

Learning Assessment Committee

General Meeting

Friday, January 8th, 2021, 11:00 a.m.

All Campuses, Virtual:

<https://fsw.zoom.us/j/81275586269>

Meeting ID: 812 7558 6269

<i>Member Roster</i>	<i>Dept./Division</i>	<i>Membership Type</i>	<i>Present</i>
<i>Elijah Pritchett</i>	<i>Humanities</i>	<i>LAC Chair</i>	X
<i>Cara Minardi-Power</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Caroline Seefchak</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Colleen Moore</i>	<i>Health Professions</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	
<i>Eric Seelau</i>	<i>Social Sciences</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Fernando Mayoral</i>	<i>Foreign Language</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Jane Charles</i>	<i>Libraries</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Jennifer Patterson</i>	<i>Business</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Jennifer Summary</i>	<i>Communications</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Kristi Moran</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Marius Coman</i>	<i>Natural Science</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Mary Conwell</i>	<i>Paralegal Studies</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Melinda Lyles</i>	<i>Computer Science</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Renee Hester</i>	<i>Academic Success</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Richard Worch</i>	<i>Crim. Justice/Public Admin</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>	X
<i>Amy Trogan</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>General Member</i>	
<i>David Licht</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>General Member</i>	
<i>Dani Peterson</i>	<i>Foreign languages</i>	<i>General Member</i>	X
<i>Margaret Kruger</i>	<i>Nursing</i>	<i>General Member</i>	X
<i>Terry Zamor</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>General Member</i>	X
<i>Tom Donaldson</i>	<i>Social Sciences</i>	<i>General Member</i>	X
<i>Tina Churchill</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>Guest</i>	
<i>D'ariel Barnard¹</i>	<i>AASPIRE*</i>	<i>Ex-officio</i>	X
<i>Grace Scardo¹</i>	<i>AASPIRE*</i>	<i>Observer</i>	X
<i>Joseph van Gaalen¹</i>	<i>AASPIRE*</i>	<i>Ex-officio</i>	X
<i>Laura Osgood</i>	<i>Education</i>	<i>Guest</i>	X
<i>Richard Hodges</i>	<i>Library Services</i>	<i>Guest</i>	X
<i>Monique Harrington</i>	<i>Humanities</i>	<i>Guest</i>	X
<i>Jim Acton</i>	<i>Speech</i>	<i>Guest</i>	X
<i>Bill Kelvin</i>	<i>Speech</i>	<i>Guest</i>	
<i>Jaime Votraw</i>	<i>Speech</i>	<i>Guest</i>	X
<i>Monica Krupinski</i>	<i>Humanities</i>	<i>Guest</i>	X

*AASPIRE – Assessment, Accountability, Sponsored Programs, Institutional Research, and Effectiveness

¹Non-Voting

1. Welcome and Call to Order – E. Pritchett opened the meeting at 11:04am
2. Review of December 2020 meeting minutes
 - a. Motion to approve: C. Seefchak
 - b. Seconded: C. Conwell
 - c. **Meeting minutes for December were approved.**
3. Calibration Session
 - a. J. van Gaalen gave a brief overview of norming and calibration
 1. Zoom chat was used to calibration scoring results
 2. The Scoring will commence on Feb 15th – all Scorers will receive an email with directions on where to find the artifacts and how to input scores in the General Education Assessment Canvas course at that time. Scoring is due on April 1st.
 - b. Oral Communicate Rubric
 1. Introduction – multiple scores landed within a one-point difference. Group discussed if speech props such as a PowerPoint presentation can be counted in the Oral rubric scoring process and further complications from implied guidelines
 2. Structure and Transition – group had high correlation but also discussed nuance of “some” and “partial” in the FSW rubrics and regarding transitions
 3. Supporting Evidence – group discussed if sources count when they are only verbally cited and not included in the PowerPoint and the role of speech visuals
 1. J. Summary stressed that Speech faculty emphasize in the classroom that the speech should be graded on what is stated verbally in the speech, and the PowerPoint should be treated only as a visual aid but not the primary component of the speech. Additionally, the verbal citations should be presented alongside the relevant information and not just all at the very end
 4. Delivery – scores landed within one-point difference for group. Group discussed the importance of relying or not relying on notes
 1. J. Summary shared that speech faculty usually ask students to provide eye contact for a high majority of the speech but if giving a direct quote they are allowed to refer to notes
 5. J. van Gaalen shared how encouraging it is to be one-point difference away in the calibration session using the FSW rubrics compared to historically when calibration sessions were more often spanning three points difference.
 6. Conclusion – scores again landed within one-point difference for the group
 1. J. van Gaalen noted that differentiating between level 2 and 3 (developing and accomplished) is the most challenging, and also that there is a level 0 option for all of our FSW Rubrics in cases of plagiarism or in the very rare occasion that nothing about the artifact is speaking to the dimension.
 - c. Zoom chat was used for calibration scoring results – Evaluate Rubric
 1. Group discussed how to determine what is accurate for Evaluate rubrics, especially when grading criteria in the assignment guidelines are implied and not explicit. Scores for all non-science faculty were N/A for this one and group discussed how to handle General Education scoring when Evaluate answer keys are not available or as explicit. Group also discussed the challenge of scoring evaluate artifacts if the communication dimension level score is low

4. Scorer Roll Call

a. **Spring 2021 Gen Ed Scorers**

- b. E. Pritchett recapped that the process of General Education Scoring has included a lot more people on board to do the scoring process which will seriously reduce the burden.

Cara Minardi-Power	Jamie Votraw
Colleen Moore	Dani Peterson
Eric Seelau	Margaret Kruger
Jane Charles	Terry Zamor
Jennifer Patterson	Tom Donaldson
Jennifer Summary	Joseph van Gaalen
Kristi Moran	Elijah Pritchett
Marius Coman	Monique Harrington
Mary Conwell	Richard Hodges
Melinda Lyles	Monica Krupinski
Renee Hester	Caroline Seefchak
Richard Worch	Laura Osgood
Jim Acton	Bill Kelvin

5. Meeting adjourned at 12:09pm.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by D. Barnard