Core Approval by FS/Core assessment data reviewed by Core Curriculum Committee and Core Assessment reports submitted annually.
3.	Development and implementation of assessment of Core Qualities Learning Outcomes	Implementation of direct assessment of Core learning outcomes	100% of the randomly selected courses targeted for assessment will participate in submitting assessment artifacts increasing number of core instructors will participate in assessing artifacts by 2024.	% of courses selected that participate by submitting artifacts and # of core instructors who participate in assessing artifacts.

4.	Assessment Results using Rubrics (Direct Assessment)	Assessment results -	For each element 85% of student work demonstrates competency at the developing or proficient level by 2024.	Aggregate assessment results.

2. What was done?
a. How was data collected?

1. The Core Committee has sponsored Core Assessment Workshops and developed Faculty Learning Communities in support of Core Learning Communities. We are tracking participation. Participation data for workshops and faculty learning communities has been collected (See appendix A for Data) by CFE and the Office of Academic Affairs which sponsors the workshops.
2. The MSU Core Qualities went to Academic Council and then to Faculty Senate for final approval and the approval was documented in the FS minutes.
3. Student artifacts demonstrating "Thinking and Problem Solving" were collected, distributed for assessment, assessed using a rubric (see data and rubric in Appendix B). 215 faculty submitted 5 student artifacts from their Core courses. 79 faculty participated in the assessment of these artifacts.
4. A cycle of assessment was designed and year 1 of assessment implemented.

b. Explain the assessment process and who participating in the analysis of the data.

Faculty who teach core courses with "Thinking and Problem Solving" as a learning outcome contributed five student artifacts from their classes and assessed five artifacts from another instructor's course within their particular field (Humanities, Social Sciences, etc.). The artifacts were then reviewed and scored utilizing an established rubric and recorded in a Qualtrics survey. The analysis of the Qualtrics data was then reviewed by the Core Curriculum Committee, the University Seminar Directors, and Friends of the Core Committee.

# of faculty submitting artifacts/# faculty invited to submit artifacts – 136/200 (68%)
# of total artifacts submitted = 680

# of student artifacts assessed = 403
# of individuals participating in assessing student artifacts using the rubric = 84

c. Who participated in the discussion and interpretation of the assessment?
Core Committee, Friends of the Core Committee, University Seminar Directors

3. What Was Learned
Based on the analysis of the data, and compared to the threshold values provided, what was learned from the assessment?

Summary of Direct Assessment of "Thinking and Problem Solving" (See Appendix D for complete data summary)

Elements of "Thinking and Problem Solving"	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Target (85% Developing or Proficient)
Synthesis of Information	12.2%	38.7%	49.1%	Met
Creation of Meaningful Information	10.4%	40.1%	49.5%	Met
Evaluation of Evidence	12.2%	41.7%	46.1%	Met
Source Citation	19.3%	38.4%	42.3%	Did not meet
Assumptions	15.0%	41.9%	43.1%	Met
Analysis	11.6%	40.9%	47.5%	Met
Critique of Counter Argument	33.8%	35.3%	30.9%	Did not meet
Asking and Answering Questions	19.5%	51.1%	29.4%	Did not meet
Defining Problems and Identifying Solutions	14.7%	59.2%	26.1%	Met
Demonstrates Creation of Knowledge or Art	19.4%	19.4%	19.4%	Did not meet

a. Areas of strength

Assessment of student learning:

- The table above documents performance based on the assessment of the various elements of "Thinking and Problem Solving" and the strengths identified included synthesis and creation of meaningful information, the evaluation of evidence, and analysis were strengths for the students. Targets were met in these areas and a few others, but nearly 50 percent of students demonstrated proficiency in these four areas.

Assessment of Assessment Process:

- The rubrics worked well and the trainings were very effective at both piloting the rubrics and correcting before going live with the direct assessment.
- The number of faculty who participated in trainings was much higher than we anticipated.
- Participation in the process overall was much better than anticipated and included involvement in the assessment trainings, submitting artifacts, and assessing artifacts.
- General feeling that we did learn something from the process worth sharing with the instructors and university community.

b. Areas that need improvement

Assessment of student learning:

- Critique of counterarguments seems to be a weakness among our students and we need to consider offering workshops to help faculty consider better ways to integrate this element into their courses and to create assignments that will provide students more opportunities to practice it.

