

General Education Assessment Subcommittee of the Learning Assessment Committee

Wednesday, May 14, 2014

11:00 a.m. 12:00 p.m.

I-122

Eileen DeLuca	Present	Marty Ambrose	Present
Don Ransford	Present	Amy Trogan	Present
Jane Bigelow	Present	Wendy Chase	Present
Peggy Romeo	Present		

1. Eileen opened the meeting by explaining the purpose and the charge of the General Education Assessment Subcommittee (GEAS).
2. The subcommittee reviewed a diagram summarizing Academic Affairs Assessment. This subcommittee will focus on assessing achievement of the current General Education Competencies as per SACSCOC **3.5.1**: *The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them.*
3. Marty provided information about the conclusion of the previous General Education Assessment cycle utilizing the Seybert Institutional Portfolio.
4. The subcommittee discussed the purpose of the General Education Review Committee (GERC) which is tasked with designing a new General Education program (with new competencies) to comply with State Rule **6A-14.0303 General Education Core Course Options must be implemented by fall 2015**. Don and Eileen serve on both committees (GEAS and GERC).
See State Rule: <https://www.flrules.org/gateway/ruleno.asp?id=6A-14.0303&Section=0>
See final recommendations of the General Education Steering and Faculty Committees that include suggested General Education Competencies: <http://www.fldoe.org/articulation/pdf/gesfcir.pdf>
5. We have one interim/transition year where we need to assess current General Education competencies while GERC is establishing the new General Education course sequence and competencies.
6. GEAS will review commonly used General Education assessments. Faculty will determine which assessment(s) best align with our current General Education competencies and which will provide us the most useful information to inform improvement in courses and the overall program.

7. The committee began a review of the AAC&U Value rubrics. Marty noted that the AAC&U Value rubrics are similar to the faculty-developed rubrics used for the Seybert Assessments.

8. The committee discussed the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric.

- Marty listed some positive aspects of the rubric.
 - The dimension related to the “Genre and Disciplinary Conventions” allowed the rubric to be more applicable across disciplines. The rubric in general also allowed the scoring of writing that fell outside of the “five-paragraph essay” structure.
 - In some ways the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric is more thorough than the current Seybert Rubric. The rubric “raises” the level for a more “collegiate” assessment. Jane, Amy, and Wendy concurred.
- Jane commented that on both the Written Communication rubric and the Oral Communication rubric there were dimensions focusing on source material (either “sources and evidence” or “supporting materials”). She thought that this was positive.
- Marty shared that the Midland College case study provides a framework for possible administration:
<http://www.fldoe.org/articulation/pdf/gesfcir.pdf>
- Eileen concurred and noted that the University of North Carolina case study also provides ideas for how to disaggregate data:
<https://www.aacu.org/VALUE/casestudies/documents/UniversityofNorthCarolinaWilmington.pdf>
- The group discussed possibilities for administration of General Education Assessment using Value Rubrics. Faculty could be provided with General Education Competencies and Rubrics and asked to submit samples of assignments already embedded in courses that may be a good match. The group also discussed using a “value-added” model where random samples were drawn from courses while disaggregating data by the number of credits acquired by students and/or course history (e.g. those who have completed ENC 1101 and 1102 versus those who had not).
- Don suggested using an assignment in SLS 1515 as a possible early data point. Eileen shared that all SLS 1515 sections have a final essay as a common course assessment. This could possibly be scored on the Written Communication Rubric.

9. Don asked for clarification regarding the purpose of the transition assessment. Should the major focus be internal validation (seeking baseline achievement data for program

improvement and/or using a value-added model of achievement) or external validation (comparing against other institutions and/or established norms)? Eileen responded that both types of assessment had value, and it was up to the faculty to decide if one or the other would be more meaningful for this transition year. She also noted that the faculty may decide to utilize both models and administer more than one of the assessment tools. Don followed up by asking if we should measure achievement of all five competencies in 2014-2015. Eileen responded that it was up to the faculty to decide, but she encouraged measuring achievement of all five competencies as a summative assessment of the current General Education Competencies that would inform program improvement as well as provide a guide for GERC as they build the new General Education Program.

10. The committee reviewed the Critical Thinking Value Rubric.

- Jane pointed out that both the definition of “Critical Thinking” provided by the AAC&U and the rubric verbiage seemed much clearer than the Seybert Critical Thinking Rubric.
- Marty noted that the language also seemed clearer than the Elder Paul Critical Thinking model and may better match the current General Education Competency.
- Wendy commented that the rubric seemed to measure important aspects of Critical Thinking especially in terms of “perspective.” The committee discussed engendering students’ ability to think critically by learning from others and feeling comfortable with revising their original thoughts based on evidence and/or exposure to new ideas/ways of thinking.
- Don and Peggy suggested that the Critical Thinking Rubric may not work as well for current assignments in Math and Science. Eileen reported that the rubrics did not need to be used in the same way as the Seybert model, that is, not every course needed to be assessed. In the future, when the General Education Program and AA are mapped using the new competencies, core courses will be chosen for assessing each General Education Competencies. She also suggested that Peggy and Don may want to review the “Inquiry and Analysis” rubric and the “Problem Solving” rubric to see if either is aligned with Math or Science assignments.

11. The committee reviewed the Information Literacy Value Rubric.

- Jane pointed out that the Definition and the rubric language were adopted from the National Forum on Information Literacy. She noted that the rubric covers the five criteria for information literacy (see ACRL). She felt that the rubric was a much better

fit for the Technology Information Management (TIM) competency than the current Seybert TIM rubric.

- Marty and Amy suggested that the Information Literacy Value Rubric may align with the Digital Literacy Assignments in the ENC courses.

12. The committee reviewed comments and the charge for the next meeting:

- Continue to review AAC&U Rubrics.
- Review Midland College and University of North Carolina case studies.
- Take CLA+ sample assessment. Eileen will send links.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca