

MEETING Minutes
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, April 19, 2013
10:00 p.m. – 12:00 noon
CPB 202, Lake Worth

Attendance:	Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Robin Fiedler <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Knopp <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marcie Pachter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Pena <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ana Porro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Helen Shub, Chair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Debra-Anne Singleton <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Warren Smith <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Melissa Stonecipher <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Patrick Tierney <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Guest: Emma Chow	

ITEM 1. Farewell and Welcome

Discussion: Helen Shub began the meeting by announcing that Professor Marcie Pachter will not be part of committee next year because she will be pursuing other exciting professional opportunities. This is a great loss for the committee, but Professor Pachter agreed to remain involved with committee activities as much as her schedule permits. The committee wishes Professor Pachter all the best in her new endeavors and thanks her for her many contributions. Ms. Shub then introduced Professor Emma Chow who will be joining the committee next year. Professor Chow comes with a great deal of experience in assessment and has already demonstrated that she will be an excellent addition to the group. Welcome Professor Chow!

Data source: None

Action: None

ITEM 2. Embedded Assessment Pilot

Discussion: Prior to today's meeting, Professor Patrick Tierney reviewed all the samples that were collected in the fall as part of the embedded assessment pilot. Because of the wide range of how the assignments were constructed, it was determined that it made more sense for the committee to focus on the actual assignments rather than on the student work. Professor Tierney selected a sample of eight assignments that represented a range of quality from the perspective of how well a student would understand what is expected of him or her after reading the assignment.

Prior to looking at the sample assignments, Professor Tierney led the committee in a lively discussion about what a well-designed test should look like. The committee determined that the first step in the process should be to insure that the learning outcomes properly describe the course. From there, it should be determined which learning outcome(s) the test will be designed to address. Assuming that the test is one that involves student writing or some other aspect of student performance, the next step is to design a rubric. The clearer the rubric is, the clearer the expectations will be to the students. It was also noted that the rubric should be supplied to the students, preferably at the beginning of the term. It is the committee's belief that when students are given the tools and responsibility for their success, they will perform better. In addition, by supplying students with the rubric in the beginning of the term, it allows for early involvement with the Student Learning Center (SLC). This is also an opportunity to inform students that working with the SLC is a multi-step process rather than a one-time visit.

The focus of the embedded assessment pilot was student writing. The faculty selected to be part of the sample were asked to submit an example of what they consider to be a major writing assignment. Since all the courses in the sample were Gordon Rule classes, the participating faculty were expected to require significant writing from their students. The committee reviewed the cross-section of assignments selected by Professor Tierney and observed that there were a number of instances where the assignment was either vague or ambiguous and they would have been uncertain how to respond if given the assignment.

The content and concepts of an exam are related to the learning outcomes; the ability to write clear instructions is the mechanical piece of the process and is where the General Education Committee plans to offer assistance to the faculty. The approach that the committee anticipates taking is to facilitate content groups using their own tests and taking them through the process of examining the clarity of the exam from the student's perspective. A suggestion was made to include a process of peer review. The questions that faculty can ask of each other include:

- What aren't we getting from students that we expect and what can we do to get it?
- How can we make our exams clearer?
- Do we come in with assumptions of what students know that are inaccurate? In other words, do we assume that students have prior knowledge that they don't actually possess?

The committee agreed that in order to help facilitate faculty discussions, we should provide faculty with guidelines as to what comprises good assessment. A subcommittee will develop those guidelines this summer. The subcommittee consists of David Knopp, Jennifer Campbell, Connie Tuisku, Debra-Anne Singleton, Helen Shub and Patrick Tierney. Ms. Shub will convene a meeting during Summer A.

Data source: Samples from embedded assessment pilot

Action: Ms. Shub will follow up with the faculty who participated in the pilot and explain to them how their submissions were used and what was learned. Ms. Shub will also convene a meeting of the subcommittee to develop assessment guidelines during Summer A.

ITEM 3. Fall 2013 Assessment Process

Discussion: During the cluster meeting on the afternoon of Convocation, each cluster that teaches general education courses will be asked to devise a common assessment for the course learning outcome they identified for each general education course taught in their area. They will be supplied with the guidelines for developing good assessments that will be developed by the General Education Committee over the summer. A question that came up is what to do if a course is taught by faculty who use different types of assessments, e.g., one assigns an essay and another uses a multiple choice test. In those instances, the cluster will be given the option of coming up with one common assessment, or two common assessments – one for each type.

The question of how to collect the assessment data was discussed. The committee determined that in order for faculty to take this process seriously, it must be a requirement for everyone to participate, rather than using a sampling method. Since there are over 2,100 general education classes being taught in the fall, collection of the data will pose a serious problem because we do not have an automated system in place to do this. Ms. Shub and Dr. Campbell will follow up with Dr. Pedersen to review the plausibility of using Blackboard for this purpose, but the likelihood is that there is not enough time for all faculty to be trained in the use of this product to begin using it in the fall for assessment collection. Associate Dean David Knopp observed that faculty are required to turn in their grade books to their associate deans and perhaps the assessment information could be included in that process. Ms. Shub will follow up with the associate deans to discuss ways in which this could be accomplished. It was further suggested that we invite the associate deans to attend our meetings. Ms. Shub will invite them to the first meeting in the fall.

In addition to the embedded assessment that will take place in the fall, we will also be utilizing a number of the scenarios, as well as the Proficiency Profile. Connie Tuisku researched the new scenario that we are proposing to pilot during Summer A with regard to copyright infringement, and she informed the committee that we have clearance to use the scenario.

Data source: None

Action: Ms. Shub will contact Dr. Sharon Sass to arrange a meeting with the appropriate associate deans to discuss assessment data collection. She will also invite the associate deans to the first meeting of the fall semester.

ITEM 4. Release Time Review – Next Year's Meeting Schedule

Discussion: Ms. Shub distributed to the faculty a summary of release time tasks and deliverables for the next academic year. She emphasized that the majority of committee time will be focused on professional development. They will become a team of experts on the mechanics of good assessment and they will then facilitate discussions and/or workshops with other faculty to assist them in improving their skills.

Data source: Release time forms

Action: None

ITEM 5. Suggestions for Text for Next Year

Discussion: In order to become better equipped to facilitate discussions and workshops with other faculty on assessment, the committee will select a text book on best practices in assessment to be used next year. The committee will study the text and teach each other chapters from the book. Ms. Shub distributed a number of examples of assessment books that could be used and asked for a small number of volunteers to assist in the selection process. The volunteers include David Knopp, Ana Porro and Tcherina Duncombe.

Data source: Various assessment books

Action: A textbook will be selected and ordered by the end of this semester, if funding is available. If it is not available, it will be requested for next year's budget.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe