APARC Minutes – 2/27/18

Minute: Kathy Morris
Attendees: Laura Krier, Karen Moranski, Kathy Morris, Sean Place, Daniel Soto, Mike Visser, Beth Warner, Laura Watt, Merith , Weisman, Puspa Amri, Tim Wandling

1. Chair Report:
    a. Next meeting is concurrent with PBAC in the Ballroom. Hopefully all can attend.
    b. LMS articles in the STAR – questions about what is represented by the perspectives in the article, and issues of communications.
    c. All previous minutes have been distributed electronically.
2. Agenda Approved – switching order of discussion of ASPIRE and LMS.
3. Minutes and past minutes approved

Business:
1. Update and discussion of LMS Project
    a. Discussion for Transition plan. 4/6/18 is set as a time when Justin Lipp will have the first official draft of the recommendation from ATISS. Michael is asking for pros and cons plus transition ideas. Summary of comparisons and pilot information. APARC would then review that material, and be able to go back and get more information, still leaving time for 2 trips to ExCom and the senate. Goal is that the information will be relatively straight forward. APARC should have their recommendation by 4/17.
    b. Beth raised questions about the one-time and recurring costs for each. She raised concerns about some aspects of the Moodle package related to unexpected costs, faculty training, etc. Michael suggested that perhaps the Moodle vendor was not forthcoming on various budget elements (LMS Evaluation Document, pps 7-9)
    c. Puspa raised the question of whether we should come up with a rubric for evaluating. Laura K noted that there is only a small bit in the charter document. Sean felt that we don't necessarily need our own criteria. We need to determine who to evaluate the pieces. For example – is usability a priority or is budget…
    d. Tim focused on what faculty are finding with Canvas. What are the plans for training faculty in a transition. "with work" canvas or moodle can be used to do XX. What is the support for faculty? Provost shared that $300K have been set aside tentatively to train faculty to use the new LMS and transfer course structures and data. This could mean hiring tech support to do the data work and faculty trainings…
    e. ATISS report will provide information specific to usability evaluation. Kathy said that Justin might give the data on staff work load, budget (initial and ongoing), technical specifics, data transfer…ATISS is more about usability and student/faculty perspectives. IT would talk about scalability, and technical

aspects. Faculty Center (with Provost) might focus on transition plan and faculty training. ,

    f. APARC will need to build in recommendations for transition plans, evaluation of the system...

    g. Michael and Beth raised issues of features that the CANVAS may have features that are highly useful that aren't available in the pilot.

    h. May 3 is when this needs to initially go to the Senate and there should be an open and transparent discussion. Decisions on May 17.

2. Follow up discussion of ASPIRE

    a. Sean & Laura K both expressed a sense that the presentation was helpful, but also a bit raised some concerns that it may not have had enough of the reasonable critiques of the work.

    b. Outcomes vs. Objectives discussion

    c. Daniel's Flavors of assessment – to see if your students are progressing and to placate government agencies. Is it meaningful to us as teachers? Is it helping the organization in terms of accountability. (Carrot reasons for doing this and sticks reasons why it has to be done).

    d. Sean – how is the going to be used to ensure that it is meaningful and leads to improvements. If assessment isn't just about "handing it up to someone else" then we are more likely to have buy in by faculty who find the process interesting and useful.

    e. Michael raised need to think about things that aren't easily measured, and how we can think quantitatively or qualitatively about more nuanced aspects of our objectives.

    f. Laura K. made the point that what is being measured needn't necessarily be based on the metaphor of "production". Could be transformation or growth …

    g. Discussion of how do you measure transformation/growth. And are we assessing value-added (growth, movement, development, change) vs. proficiency. Business Schools do tend to look at pre-post. Many Dept.s look at end products (capstone), or proficiency (e.g., foreign language)

    h. Tim calls for more work from ASPIRE to explore and articulate (plan, design…) "value-added" vs. "proficiency". It isn't either/or. Beth ties back to Carrot & Stick to help these assessments really seem like they will help instruction and help faculty/students.

    i. Daniel raised a discussion of how to build a shared vision of assessment work for departments? Asked for case-studies, etc.

    j. Michael raised the issue of trying to figure out APARCs role. Is it chief cheerleaders for Assessment?   Voice of Stability? Is there a need for a better articulation with UPRS, Aspire, and APARC in terms of who does what? A discussion to revisit in April?