**Meeting Notes**

General Education and Assessment Meeting

8/19

Attendance: Amanda Lehrian, Thomas Mohundro, Thomas Wayne, Jennifer Grove, Ihasha Horn, Ellie Bunting, Scott Ortolano, John Pelot, Jason Calabrese, David Luther, Marty Ambrose, Rebecca Harris, Jeremy Pilarski, Jim Langlas, Patricia Robinson, Natala Orobello, Sara Dustin, Jill Hummel, and Amy Trogan

* Prof. Lehrian- Explains meeting situation (Tuesday’s meeting for assessment and general education update and Wednesday for general department business).
* Since adjuncts are in attendance, everyone took turns introducing themselves so that we all would know one another.

**Gen education- Led by Prof. Lehrian**

* Composition II remains on Gen Ed. requirements
* Did not hit any major problems because Gen Ed credits remained at a total of 36.
* Prof. Lehrian asks if there are any question humanities section
	+ Proposed changes were discussed with chair of humanities, and they were okay with this system, mainly because people would still choose one item from Part A and one from Part B.
	+ General agreement about this policy
* Prof. Pelot- question about creative writing course not being on Part B.
	+ Explanation is that it hadn't been on Part B before and wasn't added during revision process. No follow up.
* Prof. Grove- question about whether all of the green highlighted courses were going to be brought through curriculum.
	+ Prof. Lehrian responds that committee left everything on the table and followed advice of specific department chairs about how to list the courses.
* Prof. Calabrese- question about Music Literature and whether or not that was a literature course.
	+ Confirmed that it's not a part of the English Department's purview
* Prof. Ambrose- noted that world lit had been left off the general education list
	+ Prof. Lehrian responded that this was a mistake and the course would be restored to the revised list
* Prof. Lehrian asked what people thought about the new guidelines requirement that students take one course from part A and one from part B.
	+ Department voiced approval. No dissenting opinions.

Gen Ed concludes

Assessment- Led by Prof. Trogan

* + A big job but assessment in very good hands with committee and Dr. DeLuca and things moving forward at a good pace. Work will have impact and produce results that faculty will be able to use.
	+ Learning assessment subcommittee, led by Prof. Ambrose, had a very productive summer and is also in a good place.
	+ Dr. Van Gaalen will be an indespensible asset for the department in his new position.
	+ All courses offered in all three modalities must be assessed and the same rule applies to courses affected by SB 1720. For us, this list includes ENC 0022, ENC 1101, and ENC 1102, all of which will need to be assessed according to a new formula. In the past, assessment has occurred to norm rubric, etc., and we will now take the next step. In many ways, this new process will be easier to follow.

**ENC 1101 and 1102**

* + We do not have to collect artifacts but do have to assess them individually.
		- Spread sheet created to provide useful information to Dr. Van Gaalen.
		- If teaching 1101 or 1102, you will need to fill out a spreadsheet for each course. Once you’ve opened the document, you will need to copy and paste the course information and banner ID into the template.
		- You will then use banner to identify which students are dual enrollment
		- The rest of spreadsheet refers to rubric that we use to assess the research essay, which is the only paper being assessed in the course since it is a universal assignment.
			* For each dimension of the rubric, professors will note 1-4 to assess the quality of the paper.
			* The rubric has detailed descriptions for each of these dimensions, and these descriptions will be shared with the department.
		- Results will then be sent to Prof. Trogan
	+ **Concerns expressed:**
		- Prof. Ambrose notes that we may want to phase this in because of the amount of extra work that will be created for department faculty. Dr. DeLuca previously noted that this does not need to be done all at once. She suggests formally asking if we can phase it in.
		- Prof. Lehrian notes that we are in good position relative to other departments since we already have rubrics created.
		- Prof. Pelot notes that the danger is that this will take away from other department work.
		- Jennifer Grove notes that Developmental Education Department had a clerk who helped to do this and asked if we could request assistance
			* Prof. Ambrose seconded asking for assistance
		- Question about when the assessments would be due (end of semester, earlier in the semester, or during the following semester) (addressed further down)
		- Prof. Bunting reiterated concerns about workload associated with the degree
			* Prof. Ambrose seconded concern of workload
		- Prof. Harris asks if it would be possible to have scoring for documents done by Spring break rather than at end of the semester.
		- Prof. Bunting asks about usefulness of tracking every single section of the courses rather than a representative set of courses since the statistical deviation should not be significant.
			* Prof. Lehrian referred to slideshow from Dr. Wright's presentation earlier in the day about what is being assessed.
		- Prof. Lehrian says that she believes it would be workable to look into having faculty submit raw data that could then be entered by a clerk in the spring and notes if this would be a solution for everyone.
		- Assignment dropbox mentioned as a possible solution but not everyone uses it and many also use different rubrics so linking it to dropbox is not workable. Possibility dropped.
		- Prof. Ambrose notes that workload already very heavy and must be careful of our time as a department. It's a worthy enterprise and Prof. Trogan and Prof. Lehrian have done great work, but we should also ask for extra help to make sure quality is maintained.
		- Prof. Trogan notes that this is still a process and still room to expand
		- Prof. Orobello asks about starting with only one course each. Prof. Bunting notes that statistically, that should provide enough information
			* + Prof. Ambrose says that this should be first question that we ask before we move forward
				+ Prof. Trogan says that this is a great selection and we would just need to make sure that information is randomized and spread out evenly
				+ Prof. Grove reiterates that work has to be distributed evenly.
				+ Prof. Ambrose notes that in terms of our time, might just not be feasible to do this for every single paper.
				+ Prof. Calabrese asks about numbers from last year's assessment and notes that the 50 he did were very time consuming, especially on top of the amount of work that teaching requires.
				+ Prof. Harris notes that the department might not want a clerk to see our data to protect privacy of students, but we could have clerk enter in all of the course information so faculty just have to enter the scoring data.