Assessment of Assessment Process:

- We need to differentiate the assessment of courses by level so that we can disaggregate results for 100/200 vs. 300/400 level courses. We could then establish targets that differ for 100/200 vs. 300/400 level courses. We should not have the same expectations that students in lower division courses will be proficient in all of these areas yet.
- We need to randomly sample courses to collect artifacts in and then have those instructors not selected participate in assessing the artifacts. This will reduce the workload for everyone and make it more likely that we can maintain a good system of assessment that provides data that informs improving teaching and learning of the MSU Core Qualities.
- More trainings for faculty in how to teach to the new MSU Core Qualities need to be provided as the faculty really enjoyed talking with one another about how they teach and assess students in these areas in their classes.

c. Are there contextual factors within or external to the university that might have impacted the results of your program/strategy? If so, what changes to the program/strategy are you making?

The first year of assessment included a population level drawing of courses in specific core perspective courses (Inquiry and the University Seminar) because the new MSU Core Qualities were not yet approved by Faculty Senate. However, Inquiry and Seminar classes, had existing learning outcomes that most closely matched "Thinking and Problem Solving" and so we piloted in those courses.

4. Next steps

a) Based on your analysis, are there other assessment strategies or outcomes that should be considered to better demonstrate performance indicators?

YES__X____ NO_____

If yes, please describe what you would like to implement for the next assessment:

- We need to differentiate the assessment of courses by level so that we can disaggregate results for 100/200 vs. 300/400 level courses. We could then establish targets that differ for 100/200 vs. 300/400 level courses. We should not have the same expectations that students in lower division courses will be proficient in all of these areas yet.
- We need to randomly sample courses to collect artifacts in and then have those instructors not selected participate in assessing the artifacts. This will reduce the workload for everyone and make it more likely that we can maintain a good system of assessment that provides data that informs improving teaching and learning of the MSU Core Qualities.
- More trainings for faculty in how to teach to the new MSU Core Qualities need to be provided as the faculty really enjoyed talking with one another about how they teach and assess students in these areas in their classes. These trainings might also be an additional location to share the assessment results from the past year.

5. Closing the Loop

Based on interest in the changes to the Core Curriculum the Core Committee invited other members of the University community to Core meetings. We now have regular attendance by representatives from Residence Life, Student Success, and have more of an open door inviting those who are eager to participate in some way.

Four members of the Core Committee attended the Institute for General Education and Assessment in summer 2019 and during that developed rubrics for assessing the three MSU Core Qualities and planned for a first year of assessment of “Thinking and Problem Solving” in Fall 2019.

Appendix A: 2019-2020 Participation in Core Workshops and Faculty Learning Communities (FLC)

Type of Participation	**# Workshops or FLC's**	**Total Individuals Participating**
Workshops	12*	176
Faculty Learning Communities	2**	9
Unduplicated Total		183

*Workshops were held with US Seminar Directors, University Studies Seminar Instructors (2 Sessions), CLS Seminar Instructors (2 sessions), First Year Writing Instructor Training, and Center For Faculty Excellence Assessment Workshops for Core Faculty (6 sessions).

**Two faculty learning communities, one with 6 faculty and the other with 3 faculty.

Appendix B: Data Summary (Qualtrics rubric assessment descriptive data): “Thinking and Problem Solving”

		Core Designation					
		Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Q3: Synthesis of Information	Total Count	395	46	61	15	38	235
	Missing Count	8	1	3	1	1	2
	Minimal synthesis of evidence (Beginning)	48	7	1	6	4	30
	Some synthesis of evidence consistent with assignment expectations (Developing)	153	17	27	2	9	98
	Successful synthesis of relevant evidence gathered in a manner appropriate for the assignment expectations (Proficient)	194	22	33	7	25	107
	Minimal synthesis of evidence	12.2%	15.2%	1.6%	40.0%	10.5%	12.8%
	Some synthesis of evidence consistent with assignment expectations	38.7%	37.0%	44.3%	13.3%	23.7%	41.7%
	Successful synthesis of relevant evidence gathered in a manner appropriate for the assignment expectations	49.1%	47.8%	54.1%	46.7%	65.8%	45.5%

