



ASSETT Advisory Board Meeting

April 17, 2019 | 1:30pm to 3:00pm | Norlin S421

Board Members:

- Nathaniel Bala, Theatre and Dance
- Carew Boulding, Political Science
- David Brown, Associate Dean of Social Sciences and of the ASSETT Program, Ex Officio
- Janet Casagrand, Integrative Physiology
- Dorothy Eissenberg, Political Science
- Kira Hall, Linguistics & Anthropology
- Aisha Jackson, Office of Information Technology
- Jen Lewon, Speech Language and Hearing Sciences
- Andy Martin, Faculty Advisor, EBIO, Ex Officio
- Laura Olson Osterman, Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures
- Beth Osnes, Board Chair, Theatre and Dance
- Anthony Pidanick, Psychology
- Jashodhara Sen, Theatre & Dance
- Mark Werner, ASSETT Associate Director, Ex Officio

Others attending:

Attending Remotely: Janet Casagrand

Approving Minutes from January 9, 2019 meeting:

Approved by: Carew Boulding

Seconded: Andy Martin

All Approved

Agenda

1:30 to 1:35 — Settle in

1:35 to 1:40 — Approve the Minutes

1:40 to 1:50 — CMAC tool demonstration

1:50 to 2:25 — Budget Discussion

2:25 to 2:40 — Update on the ASSETT Innovation Incubator projects

2:40 to 2:50 — Any board discussion or items that come up during the meeting

2:50 — Adjourn



CMAC tool demonstration

Andy shared the progress and potential of the CMAC tool. With the development of this project he has hired a Research Assistant to help with the advancement of the scholarship of teaching and learning in the department.

EBIO has now been the first to try the program and has completed an active data project. The students received a publication out of it and are acknowledged in the paper – they are not listed as authors.

The second unit to use the tool was from Geology. Here the student helped to develop a CMAC and also helped to develop gamification of curriculum with TWINE. It has been successful as an interactive tool for students. We are progressing to try during the Fall 2019 semester by doing 3 games in the same environment. There should be a publication coming out of this project as well.

1. Cross cutting concept
 - a. Why: formative assessment and monitoring of the training in EBIO – Data-driven revision of the curriculum
 - b. How: Record quantity, quality, and type of learning events
 - c. What: Has a rubric reporting
2. Review of what it looks like with the component of harvesting data and what type of folder it falls into. Then pull out the data. Then the generation looks at the folders and takes the data.
3. Harvested text is assigned to assessment as an organizer tool. The user tells the tool what verbs to look for and can then be watched over time.
4. There is an interactive tool that summarizes based on categories (exams, lectures, curriculum, exams, labs, recitations, etc.) The question to ask is, “Is your assessment doing the same to tell you if we are teaching as well as you think you are?”
5. End Result – to answer how we make progress to meet the goals of the department.
 - a. Ultimately the goal is that this becomes a tool for faculty to share allowing for better connection across courses.

There is also a group in English that aligns with the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program. Andy has been working and talking with the group quite a bit. The goal is to make the progress and knowledge of what was learned more public so that faculty can share and know what works. The tool needs to be visible or the data is really worthless.

Aisha asked if we can scrape Canvas and develop a way to see what would be illustrated.

It is felt that this would be a good alignment of the tools, but development would need to happen so that the tool could access Canvas. Some discussion with Institutional Research has happened and they are interested.

The question was also asked, “How are you reaching out to campus?”

The goal is to reach out to campus and all faculty, but currently there is still work to be done on the efficiency of the program. There are now two people who are working on this piece of the project. The software at this point is intimidating and not as user friendly as it must be before it goes out to campus. In follow up, Aisha’s idea of using the tool inside of Canvas would work well once items can be coded.



Budget Discussion

Mark reviewed the budget and opened the discussion for questions and feedback.

When working with OIT the efficiencies increased and as a result the budget gained a surplus and it was decided the best use of the money was to share the surplus with the campus. With that intention, two initiatives were developed.

1. Improving the classrooms AV and OIT equipment that OIT was supporting. This includes A&S classrooms
 - a. Shown as the FY transfer on the budget
2. David Brown and Mark looked at the remaining surplus and discussed what would make the most significant improvements
 - a. A “call” in January for a one-page statement of what faculty may want to do involving an active learning component for undergrads
 - b. Several were developed and sent for review
 - c. The reviewers narrowed the field down to a top 38 and divided these 38 into 4 similar categories.
 - i. Each group was then asked to come together and collaborate on how the funding opportunity would best be utilized.
3. The result becomes potentially 4 very innovative and collaborative projects involving several faculty across campus.
4. In the following years, just under \$200,000 per year will be used for projects to continue to help spend down the surplus

Mark completed additional review of the budget as listed in the budget line items.

In review of the next year’s budget

1. Fund Budget drops
2. Personal Costs drops
3. Day to Day stays the same
4. Professional Development is a bit lower
5. Faculty Fellows is on going
6. Domain of One’s Own is less due to Amanda saving money by rolling it out later in the year
7. Video development was not used since we inherited some cameras from OIT and our undergrads are making the videos on their own
8. Tuition Remission is down due to fewer students being paid as research assistants
9. Syllabus.colorado.edu needs an enterprise home to become a campus service
10. GORP tool was inherited

How often is the ASSETT Syllabi tool used?

- Currently it is the departments with archives of their syllabi – so students can go to the department to request and view the previous syllabi used in class. To move these out to the institutional level may also move it away from the student level by making it such a large-scale project.
- Because it is online the concerns were related to security issues, but by scaling up to the campus it becomes a little bit more attractive. One says it should be free and others say not unless there is a password because of the intellectual property that would be shared.



- Central vs. Distributed makes it a bit more efficient with one place for all who are interested to go. Access become the advantage as student expect things to be more web-based now. The turnaround to the student is faster.
- How do you communicate to the department level? Right now we are still gathering information at the college level to ask questions about privacy, accessibility, and how would everyone use it?
- Jacie and Mark are interested in reaching out to departments and working towards the gathering of more data.

Concerns/Thoughts regarding the budget?

Move to approve the budget:

- Janet votes to approve the budget
- Carew moves to approve the budget
- All in favor 100%
- 0 nay's or abstains

Update on the ASSETT Innovation Incubator projects

1. Currently there is the anticipation that these will be three-year long projects
2. Academic Futures are thinking about an interdisciplinary budget piece in research, but also to make a parallel program to advance the infrastructure to advance learning. The ASSETT projects currently developing could create a great synergy.
3. The goal is to create an environment for all who had ideas about improving teaching/learning with technology and involving undergrads with an active learning tool. Groups have been meeting all semester and have been creating proposals of about 4.5 pages.
4. The four main areas: Review of the rough drafts get feedback from David and Mark
 - a. Metacognition
 - i. Led by [Joy Adams](#) (Teaching and Learning Consultant)
 - b. Data science integration
 - i. Led by [Shane Schwikert](#) (Education Technology Researcher)
 - c. Student generated content in publishing
 - i. Led by [Amanda McAndrews](#) – (Faculty Services Portfolio Manager)
 - d. Student learning outside the classroom
 - i. Led by Jacie Moriyama – (Student Services Portfolio Manager)

Investing in future ideas with our funding is a great idea. The school of Education seems to have programs that map towards the goals of these programs. It was then suggested that the School of Education, who has been doing a similar work, could lend insight about best practices for successful development of projects.

Any board discussion or items that come up during the meeting

1. None brought forward



University of Colorado
Boulder

Meeting Adjourned

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, September 10 | 1:30pm to 3:00pm | Regent 302