General approval of this idea

Prof. Orobello notes that this also shouldn't undercut attempts to reduce number of courses being surveyed.

Prof. Trogan says she agrees and will advocate for these issues.

* + - * + Prof. Calabrese asks if the artifacts themselves will be required and the answer is that they will not (for ENC 1101 & ENC 1102), assessments involving other courses can vary).
				+ Prof. Ambrose notes that Dr. DeLuca is very reasonable and we are asking for very reasonable things. Everything is still in a fluid phase and there is definitely room for us to negotiate.

**Main questions that arose during this part of presentation:**

* + 1) Can faculty receive assistance with setting up the forms so that they then just have to enter in the assessment data (the essay scores)?
	+ 2) Do we have to assess every single class or can it be a representative percentage?
		- * Prof. Trogan says that she's absolutely interested in investigating these options and definitely possible to conduct assessment in a way that works for everyone.
			* Other questions?
				+ None

**Other items that need to be discussed:**

* Nothing has been normed or assessed in regards to literature courses
* Literature assessment would only be a percentage of assignments rather than entire courses so people would work with smaller numbers of artifacts.
* If you're teaching a literature course, you will be given information about which students have been selected and which types of artifacts will be required.
* In past, artifacts were pre-designated, now you will get to select the assignment that meets select learning outcomes. Prof. Trogan selected outcome assessments that showed up on each literature syllabus and best meet ideals of course.
* People will send unscored artifacts in for group scoring.
* Prof. Trogan especially interested in scorers who have taught literature at FSW or in other contexts. Others, of course, invited to participate.
* Work should be low intensity.
	+ Prof. Ambrose asks if people who teach lit will be notified about this project.
		- Prof. Trogan response that they will.
* Prof. Ortolano asks about the time period during which artifacts will be collected?
	+ The answer is that it will be a fall project.
* Prof. Trogan says she modified rubric so that the process would be as streamlined as possible.
* Prof. Trogan and Prof. Lehrian say that they are trying to establish a stipend for the project.
* Prof. Ortolano asks how many courses are being taught.
	+ The response is about five.
		- Prof. Trogan notes that the department might collect artifacts over multiple semesters to make sure there are enough artifacts to score. However, this has not been decided yet.

**Prof. Trogan says last item on agenda is reverse mapping project**

* Voluntary enterprise.
* Covered in the morning's meeting
* Form available in packet that is passed around to the department
* Prof. Trogan explains that goal is to have faculty share signature/exemplary assignments with the assessment committee.
	+ Hoping to have people share assignment guidelines that speak to and satisfy the old competencies. At some point down the road, people who volunteer to participate will also need to submit artifacts associated with the assignment.
	+ Guidelines must be submitted by September 26th and the artifacts by the end of the semester.
		- Jennifer asks if definitions for rubrics can be posted and Prof. Ambrose notes that those rubrics are on the way out and that Dr. DeLuca doesn't want them used any longer.
		- Multiple sources: When choosing an assignment to share for this project, people should use whatever they think best meets an outcome.
* Prof. Pelot notes that Dr. Wright said it would be better to really meet one of the outcomes and he tries to create assignment that hits all of them. This could be problematic for such an enterprise.
	+ Prof. Ambrose responds that certain assignments tend to speak especially well to certain outcomes so they are looking for those assignments that match up with certain rubrics on a significant level. The preference is for depth over breadth, and you should note which outcome is most applicable to your assignment. In this way, the assignments will help with the renovation of the outcomes themselves by revealing how faculty view and aspire to meet the different outcomes.
		- The concern is that rubrics aren't well-suited to courses or aren't being used effectively and some of the gen eds need to be renovated so they are more practical and useful for students and faculty.
* Prof. Orobello asks who the reverse mapping documents are going to
	+ Answer is that they are going to Dr. Wright and Dr. DeLuca.
* Prof. Horn asks about process of choosing an outcome when they submit an assignment.
	+ Prof. Trogan notes that people should just select the outcome that they feel best works for their assignment.

Prof. Trogan concludes to boisterous applause

Meeting Ends

Notes Prepared by Prof. Ortolano