Q4: Creation of Meaningful Information

	Core Designation					
	Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Total Count	394	46	62	15	37	234
Missing Count	9	1	2	1	2	3
Lacks the development of meaningful information or information is inconsistent with the evidence provided (Beginning)	41	9	1	2	3	26
Some creation of meaningful information consistent with the evidence provided (Developing)	158	13	27	6	11	101
Successful creation of meaningful information building on the evidence provided (Proficient)	195	24	34	7	23	107
Lacks the development of meaningful information or information is inconsistent with the evidence provided	10.4%	19.6%	1.6%	13.3%	8.1%	11.1%
Some creation of meaningful information consistent with the evidence provided	40.1%	28.3%	43.5%	40.0%	29.7%	43.2%
Successful creation of meaningful information building on the evidence provided	49.5%	52.2%	54.8%	46.7%	62.2%	45.7%

		Core Designation				
	Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Total Count	393	46	60	15	38	234
Missing Count	10	1	4	1	1	3
Lack of evaluation of evidence (Beginning)	48	11	2	1	3	31
Some indication of evaluation of evidence (Developing)	164	15	22	7	14	106
Appropriate evaluation of evidence (Proficient)	181	20	36	7	21	97
Lack of evaluation of evidence	12.2%	23.9%	3.3%	6.7%	7.9%	13.2%
Some indication of evaluation of evidence	41.7%	32.6%	36.7%	46.7%	36.8%	45.3%
Appropriate evaluation of evidence	46.1%	43.5%	60.0%	46.7%	55.3%	41.5%

Q5: Evaluation of Evidence

		Core Designation					
		Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Q6: Source Citation	Total Count	357	37	54	9	27	230
	Missing Count	46	10	10	7	12	7
	The source or the majority of sources are not cited(Beginning)	69	6	5	0	9	49
	Sources are cited and most seem appropriate for the assignment (Developing)	137	16	21	6	6	88
	Appropriate sources and citation for the assignment expectations (Proficient)	151	15	28	3	12	93
	The source or the majority of sources are not cited	19.3%	16.2%	9.3%	0.0%	33.3%	21.3%
	Sources are cited and most seem appropriate for the assignment	38.4%	43.2%	38.9%	66.7%	22.2%	38.3%
	Appropriate sources and citation for the assignment expectations	42.3%	40.5%	51.9%	33.3%	44.4%	40.4%

Q7: Assumptions

	Core Designation					
	Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Total Count	394	46	62	14	38	234
Missing Count	9	1	2	2	1	3
Assumptions, context or premises are not acknowledged (Beginning)	59	9	3	5	4	38
Assumptions, contexts or premises are alluded to (Developing)	165	18	26	6	19	96
Assumptions, contexts, or premises are clearly acknowledged (Proficient)	170	19	33	3	15	100
Assumptions, context or premises are not acknowledged	15.0%	19.6%	4.8%	35.7%	10.5%	16.2%
Assumptions, contexts or premises are alluded to	41.9%	39.1%	41.9%	42.9%	50.0%	41.0%
Assumptions, contexts, or premises are clearly acknowledged	43.1%	41.3%	53.2%	21.4%	39.5%	42.7%

		Core Designation					
		Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Q8: Analysis	Total Count	396	46	62	15	38	235
	Missing Count	7	1	2	1	1	2
	Little analysis and no clear conclusions (Beginning)	46	9	2	6	7	22
	Some analysis and construction or critique of an argument is present, but conclusions do not follow logically from the analysis or critique (Developing)	162	16	30	2	11	103
	Analysis and construction or critique of an argument or data is present and conclusions follow clearly (Proficient)	188	21	30	7	20	110
	Little analysis and no clear conclusions	11.6%	19.6%	3.2%	40.0%	18.4%	9.4%
	Some analysis and construction or critique of an argument is present, but conclusions do not follow logically from the analysis or critique	40.9%	34.8%	48.4%	13.3%	28.9%	43.8%
	Analysis and construction or critique of an argument or data is present and conclusions follow clearly	47.5%	45.7%	48.4%	46.7%	52.6%	46.8%

		Core Designation				
	Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Q9: Critique of Counter Argument						
Total Count	391	46	59	15	37	234
Missing Count	12	1	5	1	2	3
No acknowledgement of counterarguments or limitations of argument (Beginning)	132	25	17	6	10	74
Mention the existence of counterarguments or limitations of argument but do not address them specifically (Developing)	138	11	26	2	15	84
Respectfully address (consider, accommodate or incorporate) counterarguments or limitations of argument (Proficient)	121	10	16	7	12	76
No acknowledgement of counterarguments or limitations of argument	33.8%	54.3%	28.8%	40.0%	27.0%	31.6%
Mention the existence of counterarguments or limitations of argument but do not address them specifically	35.3%	23.9%	44.1%	13.3%	40.5%	35.9%
Respectfully address (consider, accommodate or incorporate) counterarguments or limitations of argument	30.9%	21.7%	27.1%	46.7%	32.4%	32.5%

		Core Designation					
		Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Q10: Asking and Answering Questions	Total Count	395	46	62	15	37	235
	Missing Count	8	1	2	1	2	2
	Lack of evidence of creative or innovative approaches to asking or answering questions (Beginning)	77	10	2	6	5	54
	Some evidence of creative or innovative approaches to either asking OR answering questions (Developing)	202	25	41	3	12	121
	Demonstration of creative or innovative approaches to asking AND answering questions (Proficient)	116	11	19	6	20	60
	Lack of evidence of creative or innovative approaches to asking or answering questions	19.5%	21.7%	3.2%	40.0%	13.5%	23.0%
	Some evidence of creative or innovative approaches to either asking OR answering questions	51.1%	54.3%	66.1%	20.0%	32.4%	51.5%
	Demonstration of creative or innovative approaches to asking AND answering questions	29.4%	23.9%	30.6%	40.0%	54.1%	25.5%

		Core Designation				
	Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Total Count	395	46	62	15	37	235
Missing Count	8	1	2	1	2	2
Lack of evidence of understanding of problems or solutions (Beginning)	58	8	1	4	7	38
Problems defined or solutions offered are well developed but may be limited in scope (Developing)	234	29	45	5	16	139
Problems defined or solutions proposed demonstrate innovative and original approach (Proficient)	103	9	16	6	14	58
Lack of evidence of understanding of problems or solutions	14.7%	17.4%	1.6%	26.7%	18.9%	16.2%
Problems defined or solutions offered are well developed but may be limited in scope	59.2%	63.0%	72.6%	33.3%	43.2%	59.1%
Problems defined or solutions proposed demonstrate innovative and original approach	26.1%	19.6%	25.8%	40.0%	37.8%	24.7%

Q11: Defining Problems and Identifying Solutions

		Core Designation					
		Total	**IA/RA**	**IH/RH**	**IN/RN**	**IS/RS**	**US**
Q12: Demonstrates Creation of Knowledge or Art	Total Count	392	46	60	15	37	234
	Missing Count	11	1	4	1	2	3
	Lack of evidence of creativity or innovation (Beginning)	76	9	4	2	13	48
	Some evidence of creativity or innovation, but may be limited in scope. (Developing)	226	24	38	11	16	137
	Demonstration of creating knowledge or art in a creative and/or innovative way. (Proficient)	90	13	18	2	8	49
	Lack of evidence of creativity or innovation	19.4%	19.6%	6.7%	13.3%	35.1%	20.5%
	Some evidence of creativity or innovation, but may be limited in scope.	57.7%	52.2%	63.3%	73.3%	43.2%	58.5%
	Demonstration of creating knowledge or art in a creative and/or innovative way.	23.0%	28.3%	30.0%	13.3%	21.6%	20.9%

Q14: Comments or suggestions pertinent to assessing "Thinking and Problem Solving"

Comment/Suggestion	**#**
Suggested altering assignment	8
Writing quality so poor hard to understand	6
Copy of Assignment needed	23
Positive comment about paper	3
Found assessment difficult because topic unfamiliar	2
Found it difficult to identify analysis in the artifact	1
Need to add "Not applicable option"	6
Believe student got the substantive content is wrong	3
Failure to acknowledge other possible explanations/opposing views	3
Inappropriate formatting or ineffective organization	2
Nothing critical or creative	2
No citations or references	3
Too general	2
TOTAL RESPONSES	64