

MINUTES
Learning Assessment Committee
February 1st, 2018
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
AA 177 (Lee Campus); E-105 (Charlotte Campus);
M-201 (Collier Campus)

	Present	Absent		Present	Absent
D'ariel Barnard	X		Barbara Miley	X	
Andrew Blitz	X		Colleen Moore		X
Leroy Bugger	X		Dr. Kristi Moran	X	
Jane Charles	X		Dr. Katie Paschall	X	
Dr. Marius Coman	X		Dr. Jennifer Patterson	X	
Dr. John Connell	X		Dr. Elijah Pritchett		X
Dr. Mary Conwell	X		Dr. Caroline Seefchak	X	
Dr. Eileen DeLuca		X	Dr. Eric Seelau		X
Thomas Donaldson	X		William Stoudt	X	
Dr. Renee Hester	X		Dr. Amy Trogan	X	
Dr. Julia Kroeker		X	Dr. Joe van Gaalen	X	
Margaret Kruger	X		Dr. Richard Worch	X	
David Licht	X		Dr. Denis Wright		X
Fernando Mayoral	X		Terry Zamor	X	
Dr. Lisa McGarity	X				

Guests: Jennifer Summary

- A. C. Seefchak opened the meeting at 11:06am & called the LAC to order.
- B. C. Seefchak asked the committee to review the meeting minutes from the previous full LAC meeting (November 2018) and two subcommittee meetings (December 2018). She noted the date would be added to the November minutes.
 - a. C. Seefchak called for a motion to approve the November LAC meeting minutes.
 - b. L. Bugger motioned to approve the November meeting minutes.
 - c. T. Donaldson seconded the motion.
 - d. C. Seefchak called for a motion to approve the December Professional Development subcommittee meeting minutes.
 - e. T. Zamor motioned to approve.
 - f. A. Blitz seconded the motion.
 - g. C. Seefchak called for a motion to approve the December General Education subcommittee meeting minutes.
 - h. D. Licht motioned to approve.
 - i. W. Stoudt seconded.

- j. C. Seefchak called for a vote to approve all three meeting minutes.
 - k. All voted in favor. Motions passed and all three meeting minutes were approved.
- C. C. Seefchak noted for the committee that D. Wright & J. van Gaalen send their regards from a concurrent meeting.
- D. C. Seefchak updated the committee about an upcoming meeting taking place with the Interim Provost and department Chairs to discuss position and duties, which will take place next Friday, February 8th. It was listed on our agenda because Chair and Assessment coordinator duties is something that has come up in our LAC meetings.
- E. Course Level Assessment updates from D. Barnard.
 - a. The Office of Assessment is currently analyzing 119 Course Level Assessments from Fall 2018 with 34% of those completed.
 - b. Estimated full completion date: week of March 26th, 2018.
 - c. You may have received reports already from some of the partially complete areas: Academic Success, Business & Technology, Health Professions, Humanities, Mathematics, and Sciences.
 - i. C. Seefchak noted that the LAC can continue to communicate to faculty about turning in assessment data.
 - 1. D. Barnard thanked C. Seefchak for the note and reiterated that absolutely if there is still data to be collected, we welcome any and all help with friendly reminders.
- F. General Education updates from D. Barnard.
 - a. We are currently preparing the General Education packets for scorers. Remember that you can bring a laptop with you to the calibration session as we will have flash drives ready to transfer the artifact files so you can begin scoring any time after the calibration session.
 - i. **Engage** calibration session will be held **Friday, February 15th at 9am** with an alternate session scheduled with Dr. van Gaalen at 1pm.
 - ii. **Visualize** calibration session will be held **Thursday, February 14th at 2pm** with an alternate session scheduled with Dr. van Gaalen at 3pm.
 - b. D. Barnard added that it should be a fun process with many neat artifacts - approximately 60 artifacts for each scorer.
 - i. C. Seefchak asked if that number doubles for someone in both competency scoring groups.
 - ii. Dr. van Gaalen joined the meeting and responded that each GenEd scorer is in only one group, either Engage or Visualize.
- G. C. Seefchak updated the LAC committee on the two upcoming outgoing publications.
 - a. The *DATAVERSED* monthly newsletter is almost ready and should go out next week.
 - b. The *Did You Know?* publication is also almost ready. We are waiting on clarification from the new Marketing & Media department to see which department will be responsible for putting it together visually.
 - c. An email will be sent out probably next week regarding these publications for members of the Communication subcommittee.
- H. C. Seefchak let the committee know about two children's literature authors coming to our campus next Tuesday, 2/5 noting that with the transitions to a new Marketing department, some events could use more word of mouth advertising. The LAC serves a specific

purpose for our institution, but we also serve our FSW community as a whole, so feel free to spread the word about this event to peers and students.

- a. J. Charles mentioned that Student Engagement has rules about what flyers can go up and where, but would be happy to print and put up flyers at the library.
 - b. Dr. Trogan agreed to let the English department know about the authors especially as there is a similar event, the Authors@FSW book signing and reading with Poet Peuo Tuy happening Monday, February 4th at 3pm in the Rush Auditorium.
 - c. J. Patterson: Is it open to the public?
 - i. C. Seefchak: Yes.
- I. C. Seefchak passed along a thank you from LAC member J. Kroeker, currently on maternity leave, to the rest of the LAC and Dr. Moran for the special presentation from November 2nd's meeting.
- J. C. Seefchak introduced progress from the Professional Development subcommittee
- a. At the last meeting in December, the Professional Development subcommittee talked about how information and examples in the Rubric Feedback booklet can be used to create web pages within the LAC page with links to exemplar assignments. The Rubric Feedback booklet came from feedback from the previous two years of General Education assessment. Having example assignments that exemplify the General Education competencies along with the FSW Rubrics available in a central place will help all FSW faculty get ideas for how to construct an assignment so it can be graded with the rubric and improve alignment of assignments with Integral Competencies.
 - i. J. Charles described how at the meeting two months ago, finding exemplars here in the booklet was discussed but then concern was expressed about the quality of these examples, especially due to the fact that they were collected prior to tweaking our own FSW Rubrics. She brought forward an idea to call from professors tools they may already be sharing in canvas. Many of those may be very useful for these exemplars in reflecting our core competencies. Oftentimes with the old competencies professors were not always sure the assignment was fitting the competencies.
 - ii. M. Kruger concurred that this was a great idea. Sometimes in health professions the title of the competencies does not fit with the actual definition – it's not always a clear connection. A solution to this is maybe highlighting the definition and not just the title.
 - b. C. Seefchak agreed and reiterated that the goal is to make this process easier for faculty
 - i. J. van Galen added another good example from how we built the rubrics each summer. We paid attention to making each dimension distinctly universal across departments. The skeleton is there, giving faculty the option to use all or parts of the rubrics. This vision can cross over to the exemplar assignments as well – they can be a skeleton.
 - ii. T. Donaldson added an idea to reach out to the professors who are the authors of chosen exemplars and have them to do a short video where they explain how it connects to the competency and/or rubric. This way you get

insight into how that instructor went through their thought process as they put together a General Education aligned assignment.

- a. M. Kruger - and others - called this an excellent idea.
2. T. Donaldson added that instructors who do that can get some credit such as TLC credit.
3. J. van Galen responded that the Office of Assessment can reach out to these faculty contributing exemplars and if they're amenable, coordinate with TLC in making a 2-minute video.
4. T. Donaldson noted that the competencies definitely take time to thoroughly digest and this would give us another tool to get this off the ground.
5. C. Seefchak agreed that the kinds of people who create great assignments are usually amenable to putting in this work to share them too – what a great idea!
6. J. Charles agreed that even as someone who was on the subcommittee to create the current GenEd competencies, it is still helpful to look them up occasionally, so any clarification would be useful.
 - a. T. Donaldson added that in the video we can ask them to give their “1 sentence translation” of the competency as well. I know this goes with the discussion we had over calibrating a sample visualize assignment where we discussed the professor not fully understanding the competency and it leads us to want to more effectively communicate these competencies.
 - i. J. Charles noted that while two are straightforward - Research is research & Evaluate is math and science - the other 6 words are non-intuitive, until you dive into the definition. That is a great idea to have a video explanation.
- c. C. Seefchak thanked J. Charles & T. Donaldson for their commendable combination of ideas of identifying faculty with already-created exemplars and asking them to share via video and started to talk about how to put them into motion.
 - i. C. Seefchak suggested a meeting of the LAC members who will identify or “tap” said faculty.
 - ii. T. Donaldson asked if that meant we are creating an adhoc subcommittee?
 - iii. C. Seefchak responded that we will use the subcommittee of Professional Development.
 1. T. Donaldson noted that the subcommittee has some examples already to go.
 2. J. van Gaalen responded that we have not yet connected names to the exemplars.
- d. C. Seefchak wrapped up the discussion by adding that if you want to tap anybody and if you have faculty in mind, please go for it. If you have questions, you can

also direct them to J. Charles. An email will go out soon regarding this process to the Professional Development Committee.

- K. R. Worch asked for clarification on the history of selecting GenEd Integral competencies, noting that the 8 were formed because the original 5 did not do what they were supposed to do.
 - a. C. Seefchak responded that they were outdated. TIM/technology – no one knew what to do with that.
 - b. R. Worch noted that on the workforce side of the college, our competencies were measured via the state framework outcomes. When we had to plug in one of the 8, some of our courses didn't fit any of those 8.
 - i. M. Kruger & C. Seefchak said Health Professions & Education had similar issues.
 - c. R. Worch brought up an issue that when the outcomes are state frameworks, the workload is tackled by department Chairs, but when outcomes are tied to assessment, the workload is on the Learning Assessment Coordinator. He suggested a tri-column table divided between Chairs, Assessment Coordinators, & Learning Assessment Coordinators to delineate the workload.
 - i. J. van Gaalen noted that this is definitely a good idea to bring to that meeting next week/Friday where the Chairs and Provost are going over positions and duties. He also added that at the time Integral competencies were chosen, different Deans handled the tasking and parameters of those Integral delineations for each course differently. So five schools may have had five different ways to task this to the three columns.
- L. C. Seefchak opened the floor to the LAC for any new business and to the Collier campus for any questions.
- M. C. Seefchak called for a motion to adjourn.
 - a. T. Donaldson motioned to adjourn.
 - b. R. Worch seconded.
 - c. All in favor to adjourn.

Meeting closed at 11:51am

Minutes submitted by D. Barnard