

## General Education Assessment Wrap-Up Meeting – 5/10/2016

Dr. Amy Trogan, Chair	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Dr. George Manacheril	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Professor Marty Ambrose	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Dr. Jeff Davis	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Dr. Joseph van Gaalen	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Professor Bobby Holbrook	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Dr. Richard Worch	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Professor Joseph Washburn	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Dr. Brian Page	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Dr. Kathy Clark	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Professor Fernando Mayoral	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Barb Miley	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Professor Myra Walters	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Dr. Eileen DeLuca	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Dr. Katie Paschall	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Allison Studer	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Dr. Caroline Seefchak	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Professor Andy Blitz	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Dr. Anne Angstrom	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Dr. Jeff Elsberry	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Professor Joyce Rollins	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Professor Sabine Eggleston	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Professor Amanda Lehrian	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Dr. Marsha Weiner	<b><i>Present</i></b>

- Dr. Trogan welcome participants and provided an overview of the year's work in academic assessment.
- Dr. DeLuca reviewed the recent history of events regarding General Education assessment from the creation of the General Education Assessment Subcommittee (GEAS) in spring 2014 through the review and application of the AAC&U model.
- Dr. DeLuca and Dr. Trogan also reviewed the course of professional development for AY 2015-2016 highlighting some of the workshops and opportunities as a result of the General Education pilot study completed for AY 2014-2015.
- Dr. van Gaalen presented results of the AY 2015-2016 General Education assessment including:
  - Artifact collection data (submission #s, disciplines represented, scorer volunteers)
    - Committee members noted that artifacts were collected from a good cross-section of disciplines.
  - Achievement data on:
    - Written Communication (COM)
    - Oral Communication (COM)
    - Comparisons with Traditional, Dual Enrollment, and Online students
      - Committee members noted overall positive achievement scores. "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" continue to be the area of lowest scores (mean of 2.65 on a 4-point scale)
      - Committee members noted that there were a low number of samples (24) from Dual enrollment sections.

- Since there was only one dual enrollment assignment and it was not a research assignment, the “Sources and Evidence” dimension could not be measured.
- The committee discussed ways to increase communication with and support for Dual Enrollment instructor to ensure comparable instruction and achievement as well as better participation in college-wide assessment.
  - Asynchronous video training
  - Incentivizing department meeting attendance
  - Providing increase faculty support to travel to sites
- Comparisons with AY 2015-2016 COM results
  - Committee members noted an increase in achievement scores which, in both years, are acceptable scores for college-level students and comparable to similar institutions
  - Some of the increase may relate to increased comfort with use of the rubric
  - Some of the increase may relate to the new procedure for identifying plagiarized papers, taking them out of the scoring pool and keeping a record of the percent of plagiarized artifacts to inform faculty and work towards better instruction to help students avoid plagiarism
- Value added studies measuring achievement based on the number of credits earned.
  - Committee members noted that there is a general increase in achievement across rubric dimensions. However in three dimensions, (Context and Purpose for Writing, Content Development, and Genre and Disciplinary Conventions) the overall mean scores were lower for the students who had earned 31-60 credits than for those who had earned 15-30 credits. It was noted that there were similar findings presented in an AAC&U Case study on Midland College.
  - The committee discussed possible reasons that these scores would be lower including the possibility that scores may decline the further students are away from having completed ENC 1101 and 1102. Faculty will want to continue to focus on writing standards and support in all courses. Next year’s professional development theme will include supporting students’ writing development.
- Inter-rater Reliability data on:
  - Written Communication (COM)

- Oral Communication (COM)
  - Comparisons with AY 2015-2016 COM results
    - Committee members noted that for Written Communication there was a general increase in reliability
    - The increase may relate to the ongoing training through calibration sessions
    - There was one dimension on the Oral Communication rubric that has a substantially lower reliability index than others, “Supporting Materials.” This is an area that could improve with more calibration sessions and an increased number of artifacts
    - Committee members noted the difficulty of collecting Oral Communication Artifacts
- The committee reviewed qualitative feedback from the scoring team.
- Written Communication Rubric:
  - Rubric worked well; when interpretive problems occur, it is usually determining achievement at 2 or 3, as opposed to 4-3, or 2-1.
  - Best suited for traditional essay/term paper writing assignments
    - One cause – communication is rapidly evolving.
    - Committee members suggested that LAC and GEPR should develop multiple rubrics for each competency to allow for both traditional and non-traditional assignments.
  - Four of five dimensions apply to most artifacts (Sources & Evidence doesn’t). Not all assignment guidelines provide clarity about source needs.
  - Choosing “Control of Syntax and Mechanics” score: Tough to distinguish between “some and few.”
  - Those which had clear instructions were score-able
- Oral Communication Rubric:
  - Clear differences for each criterion and achievement level made it easy and effective; works very well for classic speeches and presentations but can become problematic with voice-over type presentations
  - Dr. Paschall and Professor Walters emphasized the importance of the “Delivery” criterion.
  - Dimension achievement levels reported to be much clearer as compared with the written communication rubric (very effective for classical speeches and presentations).
  - Dimension achievement levels much clearer than Written Communication AAC&U Value Rubric (simplicity in this case works)
  - Rubric works well if utilized appropriately for the course. A communications course presentation as opposed to a course that is using a presentation as a means to addressing a topic may require use of only components of the rubric (e.g. if delivery is not an area of focus

in the classroom it should not be scored unless content issues or some other area is what is hindering delivery).

- “Not every presentation is going to be as concerned with supporting materials or delivery.”
- Improvements in calibration from AY 2014-2015 into AY 2015-2016 resulted in improved inter-rater reliability, higher (closer to true) achievement across rubric dimensions as a result of more effective scoring
- The faculty serving on scoring teams were asked to look at scenarios and judge whether each was an example of plagiarism. Based on the faculty “votes,” the Office of Academic Assessment developed guidelines to identify artifacts that were unscorable due to plagiarism. This allows data tracking regarding plagiarized assignments (11% of sampled artifacts exhibited some form of plagiarism as defined by faculty survey).  
The Committee was asked to reflect on the 2016-17 General Education Competency focus for assessment.
  - Committee members suggested that the lack of a clear focus for TIM will be ameliorated by the proposed General Education competencies that are scheduled to be implemented in Spring 2017.
  - Most attendees agreed that QR and CT would be strong choices for the next assessment cycle.
- The Committee was asked to reflect on the 2016-2017 professional development focus.
  - The attendees agreed with the value of continuing the Effective Research Assignment Guidelines Panel as well other professional development related to improving assignment guidelines, information literacy and supporting student research writing.
  - Professor Holbrook discussed the need for better faculty training in APA. The committee discussed having sessions where faculty could share ideas for teaching APA, MLA and Chicago styles. Professor Charles encouraged faculty to focus on adhering to the published guidelines for each style guide. Librarians continue to offer support to students and faculty.
  - Dr. Paschall encouraged a continued focus on developing effective assignment guidelines.
  - Professor Walters mentioned the need for discipline-specific professional development while emphasizing the difficulty of implementation.
- Dr. Trogan closed the session by thanking the participants for their hard work in supporting General Education Assessment across departments.
  - Next year’s committee will expand to include more “general members” to allow for more participation and training.
  - Committee members noted that it would be beneficial to invite the Academic Deans to the General Education wrap-up session.