

## 2018 MINUTES

12/7/18

Learning Assessment Committee

General Education Assessment Subcommittee

11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

AA 177 (Lee Campus); E-105 (Charlotte Campus);

G-109 (Collier Campus)

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

Guest: Jennifer Summary

- A. J. van Gaalen opened the GenEd Scoring Subcommittee meeting with information about the number of scorers, future calibration sessions, and how the practice and formal calibration session supports communication in the paired scoring process.
- a. J. van Gaalen reported that there are 14 scorers, same number as last year, so roughly same number of assignments will be scored as last year.
    1. The official calibration session will be in Feb. with one meeting for the Visualize assessment group and a separate meeting for Engage.
    2. Scorers will be paired across disciplines.
    3. Office of Academic Assessment will bring the packets of rubrics for Scorers to circle and fill out, a jump drive with the artifacts, and a feedback form.
      - a. Feedback form results in the Subcommittee meeting across the room of professional development building on feedback from previous GenEd Scoring. This will lead to exemplar assignments available on the

web page and workshops for faculty on using the FSW-developed GenEd Rubrics.

4. This practice session and the calibration session provide an opportunity for Scorers to confer with their scoring partner on things that come up such as a plagiarized assignment or assignments that are not applicable to the GenEd rubric, so each partnered pair is on the same page. The idea is not to convert your personal scoring philosophy but encourage similar scoring methods (aka if an assignment is not 100% applicable, we want to avoid one scoring giving no score and one scorer giving the lowest score).
    - a. Also in some cases, if you and your scoring partner find an unusable artifact (such as a plagiarized one), the Office of Academic Assessment may be able to replace it with an alternate artifact.
  5. Goal in this practice session is to take this time and see if we get within one point of each other in scoring.
  6. Take next 5-10 minutes to read through the Visualize assignment and score it and then we'll go around the room and talk about how we score it.
    - a. D. Licht asked if Scorers are meant to score the assignment guidelines or the assignment artifact.
      - i. J. van Gaalen reiterated that it is the artifacts we are scoring, and you may get somewhere in the vicinity of 40-60 artifacts submitted under one set of assignment guidelines.
- B. Scores for the first dimension of the Visualize Rubric were shared around the table.
- a. Global/1st Dimension: 3,2,2/na,3,3,3,na,na
    - i. Both E. Sealu & T. Donaldson shared that they considered this artifact unrepresentative of the Visualize competency based on the Visualize Rubric, had scored NA for every dimension and requested clarification on assignment applicability.
    - i. M. Kruger agreed that that this artifact was not applicable to the Visualize Rubric as the assignment did not mention global elements anywhere, a key component of many dimensions in the Visualize rubric.
    - ii. J. Patterson suggested that global could be interpreted differently, perhaps encased within the overall – though localized - environment of this particular assignment.
      - a. J. van Gaalen mentioned that the concerns about applicability are valid but when looking back at the Visualize GenEd competency description once can see more ties to the assignment.

**Visualize and engage the world from different historical, social, religious, and cultural approaches—**

Understand how history, culture, and society shape and inform the human condition in the successful pursuit of academic and occupational goals. Understand how diverse cultures have interacted with, and continue to connect with, each other on a global scale. Engage in the comparative study of the values and traditions of diverse cultures. Understand and navigate the conventions, knowledge formations, practices, and discursive norms of society, culture, and the academy in order to improve and analyze one's own thinking, value diversity, and cultivate an open-minded approach to new ideas and social issues.

He further mentioned that as tasked this LAC will create our own FSW rubric, but right now we're in the process of using a third-party rubric.

- i. E. Seelau spoke about how variability depends on the cheat sheet.
  - ii. T. Donaldson reiterated that not enough diversity representation is clearly seen in this particular artifact or the assignment, despite being called for by the Rubric.
- C. A poll was taken for the rest of the Visualize Rubric dimensions to see how many would categorize the assignment as not applicable to the rubric.
- a. Perspective Taking – 3 Scorers reported the artifact as NA.
  - b. Cultural diversity - 6 Scorers reported the artifact as NA.
  - c. Responsibility – 5 Scorers reported the artifact as NA.
  - d. Applying knowledge – 2 Scorers reported the artifact as NA.
- D. J. van Gaalen supplied recent previous commentary from non-present members.
- a. Non-present Scorers in a previous mini-practice session utilized the context of the environment that the students are in to increase applicability of the artifact. In perspective taking, for example, they commented on the "Learning Objective of the Month" section of the artifact and how the student had multiple ways of communicating the knowledge the student was tasked to present, as requested by the assignment.
    - i. T. Donaldson suggested that the visualization element of this assignment as displayed in different forms of communication made it possibly a better fit in the Communication competency than the Visualize competency.
      1. J. van Gaalen responded that the other scorers replied by saying in creating different forms of communication the student is trying to reach out to different groups of people aka to different cultures.
    - ii. T. Donaldson theorized that a professor may have used only the term "Visualize" from the competency title without taking into account the entire definition of the FSW Visualize integral competency and proposed again that such a non-applicable assignment should be thrown out and not scored.

- iii. J. van Gaalen ask for perspectives regarding the last domain in the rubric from those who did consider it applicable and gave it a score.
  - 1. W. Stoudt said he gave it a 2.
  - 2. M. Kruger said she gave it a 1.
- iv. J. van Gaalen advised that when Scorers come across cases like this, the scoring process has to be assignment driven, not student driven – so every student artifact should be an NA, not just some of them that are poor at doing what they’re supposed to do (so we don’t get 1’s down the board for all 19 artifacts).
  - i. T. Donaldson submitted that the universality of “play,” the driving force behind this assignment, could allow it to be interpreted as global and thus applicable to the Visualize competency.
- b. E. Seelau noted that in some cases a course may align with a competency, and so a professor submits the final project as a default for GenEd assessment, but that does not always mean the final project is guaranteed to necessarily align with the GenEd competency.
- c. T. Donaldson proposed that if the subcommittee agrees to throw out an assignment, there should be a communication feedback loop with those professors to ask what went into the process to submit those inapplicable assignments.
- d. J. van Gaalen responded to the proposal and suggested that the next December meeting should be about giving Scorers the ability to go through all submitted assignments and categorize into usable with the rubric versus not applicable, so that way there is data on that to communicate to professors about the assignment submissions and to make the rest of the scoring process more efficacious as well. He then asked the subcommittee how they would like to see that communication addressed to faculty.
  - 1. E. Seelau offered that the purpose and process of the GenEd assessment be explained and then let faculty know their assignment doesn’t seem to be capturing the competency.
  - 2. J. van Gaalen advocated for the importance of levels and nuances so the communication isn’t regarded as punitive.
  - 3. T. Donaldson noted that receiving an NA assignment is seen as a communication breakdown between LAC and faculty. As it’s merely a communication issue, further clarification does not have to be punitive.
  - 4. M. Kruger asked about the possibilities of being proactive and doing Professional Development Workshops about what these assignments should look like before they get turned in to get the definitions out there.
    - a. J. van Gaalen responded that the LAC doesn’t decide the next competencies to assess until the April meeting, however when the Office of Academic Assessment requests assessment

submissions via emails, we ask that the assignment speaks to the competency and we provide the competency description. The fact that FSW uniquely has 8 competencies also means we have unique challenges.

- b. T. Donaldson responded that the LAC knew we were tackling these more difficult competencies after we got the GenEd assessment process rolling.
  - c. E. Seelau responded that one can look at this rubric and create an assignment to it, so it is not an impossible task.
- E. J. van Gaalen states that the Office of Academic Assessment will take the feedback from this discussion to revamp the December meeting for next year, allowing scorers to provide applicability feedback on all collected assignment submissions in lieu of a practice session on a single artifact. He then reiterates the rest of the GenEd process for upcoming meetings.
- a. First week of February, you'll have your packets and what you need for your scoring packet.
  - b. We Encourage you to bring your laptop, so we can load the info from a jump drive right there.
  - c. Encourage you to do a quick look through the assignments so you and your scoring partner can figure out if you may need replacement assignments, etc.
  - d. You have till April 1 to submit your scored responses.
    - i. 50-60 rubric papers matched to a code for each artifact.
    - ii. It is important to keep the code on the rubric and artifact matched so we can include other value-added data information.
    - iii. Other questions?
      - 1. [from non LAC member in foreign languages?] asked how to reach out to be a part of more of the process like the feedback summer group if not a member of the LAC committee?
        - a. J. van Gaalen replied with how to reach out to your Learning Assessment Coordinator, K. Paschall or F. Mayoral.
- F. J. van Gaalen closed the meeting at 12:14pm with information that there is a Duty Day coming as well.
- a. Happy Holidays to all!

Meeting Minutes recorded by D. Barnard