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INTRODUCTION

Fall 2016 brought exciting opportunities for the continuation of the CRITICAL CORE Initiative (CCI)! We began the semester with several tasks and objectives. This report outlines and provides the outcomes of the CCI.

First and foremost the Communications Team, in collaboration with the Faculty Council, the College Consultant Council, and the Leadership Advisory Board, created a justifications document, outlining and articulating the alignment with employer needs and national initiatives (see pages 5-7). Next, via the same collaboration, a decision was made regarding the specific language for syllabi to articulate to students the purpose and process of CCI (see page 15-17).

A major event for Fall 2016 was the General Education Pilot and Assessment Day. The purpose, process and outcomes of these two events are summarized in pages 26-29.

Additionally, the Assessment Team, the Student Engagement Team, the Advising Team, the Professional Development Team, and the Communications Team had additional objectives, and met those (pages 15-25).

Going forth for the Spring 2017 semester, the CCI is piloting three programs of study, continuing the work of Faculty Liaison Teams (specific to identifying instructional strategies for CCI Key Indicators), helping General Education Foundation courses identify Signature Assignments, and finalizing the assessment/improvement plan for the GEF.

Program specialists created a process for course mapping. Over 500 courses have been aligned (including those in the General Education Foundation). Division directors identified faculty leads for each of the disciplines in the arts and sciences courses. Division Directors also identified faculty leads in the program of study areas for programs slated to be aligned in the Fall. The project specialists for the general education foundation/programs of study contacted the faculty leads and provided an overview of the CRITICAL CORE. The goal of the CRITICAL CORE initiative is for breadth of exposure to the competencies; thus, competencies were mapped by the Executive Leadership Advisory Board, in close conversation with deans, to possible course exposure points in the AA and AS degrees and also. Therefore, each of the arts and sciences courses were already mapped to a corresponding competency based on the placement of the course in the AA / AS degrees. Programs of study have been asked to provide a second exposure outside the General Education Foundation to the competencies and thus faculty leads were asked to align courses with this requirement in mind. Customized playbooks were made for each discipline/program, and the faculty leads were asked to meet with the full-time faculty members of their discipline to determine the appropriate key indicator for their course within their identified competency. Leads were followed up with during the semester, and all arts and science courses that were asked to align their courses by the deadline. The only arts and science course to not align was Geography, which was identified by the project specialists as being a better fit to align with the programs of study in the Spring of 2017. After completing alignment, courses were confirmed to be in the appropriate competency and key indicators. A few courses in the arts and sciences
were identified as needing to be updated (to align to the correct competency) and are being updated in the Spring 2017 semester. Faculty leads within the program of study being aligned were also asked to complete their alignment by the deadline, of which all did.

A great deal of work has been done and continues to be done, by faculty and staff who are committed to the mission of providing Central Piedmont Community College students the skills required for personal, academic, and professional success!
PROVIDING STUDENTS THE 21ST CENTURY SKILLS REQUIRED FOR PERSONAL, ACADEMIC, AND PROFESSIONAL SUCCESS

95% of employers give hiring preference to college graduates with skills that will enable them to contribute to innovation in the workplace\(^1\).

93% of employers say that a “demonstrated capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve problems is more important than [a candidate’s] undergraduate major\(^2\).

9 in 10 of employers say it is important that those they hire demonstrate ethical judgement and integrity; intercultural skills; and the capacity for continued learning.\(^3\)

Additional information provided by the AAC&U\(^4\) indicates the top ten things employers look for in new graduates (information in parenthesis reflects the specific CRITICAL CORE Competency by which CPCC ensures this developed skill):

1. The ability to work well in teams—especially with people different from yourself (Personal Growth and Cultural Literacy)
2. An understanding of science and technology and how these subjects are used in real-world settings (Information Technology and Quantitative Literacy)
3. The ability to write and speak well (Communication)
4. The ability to think clearly about complex problems (Critical Thinking)
5. The ability to analyze a problem to develop workable solutions (Critical Thinking)
6. An understanding of the global context in which work is now done (Personal Growth and Cultural Literacy)
7. The ability to be creative and innovative in solving problems (Information Technology and Quantitative Literacy)
8. The ability to apply knowledge and skills in new settings (Critical Thinking)
9. The ability to understand numbers and statistics (Information Technology and Quantitative Literacy)
10. A strong sense of ethics and integrity (Personal Growth and Cultural Literacy)

The CRITICAL CORE emphasizes the attainment of 21st century skills that are expected by employers and four-year transfer educational institutions, and are required for personal, academic, and professional success. The CRITICAL CORE Competencies reflect CPCC Institutional Learning Outcomes, and emphasize that our students must attain proficiency in four CRITICAL CORE skill areas: Communication, Information

---

\(^1\) Information obtained from a 2013 study conducted on behalf of AAC&U.
\(^2\) Information obtained from a 2013 study conducted on behalf of AAC&U.
\(^3\) Information obtained from a 2013 study conducted on behalf of AAC&U. [https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/it-takes-more-major-employer-priorities-college-learning-and](https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/it-takes-more-major-employer-priorities-college-learning-and)
\(^4\) Information obtained from [http://www.aacu.org/leap/students/employers-top-ten](http://www.aacu.org/leap/students/employers-top-ten).
Technology & Quantitative Literacy, Personal Growth & Cultural Literacy, and Critical Thinking.

The CRITICAL CORE Initiative encompasses the essential elements of key indicators, signature rubrics, and signature assignments all reflective of national organization standards and initiatives, including:

The Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP): The “Degree Qualifications Profile” is a nationally recognized initiative guiding institutions of higher education towards models that assure students gain the 21st century skills that are in demand from both employers and the world at large. The DQP provides a guide for institutions of higher education who are proactive in making sure that students are prepared for success, both academically and professionally. Currently, the DQP is used in some form at over 400 colleges and universities in the United States. CRITICAL CORE was informed in part by DQP research and the 21st century skills it outlines in order to best prepare our students for an ever-evolving and globalized workforce. To read the DQP online, visit this link: http://degreeprofile.org/.

Liberal Education & America’s Promise (LEAP): “Liberal Education and America’s Promise,” a concentrated effort championed by the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) to proactively develop well-rounded, job-ready college graduates, is similar to the DQP in that they both have, as their central focus, the notion that students should possess a certain set of skills that will aid them as they enter the workforce. The central components of LEAP include: Essential Learning Outcomes; Principles of Excellence; High-Impact Educational Practices; Authentic Assessments; Students’ Signature Work. The concept of “Signature” rubrics and assignments have been vital to the development of CRITICAL CORE, and the remaining tenets of LEAP have greatly influenced our approach to the initiative. To read more about LEAP, visit this link: https://www.aacu.org/leap

Other national organization standards reflected in the CRITICAL CORE Initiative design:
- National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA)
- The Institute for Evidence-Based Change (IEBC)
- The Lumina Foundation – General Education Maps and Markers
- AAC&U Value Rubrics
- AAC&U Multistate Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC)

Reviews of these nationally-recognized best practice efforts--examined in conjunction with other colleges and universities who have similar goals that have developed an approach comparable to what CPCC has designated as its objective--have shaped the design, function, and purpose of CRITICAL CORE. It is important to note that information from employers has played a crucial role in the creation of the aforementioned resources. Conversations and feedback from CPCC faculty and reflections from the initial pilot in the 2016-2017 academic year have also greatly influenced the design of CRITICAL CORE.

Questions, Comments, Feedback?
Email us at critical.core@cpcc.edu or visit our website: www.cpcc.edu/criticalcore

---

CRITICAL CORE GOVERNANCE

Leadership:

- Terina Lathe – Project Director
- Shantell Strickland-Davis – Project Manager
- Jennifer Hejazi (Gibson) – Project Specialist, General Education Foundation
- Jeri Guido – Project Specialist, Programs of Study
- Chris Flowers – Faculty Liaison Team Chair
CRITICAL CORE FULL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

SHAWN ALLISON  CATHERINE FELTON  LISA LIST  JOY SCOTT
JOEY ANDERSON  CHRIS FLOWERS  DEBBIE LORD  VICTORIA SCOTT
CARL ARRINGTON  ALISON GAGAN  SUZANNE MARCOUX  VICKY SEMPLE
LAURA BAZAN  JB GAMMON  DIANNE MATTHEWS  ANASA SENGA
JIM BAZAN  JENNIFER GIBSON  EDITH MCLEROY  KEITH SHANNON
RYAN BEAN  LISA GODWIN  RINAV MCLEROY  ASHLEY SHERILL
TONY BEATTY  CHRIS GOENNER  CHRISTOPHER MEISTER  DENA SHONTS
MALLORY BENZ  JENIFFER GRAHAM  KAREN MERRIMAN  STEFNEY SIMPSON
DAVID BLACK  MIKE GRIER  MATT MILLER  ROCHELLE STEPHENS
KELLY BLACK  JERI GUIDO  KIMBERLY MILLER  KAREN STREPPA
COURTNEE BONDS  TERESA HALL  ELIZABETH MITCHELL  SHANTELL
KARA BOSCH  ELIZABETH HAMRICK  STACEY MOORE  STRICKLAND-DAVIS
BRAD BOSTIAN  ADAM HARRIS  LINDA MOORER  STEVEN SULLIVAN
JIM BOWEN  RUTH HEDGEPETH  ANGELINA OBERDAN  KAREN SUMMERS
MARY BRADHAM  MARK HELMS  LYNN ORDOYNE  OWEN SUTKOWSKI
CHRIS BRAWLEY  GEORGE HENDERSON  DARRIEN PAGE  FRANKIE TACK
AMY BRUINING  PAT HENDRICKSON  YANESSA PAGE  KELLY TRAINOR
AMANDA  GREG HIGGENS  CHRIS PAYNTER  MELISSA VRANA
CAPOBIANCHI  MIKE HOGAN  KEITH POWELL  KATHY WATKINS
KENT CASHION  DONNA HOUSMAN  MIKE PUTTS  DENISE WELLS
MARcia COLSON  LUVON HUDSON  CATALINA RAMIREZ  KATHRYN WELLS
MARK COLTRAIN  TODD HUERTA  MELANIE REDDRICK  ELIZABETH WEST
KENN COMPTON  LAUREN JACKSON  NICHOLAS RIGGINS  LINDA WHITE
JENNIFER CONWAY  CAROLYN JACOBS  GARY RITTER  SARAH WILDE
RICK COULTER  BRUCE JOHNSON  TIMOTHY ROBINSON  WILLIE WILLIAMS
ROB CRAIG  CONNIE JOHNSTON  NADINE RUSSELL  TAMARA WILLIAMS
CATHEY CURTIS  MARY KANTOR  THERESA RUSSO  CHRISTIE WILLIAMS
RITA DAWKINS  GLORIA KELLY  MANDY SAUNDERS  LINDSAY WILLIS
ALLAN DIDONATO  MARY KILBURN  JEFF SCAGGS  HOLLY WOODRUFF
LINDA DUNHAM  PAUL KOEHNKE  ANDREW SCHENECK  ALAN YAMAMOTO
TONY EMETU  TERINA LATHE  JULIET LAUGHLIN  JANEL YOWELL
JASMIN FEIMSTER
CRITICAL CORE COLLEGE COUNCIL

LAURA BAZAN  PAT HENDRICKSON  MANDY SAUNDERS
COURTNEE BONDS  MIKE HOGAN  ANASA SENGAL
JIM BOWEN  BRUCE JOHNSON  KEITH SHANNON
AMY BRUINING  MARY-MARGARET KANTOR  DENA SHONTS
AMANDA CAPOBIANCHI  GLORIA KELLY  KAREN SUMMERS
MARCIA COLSON  PAUL KOEHNKE  OWEN SUTKOWSKI
MARK COLTRAIN  RINAV MEHTA  KELVIN THOMPSON
KENN COMPTON  KAREN MERRIMAN  KELLY TRAINOR
RITA DAWKINS  ELIZABETH MITCHELL  MELISSA VRANA
ELIZABETH HAMRICK  CHRIS PAYNTER  DENISE WELLS
RUTH HEDGEPETH  CATALINA RAMIREZ  TAMARA WILLIAMS
MARK HELMS  NICHOLAS RIGGINS  ALAN YAMAMOTO
GEORGE HENDERSON  NADINE RUSSELL

Role/Responsibilities:

1. Attends CC Consultant Council meetings, and participates as requested in CRITICAL CORE Initiative activities.
2. Acts as an advocate and liaison for the CRITICAL CORE Initiative, specifically as it relates to the sharing and dissemination of information regarding the CRITICAL CORE Initiative.
3. Represents specific areas in the college, and provides concerns and questions regarding the planning and implementation of the CRITICAL CORE.
4. Reviews reports shared by the CRITICAL CORE Project/Pilot Specialists, CRITICAL CORE Initiative Teams (Advising, Assessment, Communications, PD, and Student Engagement), and Faculty Liaison Teams.
5. In collaboration with other members and areas of the college, seeks and recommends consensus-based options regarding the planning and implementation of the CRITICAL CORE.
CRITICAL CORE FACULTY COUNCIL

TONY BEATTY          TERESA HALL          KEITH POWERLL
RICK COULTER         CAROLYN JACOBS       THERESA RUSSO
LINDA DUNHAM         JULIET LAUGHLIN       KATHY WATKINS
JB GAMMON            SUZANNE MARCOUX      ELIZABETH WEST
CHRIS GOENNER        MATT MILLER          CHRISTIE WILLIAMS

Roles/Responsibilities:
1. Attends CC Faculty Council meetings, and participates as requested in CRITICAL CORE Initiative activities.
2. Acts as an advocate and liaison for the CRITICAL CORE Initiative, specifically as it relates to the sharing and dissemination of information regarding the CRITICAL CORE Initiative.
3. Reviews reports shared by the CRITICAL CORE Consultants Council, Project/Pilot Specialists, CRITICAL CORE Initiative Teams (Advising, Assessment, Communications, PD, and Student Engagement), and Faculty Liaison Teams.
4. In collaboration with other members and areas of the college, seeks and recommends consensus-based options regarding the planning and implementation of the CRITICAL CORE.
FACULTY LIAISON TEAM LEADERS: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Faculty Liaison Team Chair: Chris Flowers

Communication Faculty Liaison Team Leader: Jennifer Graham
Critical Thinking Faculty Liaison Team Leader: Jen Gibson
Information Technology and Quantitative Literacy Faculty Liaison Team Leader: Joey Anderson
Personal Growth and Cultural Literacy Faculty Liaison Team Leader: Chris Brawley

FACULTY LIAISON TEAM LEADER ROLE/RESPONSIBILITY:

1. Act as advocate and liaison for CRITICAL CORE Initiative
2. Attend and participate in all CCI applicable meetings
3. In collaboration with Faculty Liaison Chair, arrange, guide, and co-lead monthly Faculty Liaison Team members
4. Initiate and maintain regular correspondence with Faculty Liaison Team members, to ensure faculty engagement and understanding of the CRITICAL CORE Initiative
5. Attend and complete required training
6. Ensure Completion of Deliverables
   a. Faculty Reflection regarding participation in Fall Pilot
   b. Documentation of faculty experience with pilot
      i. Key Indicators
      ii. Signature Rubrics
      iii. Signature Assignments
      iv. Weighting of Signature Assignments
      v. Impact on Teaching
      vi. Experience of students
   c. Participation in Fall Pilot
      i. Assist with documentation of faculty participation
      ii. Assist in assessment of Pilot results
      iii. Assist in producing and sharing reports of the pilot
FACULTY LIAISON TEAM MEMBERS: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Faculty Liaison Team Objectives:
1. Via discussion and reflection, provide an understanding of the GEF Pilot
2. Provide recommendations regarding Key Indicators, Signature Rubrics, and Signature Assignments
3. Attain necessary understanding, via training, of how to utilize Key Indicators, Signature Rubrics, and Signature Assignments
4. Provide suggestions, per area, regarding the establishment of Signature Assignments and consistent weighting

Faculty Liaison Team Member Roles and Responsibilities
1. Act as advocate for CRITICAL THINKING Initiative
2. Attend and participate in all CCI applicable meetings
3. Act as Faculty Liaison, dissemination information to fellow faculty, via program/division meetings, and reporting back questions and concerns
4. Attend monthly meeting
5. Attend and complete required training
6. Complete reflection documentation regarding participation of FLT and Pilot
7. Participate in Pilot
8. Participate in End-of-Semester Assessment (Pilot)
FACULTY LIAISON TEAM MEMBERS:

COMMUNICATION
Chair: JENNIFER GRAHAM
- ROB CRAIG
- CATHERINE FELTON
- JENNIFER GRAHAM
- LYNN ORDOYNE
- TIMOTHY ROBINSON
- VICKY SEMPLE
- ASHLEY SHERRIL
- LINDA WHITE
- LINDSAY WILLIS

PERSONAL GROWTH AND CULTURAL LITERACY
Chair: CHRIS BRAWLEY
- CHRIS BRAWLEY
- ALLAN DIDONATO
- LINDA DUNHAM
- TONY EMETU
- LAUREN JACKSON
- CAROLYN JACOBS
- MARY KILBURN
- JULIET LAUGHLIN
- SUZANNE MARCOUX
- CHRISTOPHER MEISTER
- YANESSA PAGE
- THERESA RUSSO
- FRANKIE TACK

CRITICAL THINKING
Chair: JEN GIBSON
- DAVID BLACK
- RICK COULTER
- JENNIFER GIBSON
- LISA GODWIN
- CHRIS GOENNER
- STACEY MOORE
- KEITH POWELL
- JEFF SCAGGS
- ROCHELLA STEPHENS
- KATHRYN WELLS
- HOLLY WOODRUFF

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND QUANTITATIVE LITERACY
Chair: JOEY ANDERSON
- JOEY ANDERSON
- JIM BAZAN
- RYAN BEAN
- MARY BRADHAM
- JASMIN FEIMSTER
- ALISON GAGAN
- JB GAMMON
- DIANNE MATTHEWS
- KIMBERLY MILLER
- STEVEN SULLIVAN
- KATHY WATKINS
COMMUNICATIONS AND MARKETING TEAM

Team Leader:
- ROB CRAIG

Team Members:
- MALLORY BENZ
- CHRIS FLOWERS
- MIKE GRIER
- JENN CONWAY

Objectives/Goals:
1. Proposal process for creation and dissemination of information
2. Language modification regarding CCI
3. Suggestions for Syllabus Inclusion (language)
4. Identification of target groups/audiences
5. Proposal of specific avenues to disseminate information to target groups/audiences
   Creation of target audience materials

Updates:
The Communications and Marketing sub-team led by Rob Craig, successfully completed their objectives for the 2016-2017 academic year in the Fall 2016 semester. Their objectives included making recommendations for syllabus language, audience specific marketing materials, and a student facing language for future CRITICAL CORE materials. Team members (faculty and staff), worked collaboratively to provide two examples of syllabus language, prototypes for the student facing CC bookmarks, and ideas for future marketing materials.

