

General Education Assessment Subcommittee of the Learning Assessment Committee

Wednesday, July 9, 2014

3:00-4:00 p.m.

I-122

Eileen DeLuca	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Marty Ambrose	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Don Ransford	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Amy Trogan	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Jane Bigelow	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Wendy Chase	<b><i>Present</i></b>
Peggy Romeo	<b><i>Present</i></b>	Joe van Gaalen	<b><i>Present</i></b>

1. Eileen introduced Dr. Joseph van Gaalen, Coordinator of Academic Assessment.
2. The committee reviewed the draft of guidelines for the fall 2014 General Education assessment and the template for submission of assignments. Discussion and suggestions:
  - a. The committee discussed recruiting volunteers. How many faculty/sections/artifacts are “enough?” Joe noted that in the Midland Case Study, their artifacts came from about 60% of the core courses. For the FSW pilot, the committee will recruit volunteers, but go back and re-visit departments asking for additional participation if needed.
  - b. The committee discussed the need to help discipline chairs and faculty understand that this assessment process is different than our former assessment process (Seybert). In the new process we want to see assignments that faculty believe align with the current General Education competencies (regardless of the assessment tool). The focus will be on building an assessment model based on faculty expertise.
  - c. The committee agreed to make a link to the AAC&U rubrics available to all faculty, but emphasize that we are looking for assignments aligned with the competencies.
  - d. Don suggested putting the words “from existing assignments” in bold. Peggy suggested also allowing for “new” assignments.
  - e. It was suggested that the statement “ensure all disciplines are represented” in item #2 is highlighted.
  - f. Joe suggested adding the language “the best example” to item #1 where it discusses submitting assignments and artifacts.
  - g. It was suggested that the language “all of the ungraded” be added to the third item regarding artifacts.

- h. Peggy suggested adding specific guidelines for “sending in answer keys” where relevant.
  - i. It was suggested that we may want to produce a “Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)” page.
  - j. Peggy suggested adding a statement about earning college service for participation.
  - k. Joe discussed recruiting artifacts from both adjunct and full-time faculty. The committee agreed to add the language “Full-time and Adjunct” to item #1.
  - l. The committee revised the submission date to September 26 to make it a Friday.
  - m. Don suggested adding the wording for each of the five General Education competencies as a guideline for those unfamiliar with the competencies.
  - n. Eileen suggested adding the name and contact information of the support staff to the document (Joe and Crystal).
  - o. The committee discussed revising the title of the document to include the words “guidelines” and “opportunity.”
  - p. Eileen noted that Crystal Revak could be responsible for printing College Service certificates.
  - q. Other word choices suggestions were made by various committee members.
3. The committee continued to discuss a plan for General Education Assessment Administration for AY 2014-2015.
- a. Dr. Wright has planned to dedicate Tuesday, August 19, to assessment. Tentatively, 9-12 will be a meeting with all faculty. Eileen and Marty asked Dr. Wright to reserve some time for the group to disseminate the General Education Assessment Plan. Eileen will provide an overview and appeal to faculty to share assignment descriptions that they feel align closely with one or more General Education Competencies. We will highlight how this process is less intrusive than the Seybert model. We will also highlight that the collection of assignment descriptions will help us develop the General Education Assessment Model. Dr. Wright reserved the afternoon for departments to meet to discuss assessment. During this time, Chairs and Assessment Coordinators can discuss both course-level and General Education assessment.
4. The committee reviewed the ACT CAAP during the last ten minutes of the meeting.
- a. Amy liked the Critical Thinking reading topics and felt they were relevant and related to a contemporary worldview. She noted that the questions were challenging and that 40 minutes was not enough time for students to successfully complete the exam.
  - b. Wendy noted that the Critical Thinking Exam was similar to the Reading exam.
  - c. Don noted members said that the exam felt like an “entrance” exam.

- d. Don noted the math exam did not really involve quantitative reasoning and only tested specific mathematics skills. Peggy agreed. Neither felt that the exam was a good measure of quantitative reasoning.
  - e. Amy, Marty, and Jane liked the English Grammar exam items and the use of contextualized grammar.
  - f. Don and Peggy thought the Science exam was “okay.” Don noted that the Science exam contained more quantitative reasoning than the Math exam.
  - g. Marty liked the planning packet provided with the ACT CAAP. There were useful strategies for beginning an assessment conversation.
5. The committee discussed potential problems with standardized exams including motivating students to do their best work, the temptation to “teach to the test, the heavy focus on reading skills to measure other skills, finding proctors, space issues, and use of computers.
- a. Wendy suggested that if our students were doing poorly in the State University System, then it may be useful to use standardized measures to diagnose issues. Otherwise, she feels local assessments are a more valid measure.
  - b. Eileen noted that the State Accountability reports historically have shown Edison (now FSW) students do well in the SUS.
  - c. Eileen and Joe related that even with locally designed measures or Value Rubrics there can be comparative studies. The college can determine achievement comparing scores by
    - i. number of credits completed
    - ii. entering GPA
    - iii. demographic characteristics
    - iv. semester to semester/year to year
    - v. etc.
6. The group discussed the three chapters from “Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment.” Amy noted that chapter five provided a good framework for leading a norming session. She also shared an idea from the recent assessment conference. One of the speakers suggested that faculty write annotations explaining why an artifact was given a particular score on a specific rubric dimension.
7. Marty will work on an updated draft of guidelines and a form for assignment/artifact collection.
8. Tentative agenda for next meeting (July 16):
- a. Provide an overview of the GEAS process to LAC Members or Chairs who are able to attend.
  - b. Share highlights from the State Assessment Meeting.

- c. Review updated draft of General Education Assessment guidelines and assignment submission form.
- d. Continue implementation plan. This may include an extended discussion of the chapters from “Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment.”

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca