

2018 MINUTES

12/7/18

Learning Assessment Committee

Professional Development Subcommittee

11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

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

G-109 (Collier Campus)

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

- A. Dr. Worch reviewed the instructions for the subcommittee breakout meeting
- a. Upon reviewing and getting familiar with the **General Education Artifact Submission Scorer Feedback** booklet, one exemplar assignment should be selected for Investigate, Research, Quantitative Reasoning, and Critical Thinking
 - b. Exemplar assignments should be selected with how faculty can make assignment instructions clear for students and how faculty may best create good assignments that align with competency goals and measures
 - c. Exemplar assignments will then be considered for addition to the web-based professional development for faculty currently under design
 - d. Jane Charles recommended each committee member take one competency and identify exemplar assignment; Charles (Research), Conwell (Investigate), Coman (Quantitative Reasoning), Worch (Critical Thinking)
 - e. Professor Charles noted the assignments were from the previous competencies

- i. It was also noted they could be somewhat dated and irrelevant to the new competencies
 - ii. Perhaps a call out to faculty for current assignments could be made to faculty when we return in January
 - iii. Professor Charles stated she felt confident there are many exemplar assignments that could be considered
- f. Dr. Coman identified possible assignments # 9 and 16 as the exemplar with the following notations;
 - i. #9:
 - 1. the calculations may look somewhat extensive; but in reality it's only 2 formulas;
 - 2. showing work is assumed/presumed cannot get final answer without doing the work
 - 3. real analysis and evaluating aspects are contained within students' calculations
 - 4. the only shortcoming for QR 9 is that 90% of questions investigate same phenomenon meaning a student will either correctly answer all questions or none
 - 5. the rubric's evaluation aspect is there but it's implied, included in the inferences a student makes
 - ii. #16:
 - 1. Requirements are better written and the evaluation aspect is explicit rather than implied
 - iii. The other assignment submissions are not on par for consideration
- g. Dr. Worch identified assignment #2 as the exemplar
- h. Dr. Conwell had only one choice available and did not feel it met the competency or was exemplar; she also asked if other assignments were available for review
- i. Professor Charles had no recommendation for an exemplar assignment from the booklet and suggested we bring in exemplar professors during the month of January to obtain better assignments; she stated she is also willing to coordinate the faculty submissions

The subcommittee meeting concluded at 12:15 p.m.