CRITICAL CORE SYLLABUS LANGUAGE
SUBMITTED BY THE CCI COMMUNICATIONS AND MARKETING TEAM

SYLLABUS LANGUAGE FOR ALL COURSES: This is the language to replace the old CORE4 language in course syllabi.

CRITICAL CORE
Central Piedmont Community College has identified Communication, Critical Thinking, Personal Growth & Cultural Literacy, and Information Technology & Quantitative Literacy as 21st century skills expected by both employers and four-year educational institutions. All graduates are required to complete course work that demonstrates acquisition of these critical core competencies, which are crucial to personal, academic, and professional success. These competencies are demonstrated throughout the content of the course, discipline or program of study, and complement basic program knowledge and application.
SYLLABUS LANGUAGE FOR COURSES THAT ARE PART OF THE PILOT: This is the language to be used in course syllabi for courses that are participating in the piloting of the CRITICAL CORE.

CRITICAL CORE

Central Piedmont Community College has identified Communication, Critical Thinking, Personal Growth & Cultural Literacy, and Information Technology & Quantitative Literacy as 21st century skills expected by both employers and four-year educational institutions. All graduates are required to complete course work that demonstrates acquisition of these critical core competencies, which are crucial to personal, academic, and professional success. These competencies are demonstrated throughout the content of the course, discipline or program of study, and complement basic program knowledge and application.

COURSE TITLE is aligned with COMPETENCY TITLE (INPUT COMPETENCY DEFINITION), and will focus on providing students the opportunity to attain and document the following ability: KEY INDICATOR.

The following rubric illustrates your expected path of growth in the competency: (WILL VARY BY KEY INDICATOR AND ALIGNED RUBRIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY TITLE</th>
<th>KEY INDICATOR**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"Reprinted [or Excerpted] with permission from Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement: Tips and tools for Using Rubrics, edited by Terrel L. Rhodes. Copyright 2010 by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.”

The (INPUT TITLE OF SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT) (see syllabus for details) will be utilized to assess your level of proficiency. This assignment is worth (INPUT WEIGHT) % of your final grade.

EXAMPLE—

CRITICAL CORE

Central Piedmont Community College has identified Communication, Critical Thinking, Personal Growth & Cultural Literacy, and Information Technology & Quantitative Literacy as 21st century skills expected by both employers and four-year educational institutions. All graduates are required to complete course work that demonstrates acquisition of these critical core competencies, which are crucial to personal, academic, and professional success. These competencies are demonstrated throughout the content of the course, discipline or program of study, and complement basic program knowledge and application.
program of study, and complement basic program knowledge and application.

**Introduction to Sociology** is aligned with **CRITICAL THINKING** (defined as the ability to interpret, analyze, synthesize, or evaluate information, issues and ideas and apply creative thought to formulate an opinion, solve a problem or reach a conclusion), and will focus on providing students the opportunity to attain and document the following ability: **student selects and uses information appropriately to investigates a point of view or conclusion**.

The following rubric illustrates your expected path of growth in the competency: **(WILL VARY BY KEY INDICATOR AND ALIGNED RUBRIC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL THINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SELECTS AND USES INFORMATION APPROPRIATELY TO INVESTIGATES A POINT OF VIEW OR CONCLUSION **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>EMERGING</th>
<th>PROFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation and/or evaluation.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation and/or evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation and/or evaluation to develop a coherent analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.</td>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation and/or evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation and/or evaluation to develop a coherent analysis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation and/or evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning</td>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Reprinted [or Excerpted] with permission from Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement: Tips and tools for Using Rubrics, edited by Terrel L. Rhodes. Copyright 2010 by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.”**

The **Final Reflection Paper** (see syllabus for details) will be utilized to assess your level of proficiency. **This assignment is worth 10% of your final grade.**
ADVISING TEAM:

Team Leader:
- HOWARD BYRD

Team Members:
- TODD HUERTA
- SERENA JOHNSON
- CONNIE JOHNSTON
- MIKE PUTTS
- TIEREN SCOTT
- VICTORIA SCOTT
- STEFNEY SIMPSON
- KELVIN THOMPSON
- JANAEL YOWELL

Objectives/Goals:
1. Plan for advisors to be engaged and participate in CCI
2. Suggestions for advisor-specific training materials/content
3. In collaboration with the PD and Communication/Marketing Teams, creation of advisor-specific resources

Updates:
The Counseling and Advising sub-team led by Howard Byrd, have successfully completed their objectives for the 2016-2017 academic year. Their objectives included making recommendations for advisor engagement with the CRITICAL CORE, and building a professional development day specifically geared to ensuring counselors and advisors understand and can speak to students about the importance of the CRITICAL CORE competencies. The PD day, scheduled for February 10, 2017, was approved and is supported by the Associate Vice President for Student Success Services.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT TEAM

Team Leader:
- AMANDA CAPOBIANCHI

Team Members:
- JOEY ANDERSON
- CARL ARRINGTON
- BRAD BOSTIAN
- MARCIA COLSON
- KEITH POWELL
- ANDREW SCHENCK
- JOY SCOTT
- DENA SHONTS
- KAREN STREPP
- WILLIE WILLIAMS

Objectives/Goals:
1. Plan for student engagement
   a. At college level
   b. At course level
c. At program level
  d. Within Co-Curricular activities

2. Plan for student participation in CCI
3. Proposal for student feedback mechanism
4. In collaboration with Communication and Marketing Team, creation of information targeted to student population
5. Suggestions for continued student engagement
6. Alignment of CCI to Co-Curricular activities and opportunities

UPDATES:
The Student Engagement sub-team led by Amanda Capobianchi, served in a consultative role for the other CRITICAL CORE Initiative sub-teams, making recommendations and providing feedback on student engagement opportunities during the Fall 2016 semester. Their objective for the Spring 2017 semester includes the planning and implementation for the 1st annual CRITICAL CORE Symposium, a college-wide event targeted to spreading the mission and vision of the CRITICAL CORE. This event is scheduled for August 2017.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEAM

Team Leader:
- MARK COLTRAIN

Team Members:
- SHAWN ALLISON
- MARK COLTRAIN
- DONNA HOUSMAN
- LISA LIST
- DEBBIE LORD
- ANGELINA OBERDAN
- DARRIEN PAGE
- FRANKIE TACK
- SARAH WILDE

Objectives/Goals:
1. Review current training available, regarding CCI
2. Suggest modifications to available training regarding CCI
3. Suggest comprehensive plan and model for new CCI Professional Development
4. Suggest policy and procedures regarding CCI Professional Development.

UPDATES:
The Professional Development sub-team led by Mark Coltrain and Sarah Wilde, successfully completed their objectives for the 2016-2017 academic year in the Fall 2016 semester. Their objectives included conducting an assessment of training needs for college stakeholders and recommending a comprehensive Professional Development plan for the CRITICAL CORE Initiative. Team members (including faculty and staff), worked collaboratively to provide recommendations for faculty development, staff engagement with the CRITICAL CORE, and a comprehensive plan for employee online learning development. Because of the detail and
structure provided in the PD plan, many of the recommendations have been put forth and are being planned and/or implemented in the Spring 2017 semester. A complete listing of the planned professional development is available upon request.

ASSESSMENT TEAM:

Team Leaders:
- TERINA LATHE
- LISA GODWIN

Team Members:
- KARA BOSCH
- GREG HIGGENS
- LUVON HUDSON
- JULIET LAUGHLIN
- SUZANNE MARCOUX
- GARY RITTER
- TIMOTHY ROBINSON
- ROCHELLA STEPHENS
- KATHY WATKINS
- DENISE WELLS
- LINDA WHITE
- LINDSAY WILLIS

Objectives/Goals:
Reviews research-based literature and model assessment plans to provide suggestions and recommendations for the CRITICAL CORE Assessment Plan”

1. Using research-based literature and best-practices, suggest sampling process for GEF assessment
2. Using research-based literature and best-practices, suggest technical and technological requirements/processes for GEF assessment
3. Using research-based literature and best-practices, suggest technical and technological requirements/processes for Programs of Study assessment
4. Using research-based literature and best-practices, provide suggestions for data analysis and reporting
CRITICAL CORE: ASSESSMENT MODEL
SUBMITTED BY THE CCI ASSESSMENT TEAM

THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT OUTLINES THE SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT MODEL AGREED UPON BY THE CCI ASSESSMENT TEAM, FALL 2016

**MODIFICATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE SINCE DECEMBER 2016. FOR UPDATED PLANS, PLEASE CONTACT THE PROJECT DIRECTOR**
ANALYSIS PROCESS

1. COLLECTION OF STUDENT LEARNING DATA--STUDENT SCORES

WHAT IS IT?
A collection and compilation of student scores on signature assignments, utilizing signature rubrics, as a means to understand student attainment of CRITICAL CORE skills.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE?
To provide a consistent and reliable understanding of student attainment of CRITICAL CORE skills, reviewed by faculty, for the purpose of creating an annual improvement plan.

HOW WOULD THIS BE ACCOMPLISHED?
All curriculum courses will have an identified signature assignment (a common assignment to be used consistently across all course section offerings, and weighed the same in all course section offerings) that best captures student attainment of the skill associated with the key indicator.

Signature assignments will be tagged in blackboard. This process is similar to that used for the EVA. The learning management system then provides both a means to capture student scores and is a repository for student learning artifacts.

Faculty, utilizing the signature rubric for the key indicator will assess the signature assignment, and provide/input into the grade column, a score (0-4).

Faculty may use whatever additional grading rubric/scale for the assignment, in order to provide students a grade for the signature assignment. However, in regards to the CRITICAL CORE assessment model, the assigned score (0-4) must be apparent in the gradebook.

Scores can then be compiled and reported out, via blackboard analytics.

These scores will provide an understanding of student attainment at the course, discipline, program, and college level.

2. DATA VALIDATION--FACULTY REVIEW OF ARTIFACTS OF LEARNING

WHAT IS IT?
Discipline and program faculty opportunities for an “in-house” peer-faculty review of student learning.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE?
The purpose of having fellow peer faculty complete a review of the student learning is not to second-guess or evaluate the instructional strategies of faculty.

The purpose is to provide faculty within a discipline and/or program the opportunity to consider the following:

- How well are our students attaining the skill associated with a particular key indicator?
- As a group of faculty teaching a specific course, how do we define this skill in regards to course/program content?
- As a group of faculty teaching a specific course, what instructional strategies (i.e., changes to the signature assignment) can we identify to ensure the best opportunity for students to attain this skill?
- Given these discussions and reflections, what suggestions can we make, at the discipline/program level, to improve student attainment of CRITICAL CORE skills?
HOW WOULD IT BE ACCOMPLISHED?

EXAMPLE A: Faculty may review a sampling of student work with their peers to discuss how a particular key indicator looks within their classes, and/or what their own expectations, as a group, should be concerning attainment of the key indicator.

EXAMPLE B: If artifacts of learning are not readily available, for example, in the case that students are demonstrating a key indicator and the demonstration cannot be captured, a faculty member could invite other faculty to attend a demonstration. Similar to example a, the significance of this peer review is the discussions among faculty, following the opportunity to view student learning.

- In either case, this peer review would be planned and arranged by division directors/program chairs, and subsequent suggestions for improvement will be compiled and considered for inclusion of the healthy programs review.
- Subsequent reviews will include an evaluation of the improvement plan.
- Should the improvement plan include institutional changes (i.e., college-wide training, college-wide production of student resources, changes to key indicator alignment), approval will be required by the CRITICAL CORE leadership team and the learning unit.

3. DATA VALIDATION-- INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW OF ARTIFACTS OF LEARNING

WHAT IS IT?
An interdisciplinary validation of student learning, that utilizes the faculty liaison teams, to review artifacts of student learning*.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE?
The purpose of having interdisciplinary faculty complete a review of the student learning is not to second-guess or evaluate the instructional strategies of faculty. The purpose is to provide an understanding of how well the college is establishing consistent expectations of skill development across courses, discipline, and programs. Specific questions, given an interdisciplinary review would include the following:

- To what extent can an outsider (a faculty member outside of the discipline/program) see student skill attainment?
- As a college, how consistent are our expectations regarding skill development?
- What variations are apparent in skill development?
- What instructional strategies can we suggest to ensure the best opportunity for students to attain this skill?
- Given these discussions and reflections, what suggestions can we make, as an institution, to improve student attainment of CRITICAL CORE skills?

HOW WOULD IT BE ACCOMPLISHED?

GENERAL EDUCATION FOUNDATION:

- A sampling of student work (pulled via blackboard analytics or via recorded/live demonstration*) is reviewed by the appropriate faculty liaison team, during a CRITICAL CORE assessment day.
- The faculty liaison teams provide a cross-discipline, cross-program perception of skill development, and via discussions, provide suggestions for instructional and assessment strategies.
• The general education foundation review is completed in January, using fall artifacts of learning and is completed under the direction of the general education foundation subcommittee.
• The general education foundation subcommittee provides analysis and feedback to disciplines/faculty that are included in the general education foundation in March.
• The general education foundation subcommittee, in collaboration with appropriate disciplines and faculty, creates an improvement plan (completed by April), to be implemented the following fall.
• Subsequent reviews will include an evaluation of the improvement plan.
• Should the improvement plan include institutional changes (i.e., college-wide training, college-wide production of student resources, changes to key indicator alignment), approval will be required by the CRITICAL CORE leadership team and the learning unit.

*if artifacts of learning are not readily available, for example, in the case that students are demonstrating a key indicator and the demonstration cannot be captured, a faculty member could invite faculty liaison team members to attend a demonstration. Another option is to identify early enough in the semester a sampling of such courses, and instruct faculty to record students demonstrating the skill, and those recordings would be reviewed by the faculty liaison teams.

PROGRAMS OF STUDY:
Sampling of student work (pulled via blackboard analytics or via recorded/live demonstration)
• A sampling of student work (pulled via blackboard analytics or via recorded/live demonstration*) is reviewed by the appropriate faculty liaison team, during scheduled events (planned and scheduled by division directors/program chairs).
• The faculty liaison teams provide a cross-discipline, cross-program perception of skill development, and in discussion and collaboration with program faculty, suggest instructional and assessment strategies.
• Programs of study, under the direction/guidance of the division director/program chair, will determine when and how faculty liaison teams can best collaborate with program faculty for an interdisciplinary review.
• Programs of study will include the results of the interdisciplinary review and subsequent suggestions for improvement as part of the healthy programs review.
• Subsequent reviews will include an evaluation of the improvement plan.
• Should the improvement plan include institutional changes (i.e., college-wide training, college-wide production of student resources, changes to key indicator alignment), approval will be required by the CRITICAL CORE leadership team and the learning unit.

*if artifacts of learning are not readily available, for example, in the case that students are demonstrating a key indicator and the demonstration cannot be captured, a faculty member could invite faculty liaison team members to attend a demonstration. Another option is to identify early enough in the semester a sampling of such courses, and instruct faculty to record students demonstrating the skill, and those recordings would be reviewed by the faculty liaison teams.
FALL 2016 PILOT

The CRITICAL CORE Initiative Leadership Team is dedicated to ensuring that the CRITICAL CORE Initiative is faculty-led and college-engaged. The Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 Pilots are testaments to this process.

The Fall 2016 Pilot had the following goals (to be attained via the discussions of Faculty Liaison Teams, the faculty reflections, and the Assessment Day results):

-Ascertain the experience of faculty regarding the appropriateness of Key Indicators
-Ascertain the experience of faculty regarding the alignment of Key Indicators to General Education Foundation Courses.
-Ascertain the appropriateness of the CRITICAL CORE process (faculty input, faculty experience, course inclusion of key indicators, signature rubrics, and signature assignments)
-Comprise and consider the strengths and weaknesses of the CRITICAL CORE plan
-Understand the needs of faculty specifically regarding potential professional development needs, to ensure success of CRITICAL CORE Initiative
-The results of this pilot (via the Faculty Liaison Team discussions/minutes, faculty reflections, and Assessment Day results) will be continually reviewed and carried forth, to the College Consultant Council, the Faculty Council, the CRITICAL CORE Initiative Sub-Committees, and the Executive Leadership Advisory Board, for the purpose that other areas of the college have the opportunity to hear the data, and speak to their concerns/questions/suggestions for possible modification.

As appropriate, and upon a consensus-building environment, changes to the CRITICAL CORE may be possible, but said changes would only occur once we have completed the full year of pilots. This ensures that all stakeholders' input and all data is provided sufficient opportunity for consideration.

Although the fall pilot focused on courses that fall within the General Education Foundation (GEF), all members were encouraged to participate even if they taught a class that was outside of the GEF. Faculty were asked to identify a course they would be teaching in the fall that they could use for the pilot, identify the CRITICAL CORE Competency and Key Indicator, and finally, to use an assignment specific to their class that aligned with said competency/key indicator (Signature Assignment) with a recommended weight of at least 5%. During the pilot, faculty consensus of all who taught a particular course was not necessary.

The Signature Rubric utilized to score the Signature Assignments depended on the specific Competency and Key Indicator chosen. While classes that fell under the GEF were already aligned with a particular Competency and Key Indicator (Key Indicators 1 or 2), faculty who taught courses outside of the GEF had to choose the Competency and Key Indicator (3 thru 5) they felt best aligned for their course. Faculty were also provided sample language to include in the preparation of their syllabus for the course being piloted. Final documentation (copy of the syllabus) was collected for a majority of the pilot courses (88.9%) and are available in the CRITICAL CORE SharePoint database.
The Fall Pilot included 44 participating faculty teaching 79 sections of 34 different courses. Of these, 52 sections of 19 courses aligned with the GEF and 27 sections of 15 courses aligned with Programs of Study (POS) courses.

### Total Courses Piloted Broken Down by Key Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Unique Courses</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Unique Courses</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Critical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF KI 1-2</td>
<td>3 KI 1</td>
<td>1 KI 3</td>
<td>4 KI 2</td>
<td>6 KI 1</td>
<td>3 KI 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS KI 3-5</td>
<td>1 KI 1</td>
<td>1 KI 3</td>
<td>POS KI 1-2</td>
<td>4 KI 4</td>
<td>2 KI 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS KI 3-5</td>
<td>8 KI 1</td>
<td>1 KI 3</td>
<td>POS KI 3-5</td>
<td>11 KI 2</td>
<td>8 KI 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS KI 3-5</td>
<td>5 KI 1</td>
<td>8 KI 4</td>
<td>POS KI 3-5</td>
<td>10 KI 5</td>
<td>0 KI 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Day

The Assessment Day, co-led by Mary Margaret Kantor and Jen Gibson, represented the culmination of the Fall 2016 pilot. Assessment day consisted of the creation of interdisciplinary teams to blindly evaluate student work from outside their immediate discipline. Quantitative scores from the original instructors as well as the interdisciplinary teams, were collected and compared to explore consistency and validity. Qualitative information about the pilot experience were collected during group discussions as well as in written form to explore pilot experiences, strengths, weaknesses, the feasibility of cross-discipline assessment, and the experience of having one’s own student work scored by colleagues.

The objectives of the pilot were to ascertain the experience of the faculty regarding the appropriateness of the key indicators, of the alignment of key indicators to the GEF, and of the appropriateness of the CRITICAL CORE process as well as considering the strengths and weaknesses of the plan, and the professional development needs of the faculty. Information was gathered for each of these objectives in both quantitative and qualitative forms during the assessment day.

Procedures for Critical Core Assessment Day

I. Preparation-completed prior to Assessment Day
   A. Follow procedures as outlined by Terina for gathering and labeling of student work and submitting to Jen Gibson.
   B. Jen (and helpers) catalogue and code work. Work is divided into folders for each of the groups that will be participating in the assessment day activities.
   C. Participants receive notice of which Key Indicator they will be assessing and a document that describes the assignments (including directions given to students) they will be seeing.

II. Assessment Day Activities
   A. Participants arrive and join the group to which they have been assigned (3 members per group). Prepared for them are rubrics and folders of student work. Roles of the 3 group members include 2 scorers and 1 tie-breaker. These roles should be rotated throughout the session.
   B. Each of the two scorers assesses each piece of work using the rubric. Using a rotation system is best, scorer 1 assesses a piece of work, passes work on to scorer 2 and passes the rubric to the tie-breaker. When scorer 2 finishes assessing the work, both the work and the rubric is passed to the tie-breaker. Tie-breaker compares the two rubrics—if score is off by more than one column, the tie-breaker assesses the work and records a score. Tie-breaker is also responsible for recording all final rubric scores given each piece of work.
   C. Throughout the process rubric scores will be gathered from each group and aggregated so that a report can be generated and used for discussion in the second part of the day.

(At intervals each group pauses in their work and takes time to discuss those pieces of work that required the tie-breaker to also assess and a final score decision is made.)
CRITICAL CORE Pilot Instructions Regarding Signature Assignments, Scores, and Artifacts of Learning

1. Faculty will score their Signature Assignments using the Signature Rubric, for ALL sections they are piloting, and provide that data to Jen Gibson by December 9th. See example chart below for how this data should be reported:

2. Additionally, faculty will provide a brief reflection on their experience doing so (1-2 paragraphs) and submit with the data.

3. If faculty are providing more than one section of a course for the Pilot, please identify at least one section in which all Signature Assignments for that one course section will be made available for the Assessment Event. Faculty should make that determination ASAP, and submit that determination to Jen by November 15th.

4. Artifacts for the Signature Assignments will be collected as follows--- If the Signature Assignment is a document of sorts (essay, paper, reflection, etc.), then a copy of the document will be submitted to Jen Gibson by December 9th. This copy should include, in the right top corner, the score received (0-4).

5. If the Signature Assignment is a not a document (performance, artwork, speech, etc.), then faculty will need to provide a detailed “checklist” of how the Signature Assignment was fully evaluated, and specifically how the Key Indicator was evaluated. This faculty checklist should be extensive enough so that other faculty can see the manner by which the Key Indicator was captured and scored. Copies of these check-lists will be submitted to Jen Gibson by December 9th.

***If you have not already done so, please send (via email) Jen Gibson a copy of the Signature Assignment, with the student instructions included.
ASSESSMENT/IMPROVEMENT DAY RESULTS

Prior to the CRITICAL CORE Assessment Day, faculty participating in the pilot had the opportunity to “rehearse” the actual assessment day processes by engaging in a rubric calibration session. The purpose of this session was to provide faculty a time to review sample artifacts for each of the competencies/key indicators in the General Education Foundation and engage in conversations about assessments on the Signature Rubric. The rehearsal dates took place on December 2nd and 13th, 2016.

The CRITICAL CORE Assessment Day was held on December 14th. Student artifacts (n = 154) from faculty members piloting the General Education Foundation courses (key indicators #1 and #2) were evaluated by ALL piloting faculty members in the event which was meant to facilitate robust discussion about the competencies, key indicators, and the use of the Signature Rubrics. The number of artifacts assessed was not an intended measure of statistical significance for the pilot Assessment Day.

Participants arrived and joined the group to which they had been assigned taking into account their Faculty Liaison Team competency. Appropriate rubrics and folders of student work was pre-prepared and available for each group. Roles of the group members included 2 scorers and 1 tie-breaker. The roles were rotated throughout the session. Throughout the process faculty engaged in discussion about the ability to assess the skill and how they came to their scores. Signature rubric scores were gathered from each group and aggregated and a report/visual representation was generated to use for discussion in the second part of the event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY AND KEY INDICATOR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ARTIFACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION – KI – 1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION – KI – 2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL THINKING – KI - 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL THINKING – KI – 2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL GROWTH &amp; CULTURAL LITERACY – KI – 1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL GROWTH &amp; CULTURAL LITERACY – KI – 2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY &amp; QUANTITATIVE LITERACY – KI – 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY &amp; QUANTITATIVE LITERACY – KI – 2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Day Average Score

Average Difference Between Instructor Score and Assessment Day Score

Number of Mediations Needed

Frequency of Scores within Indicators
FACULTY LIASON TEAM REFLECTIONS

The Faculty Liaison Team members met during the fall semester to attain necessary understanding of the CRITICAL CORE Initiative and processes within their teaching practices. As a part of the fall pilot, they were asked to engage in monthly reflections about their experiences with the CRITICAL CORE and the piloting of their Competency and Key Indicator with their chosen Signature Assignment. The following themes of reflection were derived from the required faculty reflection documents.

Moments of Encouragement and Success:
- Helps enforce the need for these competencies in our students.
- The Signature Assignment has caused me to emphasize the importance of communication skills to my students and more mindful of critical thinking.
- I have added more “low stakes” assignments to help my students building toward ITQL.
- The experience has increased my understanding of the Pilot; I’m glad I’ve had the opportunity to participate in this initial process. Students seem to be getting it, too.
- I believe the fundamentals of the CCI are essential to student success.
- Previous experience with core competencies lacked oversight and was ineffective. The CCI ensures achievement of core competencies by our students, and allows for consistent focus on broad key skills that are needed across disciplines for success in future educational and occupational endeavors.
- For me, the benefits of the CCI are that it gives us a tangible set of institutional learning goals. In other words, the broad nature of the competency categories ensures that we’re exposing students to the 21st century skills they’ll need in order to be successful both academically and professionally. The fact that all Key Indicators are tied to specific classes, too, helps clearly articulate the point at which students will have the opportunity to grow in relation to each of the competencies.

General Challenges:
- At times, the purpose of the pilot was unclear or confusing.
- I’m not sure how we’ll be able to train adjunct faculty in regards to this.
- Understanding all of this could be difficult for students.
- Capturing large files (such as speeches) in a digital format for evaluation presents challenges.
- The perception could exist that the CCI is being used for individual instructor evaluation.
- I’m worried that using only one of the Key Indicators may be too narrow.
- Concerned about folks assessing work outside of their expertise area.
- Signature Assignment approvals
Signature Assignments:

- How can we ensure consistency in Signature Assignments across all programs?
- If each instructor is doing a portfolio or long assignments, how are we supposed to go through all of these? How do we know what to look for in other disciplines? Would it be best to evaluate the Signature Assignment at the start of the semester and the end in order to measure growth?
- What is the best way to develop a proper scoring approach for the Signature Assignment?

Signature Rubrics:

- Signature Rubrics too broad/generic.
- Students experienced some confusion between the grading rubric for a course and the Signature Rubric.
- Some of the rubrics may need to be reworded.

Teaching and Student Engagement with the CRITICAL CORE:

- Unsure of how to communicate the importance of CRITICAL CORE to students.
- I’m now more aware of how to integrate the competencies into the curriculum.
- I have communicated the purpose of the CCI by providing handouts, a video, and a final reflection paper.
- I certainly emphasize critical thinking, ITQL, and communication in all of my courses. Although it isn’t tracked in a formal manner, it is certainly assessed in a variety of ways. I am now thinking more about incorporating it on more frequent low stakes assignments so it is innate within the course.
- It has made me more deliberate in teaching and assessing student acquisition of core competencies and has provided a way for me to be more aware of my students’ progress in achieving competency in IT/QL.
- It has really highlighted the importance of backwards design.
- The CCI provided me with an opportunity to restructure an assignment and align it with a rubric.

General Thoughts:

- Having a glossary of terms for CRITICAL CORE would be helpful.
- Additional explanations of what an Authentic Assessment is may be helpful.
- A video or required training tied to CRITICAL CORE would be helpful.
- It could be worthwhile to change the Signature Rubric benchmark designations to “Accomplished/Competent/Developing/Beginning.”
- There could potentially be various ways to use the Signature Assignment and Signature Rubric throughout the course; for example, instead of one assignment, multiple smaller assignments that result in a larger assignment could be a different approach.
- I had my students submit a portfolio of 5 different assignments. The portfolio approach is one I like, but it may be easier to take pieces from all 5 labs and make one and use that as the Signature Assignment.
• I think that the CCI has many benefits, first it focuses the instructors on the Critical Core initiative and aids instructors on structuring and further defining the outcomes to the key indicator. It also increases collaboration among faculty members, and well as allow FT and FT opportunities to engage more and add their opinions to the assignments as well as different viewpoints. This process increases understanding of the critical core process and help me use different approaches as I discuss the benefits of this process to my students.

• I would like to see some consistency in the process; better, more clear, more efficient and concise instructions about the process.

• Continue to encourage all that this is a learning Pilot and there will be “bumps” and continue to encourage others to provide feedback to make the critical core initiative success.

• I think it will be nice to have so that the part time employees will understand the critical core requirements. I like the idea of trying to make the assignment fit with things we are all already doing.

• Educating faculty on all the terminology. It can be confusing but I think instructors are doing it any way just not call assignments “signature assignments”.

**Assessment Day:**

• I think grading could be very problematic for people outside the discipline. Our assessments were generally easy to evaluate at one level, but giving a grade of 4 indicates a “sophisticated understanding” and on the assessment many sounded like they had such and understanding until one pays attention to historical detail. I, being familiar of the history, could pick out gross historical errors that others would probably miss. If they made such gross errors it reveals they do not have a “sophisticated understanding” and grades outside of the discipline might not be in a position to catch this.

• I enjoyed scoring work outside of my discipline. The purpose of students writing the essay is to interim the average person of their knowledge on the topic. If they succeed, the score will be higher.

• Maybe not useful for appropriately/fairly scoring signature assignments; but is helpful for the faculty member to be exposed to other areas

• Sometimes we get desensitized in our own area. Good to have outside perspectives, it provides us with new perspectives.

• The assessment process itself was a lot of fun. I found it valuable to talk with other faculty about where our students are academically.

• Faculty discussions helped a great deal. Grade by the instructor is tough because we have bias. Example that bias and find out what students need. That helped us figure out what students need—courses should not be isolated links to next classes.

• It would be nice if the use of time during the day was more stream-lined, but the entire team was pleasant, helpful, & knowledgeable.

• I think the process for reading, scoring, and recording data relevant to the signature assignment was very efficient. Our team worked well together and was mostly consistent in scoring. It was a bit challenging to grade a math or stats assignment. Given the criteria in the rubric, it was do-able.
• Strengths: Good to see everyone come together and determine some standards for student success. Weakness: Not really a weakness; but the fumbling to figure out how to do what we’re trying to do is sometimes frustrating. The next time should be smooth sailing (: 
• Overall I thought that the assessment Day and pilot was a good experience. In my opinion, this was a “true” pilot where faculty had an opportunity to help build it from the ground up. And because it was a pilot, there was no pressure to be perfect, with the knowledge that we would have a chance to tweak the process.