

General Education Assessment Subcommittee of the Learning Assessment Committee

Monday, June 9, 2014

11:00 a.m. 12:00 p.m.

I-122

Eileen DeLuca	Present	Marty Ambrose	Present
Don Ransford	Present	Amy Trogan	Present
Jane Bigelow	Present	Wendy Chase	Absent
Peggy Romeo	Present		

1. The committee reviewed the AAC&U Midland College case study which provides a framework for administration: <https://www.aacu.org/VALUE/casestudies/midland.pdf>.
Some takeaways:
 - a. The committee thought “appealing to faculty to submit artifacts (student-produced assignments) that, in their opinion represented attainment” (p. 1) of the General Education Competencies would be a useful way to begin to identify assignments and core course for assessment.
 - b. The committee reviewed Midland’s value-added model of identifying “freshman-level” and “sophomore-level” courses. The results allowed the college to engage in targeted professional development. This model (with modifications) may be useful for FSW’s General Education assessment.
 - c. The committee discussed Midland’s model of engaging evaluators in an “in-depth professional development workshop” (p. 2). Marty commented that training and norming sessions are key to the success of rating sessions. Jane, Don, Peggy, and Amy concurred and shared experiences from previous General Education rating sessions.
2. The committee reviewed the AAC&U University of North Carolina Wilmington case study: <https://www.aacu.org/VALUE/casestudies/documents/UniversityofNorthCarolinaWilmington.pdf>
Some takeaways:
 - a. Don suggested that when collecting and assessing student artifacts, we should focus on graded assignments. Jane agreed that the focus should be on summative assessments. Eileen shared that UNCW came to the same conclusion: “Students are motivated to perform at their best because the assignments are part of the course content and the course grade” (p 1).
 - b. Marty and Peggy noted that we would need to ultimately ensure that we are receiving samples from across delivery modes. Eileen shared that UNCW used

stratified random sampling to ensure they were collecting artifacts from across delivery modes (face-to-face, online, dual enrollment).

3. The committee began to design a plan for General Education Assessment Administration for AY 2014-2015.
 - a. During professional development days, faculty should be informed of the General Education Assessment Plan. Administrators and/or LAC Leaders will appeal to faculty to share assignment descriptions that they feel align closely with one or more General Education Competencies. . We will highlight how this process is less intrusive than the Seybert model. We will also highlight that the collection of assignment descriptions will help us develop the General Education Assessment Model.
 - b. The committee discussed creating guidelines and a submission form for this process. The committee will emphasize that we are looking for **existing** assignments. Also, the form would include areas to identify if the faculty are full or part-time, which sections the assignment is given in, whether or not the assignment is “common” to all sections and which modality (face-to-face, online, blended) the assignment is offered in.
 - c. Faculty would be encouraged to submit assignment guidelines by the end of September to give the Learning Assessment Committee time to review assignments, create a program map, and ensure all departments are appropriately represented. Additionally, the committee will compare guidelines to the rubrics to see which align best and how the rubrics may need to be revised.
 - d. Faculty will be granted either college service credits and/or professional development credit for participation in the process.
 - e. Assessment Coordinators will be tasked with working with their departments to identify and submit assignment guidelines. They may also become team leaders for scoring artifacts.
4. The committee reviewed the ETS Proficiency Profile during the last ten minutes of the meeting.
 - a. Committee members noted that the exam felt like an “entrance” exam. It was noted that ETS also produces the SAT.
 - b. Marty noted that the exam was easier to maneuver than the CLA+. Peggy agreed.
 - c. Committee members felt that the ETS Proficiency Profile was more detailed and specific than the CLA+.
 - d. Committee members noted that there was a focus on critical thinking.

- e. Committee members noted that it was less authentic than the CLA+. The CLA+ embeds reading, writing, critical thinking and mathematics in a performance assessment. In the ETS Proficiency Profile it is clear when the students are “doing” math versus “doing” reading or writing. Committee members noted that students with “math phobia” or “reading phobia” could tune out during those distinct sections.
 - f. Jane noted that it is difficult to do well on math problems if the student is not in a math course at the time of the exam.
 - g. Don noted that the test actually involves quantitative reasoning and unlike other exams, students can’t just plug answer choices into the problem to solve problems.
 - h. The committee discussed potential problems with standardized exams including motivating students to do their best work, the temptation to “teach to the test, the heavy focus on reading skills to measure other skills, finding proctors, space issues, and use of computers.
5. Eileen passed out copies of three chapters from “Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment.” She asked committee members to review before the next meeting.
 6. Eileen will work on a draft of guidelines and a form for assignment/artifact collection. Marty suggested that we comment on the draft materials in between their development and the next meeting date.
 7. Tentative agenda for next meeting (July 9):
 - a. Review draft of General Education Assessment guidelines and assignment submission form.
 - b. Continue implementation plan. This may include a discussion of the chapters from “Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment.”
 - c. Review sample CAAP tests (Eileen will send links).

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca