ITEM 1. Report on Grading of Critical Thinking Scenarios

Discussion: The QEP Implementation Team, along with several members of the General Education Assessment Committee, met numerous times for the purpose of applying the recently developed critical thinking rubric to the critical thinking scenarios administered in prior assessment cycles. The primary intent of this exercise was to acquire baseline data for the QEP. However, it has also turned out to be an excellent opportunity to not only share ideas about critical thinking, but to also re-examine the rubric and the scenario.

The critical thinking scenario was initially developed to measure the critical thinking general education learning outcome which states that students will be able to engage in purposeful reasoning to reach sound conclusions. The rubric developed to score the student responses to this scenario was a holistic rubric. The QEP, however, defines critical thinking in a more detailed fashion which consists of four separate learning outcomes, three of which are measures of direct evidence of learning. The rubric developed for the QEP is therefore an analytic rubric which, when applied to the scenarios administered in the first two cycles of assessment, did not prove to be a good fit. It was suggested by the Assessment Committee that the grading sub-committee attempt to use the new rubric to score the latest set of scenarios because numerous modifications were made to that scenario and its instructions which are more in line with the outcomes of the QEP.
Several faculty who will be on campus during Summer A volunteered to help score the most recent scenarios. They are:

- Pat Tierney
- Tcherina Duncombe
- Marcie Pachter
- Connie Tuisku
- Andrew Plotkin

The committee agreed that the critical thinking scenario should be revised to match the QEP rubric, so that in future assessment cycles, the general education assessment for critical thinking will also be an appropriate measure for QEP purposes.

Data/data source: None

Action: Karen Pain will follow up with the faculty who volunteered to score the most recent set of critical thinking scenarios using the QEP rubric.

ITEM 2. Embedded Assessment Video

Discussion: Helen Shub introduced Robin Fiedler to the committee. Professor Fiedler is not only an English adjunct professor, but she is also an experienced film director. Professor Fiedler is generously donating her time to assist the committee in developing a professional short film to show faculty at Convocation. The purpose of this film is to act as a teaser to begin to introduce the idea that good student writing is every faculty member’s concern. To begin the discussion, Professor Fiedler informed the committee that she needs an audience profile along with a script and dialogue.

After much discussion, it was decided that the primary purpose of this video should be to highlight the problem, that the level of writing among our students needs to improve, and that good writing is not only the responsibility of the English faculty. The video should make it clear that all faculty should hold their students accountable for proper writing. It was also decided that the tone of the video should be upbeat and inspirational and that it should be empowering.

A subcommittee was formed to develop the video including the following:

- Patrick Tierney
- Jennifer Campbell
- Debra-Anne Singleton
- Andrew Plotkin
- Helen Shub
- Marcella Montesinos
- Robin Fiedler
ITEM 3. Review of Deliverables and Schedule for Next Year

Discussion: Helen Shub presented the committee with a list and schedule for all the projects and deliverables for the next academic year. As part of that discussion, Professor McGavin raised the question as to how we can assist the English and prep English clusters in actualizing the writing plan developed by the Expert Writing Committee. In this plan, all faculty who teach ENC 1101, ENC 0025 and EAP 1684 will be required to use the newly developed rubric to grade writing assignments. Professor McGavin’s chief concern is that while the newly-developed learning outcomes were approved through the curriculum process, there is no place in that process for the inclusion of the rubric. Without some type of official “seal of approval” there is concern that some faculty, especially adjuncts, will not feel compelled to use the rubric. Professor McGavin pointed out that without the rubric to define the learning outcomes, the entire point of the project will be lost.

Dr. Jennifer Campbell noted that there is a course syllabus template which is prepopulated with the learning outcomes. She suggested that it might be possible to add the rubric to the syllabus template for those three courses. This could then be sent to the relevant department chairs to send to their faculty along with a note from Professor McGavin. This note would explain that faculty must use this template to enter their syllabus information and are encouraged to use the rubric on all their assignments, but are required to use it on their final assignment.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:00 pm.
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