

Meeting Minutes

Learning Assessment Committee

Friday, May 4th, 2023, 9:00 a.m.

AA-172

<i>Member Roster</i>	<i>Dept./Division</i>	<i>Membership Type</i>	<i>Present</i>
<i>Jennifer Summary</i>	Communication Studies	LAC Chair	X
<i>Bill Kelvin</i>	Communication Studies	Coordinator	X
<i>Cara Minardi-Power</i>	English	Coordinator	X
<i>Caroline Seefchak</i>	Education	Coordinator	X
<i>Colleen Moore</i>	Health Professions	Coordinator	
<i>Eric Seelau</i>	Social Sciences	Coordinator	
<i>Fernando Mayoral</i>	Foreign Language	Coordinator	X
<i>Jane Charles</i>	Libraries	Coordinator	X
<i>Jennifer Patterson</i>	Accounting/Business/Management	Coordinator	
<i>Krissy Cabral</i>	Crime Scene Technology	Coordinator	X
<i>Kristi Moran</i>	Mathematics	Coordinator	
<i>Marius Coman</i>	Biology/Chemistry/Physics	Coordinator	
<i>Mary Conwell</i>	Paralegal /Arch., Const., Engr.	Coordinator	X
<i>Monique Harrington</i>	Humanities	Coordinator	X
<i>Renee Hester</i>	Academic Success	Coordinator	
<i>Richard Worch</i>	Criminal Justice/Public Admin.	Coordinator	X
<i>Rushell Hopkins</i>	Computer Technology	Coordinator	
<i>Dolores Batiato</i>	Business	General Member	
<i>Terry Zamor</i>	Mathematics	General Member	
<i>Tina Churchill</i>	Mathematics	General Member	
<i>Tom Donaldson</i>	Social Sciences	General Member	
<i>Meghan Carlson</i>	Mathematics	General Member	X
<i>Amy Trogan</i>	English	General Member	
<i>Tami Such¹</i>	Dean, Health Sciences	Ex-officio	
<i>D'ariel Barnard¹</i>	AASPIRE*	Ex-officio	X
<i>Joseph van Gaalen¹</i>	AASPIRE*	Ex-officio	X
<i>Jessica Godwin¹</i>	AASPIRE*	Observer	X

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

¹Non-Voting

- I. Welcome and Call to Order at 9:05am – J. Summary, Committee Chair
- II. Approval of April 2023 meeting minutes – **April minutes approved with minor correction**
 - a. Motion to approve: R. Worch

- b. Seconded: M Carlson
- III. The Future of LAC
 - a. J. van Gaalen shared new updates for structure of the Learning Assessment Committee and Coordinator positions moving forward
- IV. General Education Assessment Wrap Up Preliminary Results of VISUALIZE and ENGAGE Competencies with J. van Gaalen
 - a. Visualize and Engage both had lower achievement levels compared to the other competencies
 - b. Visualize data
 - I. 167 artifacts, 22 assignments, sample count broken out by modality
 - II. Note of context: Assignments were selected by the faculty member of the sampled courses
 - III. Overall, there is room for discussion and improvement in alignments from assignment to general education competencies
 - IV. Interesting points to highlight:
 - I. Achievement levels varied across modalities, specifically for the dimension of Global Self-Awareness verses other dimensions.
 - II. Achievement level by credits earned did not vary much, which is not surprising in the context of the reduced exposure students have to the Visualize competency which is currently a competency identified as integral in a smaller number of courses than other competencies.
 - III. Achievement levels did not vary much between Full-Time (FT and Part-Time (PT) students, which is very different from last year's competency data from Think and Investigate.
 - IV. Achievement levels did vary between First Time in College (FTIC) and non-FTIC. In other words, students who are more familiar with college in general, demonstrated higher achievement.
 - V. Key takeaways and quotes from scorers emphasized lack of alignment from assignments to competency.
 - VI. **Suggestion**
 - I. **LAC tasked with completing a review of competency over next few years.**
- c. Engage data
 - I. 159 artifacts, 26 assignments, sample count broken out by modality
 - II. Interrater reliability was low compared to other competencies
 - III. Interesting points to highlight:
 - I. Very low achievement is potentially indicative of overlap with misalignment.
 - II. Modality: Achievement Levels varied significantly for three of the four rubric dimensions. Dual Enrollment (DE) samples were unavailable.
 - III. Engage artifacts were primarily drawn from SLS 1515 artifacts, therefore discussions about Engage data results can focus on needs

or review of this course. For example, SLS 1515 has a high number of identified integral competencies, but that means less time in the classroom is able to be devoted to each of those competencies.

IV. Achievement levels for FT vs PT were similar

V. Achievement levels varied for both FTIC & non-FTIC as well as FGIC and non-FGIC, and this difference in achievement levels was loud enough to be heard through the noise, so to speak, of scoring challenges, competency misalignments, etc.

VI. Key takeaways and quotes from scorers emphasized lack of elements from dimension of Diversity of Communities & Culture available in the assignments.

VII. Suggestion

I. LAC tasked with completing a review of competency over next few years.

V. New Business with J. Summary

a. Those interested in being an Effectiveness Coordinator, talk to your Dean

b. Those interested in being LAC Chair next year, talk to current Chair, J. Summary

VI. Adjournment

a. Motion to adjourn: F. Mayoral

b. Seconded: R. Worch

c. Meeting adjourned at 10:19am