

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Assessment of Student Learning Minutes  
(Inactive)

Assessment of Student Learning Committee  
(Inactive)

---

4-9-2019

### Assessment of Student Learning minutes 04/09/2019

Assessment of Student Learning Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as\\_stu\\_learn](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as_stu_learn)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Assessment of Student Learning Committee, "Assessment of Student Learning minutes 04/09/2019" (2019). *Assessment of Student Learning Minutes (Inactive)*. 149.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as\\_stu\\_learn/149](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/as_stu_learn/149)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Assessment of Student Learning Committee (Inactive) at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Assessment of Student Learning Minutes (Inactive) by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

**Assessment of Student Learning Committee**  
**April 9, 2019, 11:40am**  
**Humanities Bldg. 112**

Members present: Kristin Lamberty, Sara Carman, Tricia Rohloff, Argie Manolis, Viktor Berberi, Rebecca Dean, Rachel Johnson, Nade Sotirova, Simon Franco

Members absent: Nina Ortiz, Sheila Windingstad

Guests:

***In these minutes: Campus Student Learning Outcomes***

**Announcements**

- Sent out 7.12 request to Divisions
- From those attending the HLC Conference - confirmation that we need new CSLOs

**Approval of Minutes from March 12, 2019**

- [Link to minutes](#) - approved

**Models for Campus Student Learning Outcomes**

- [Compiled Feedback on the Proposed CSLOs](#)
- Model 1: Original Model
  - This model can work well with the AAC&U rubrics
  - We can create some more general, universal rubrics from the AAC&U rubrics, perhaps by breaking them into component parts
- Model 2: “Humanities” Model
  - We agree that we should change the language in this model and the first model to say “multidisciplinary” rather than “interdisciplinary”
  - It should be clear that a student’s work can be interdisciplinary without requiring that all faculty teach or do research that is interdisciplinary
- Model 3: Curriculum Committee “Combination” Model
  - Rebecca will create a Google doc where we can work on this
  - The subcategories could include the well-supported outcomes from our current CSLOs as well as the new models
  - Several members of the community object to “Citizen” as a category label. “Citizenship” may be acceptable, but still has political meanings that might be off-putting. There was also an objection to “Steward”. Can we either come up with new words or perhaps define the categories but ask our marketing people to come up with appropriate labels? There was a general sense that Humanities faculty, in particular, would not want to vote on a model until they knew which words were going to be used.
  - We need to focus on development - introduce, reinforce, or emphasize (not master) skills and knowledge. CSLOs aren’t about what students are introduced to in the GenEd program. The CSLOs reflect that students are given developmental possibilities in all of these categories. We can look at how students develop over time, which can help us develop and improve our curriculum.
  - It will be helpful to show how the old CSLOs correspond to the new ones
  - Can we have a Venn diagram that shows the 3 categories, with the overlaps also labeled. Communication should be in the middle
- Model 4: A. Kildegaard the first - we did not have time to discuss this model

- Model 5: A. Kildegaard the second
  - This appears to be more a description of our curriculum than a set of outcomes. The CSLOs are meant to include both curricular and co-curricular aspects of education. There is no co-curricular component here.
  - Intended focus is on process not outcomes? If we assess by checking off boxes (student took these classes, finished this major) then it's not assessment. Assessment would require all majors, for example, to prove mastery of the field beyond merely grades.
  - Does not allow for a more developmental focus on improving curriculum and learning.
- Current CSLOs.
  - They speak to many of the same topics as the new CSLO models. Can we show how a new "combine" model, as suggested by Curriculum Committee, could subsume these?
  - As with model one, we can use AAC&U rubrics, but would need a lot of centralization to systematically apply them. If the newer CSLOs are more general (basically, getting rid of the bullet points), then we could apply a similar approach as suggested above under Model 1.
  - Some ideas to make the current CSLOs better:
    - Get rid of the language that suggests they are not required by all students
    - Get rid of the bullet points
    - Shift the first category so it isn't just about fulfilling the curriculum
    - If our objection is to the language, then perhaps we can talk to marketing or specialists in that issue, rather than changing the content of the categories
    - Could we replace all the categories with a list of 12-15 bulleted outcomes? The concern is that this would lead us back to our current situation, where we have too many CSLOs to easily assess.

### **Final Vote on Campus Student Learning Outcomes**

- We were not able to finish our work on the models in order to vote
- Rebecca will create a Google Doc so we can collaborate on this between meetings
- We will either vote next meeting, vote over email, or hold a special off-schedule meeting to vote, depending on what we learn from those who attended the HLC conference about how critical it is for these CSLOs to be in place before the Fall.

Date of next meeting (if known): April 23, 2019

Adjournment time: 12:40

Submitted by Rebecca Dean

Date submitted to Digital Well