

MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, January 13, 2012
10:00 p.m. – 12:00 p.m.
ETA 101, Lake Worth

Attendance:	Diane Bifano <input type="checkbox"/>	Susan Caldwell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Ciucci <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Robin Hoggins-Blake <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marcella Montesinos <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marci Pachter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input type="checkbox"/>	David Pena <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Anthony Piccolino <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Carole Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Syeda Qadri <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Helen Shub <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Debra-Anne Singleton <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Victor Slesinger <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Melissa Stonecipher <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Patrick Tierney <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bobette Wolesensky <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

ITEM 1. Embedded Assessment

Discussion: The meeting began by introducing Debra-Anne Singleton as a new member of the committee. Ms. Singleton is the manager of the Lake Worth Campus Student Learning Center and will be a very welcome addition to the committee.

The purpose of today’s meeting was to begin to discuss how to create an assessment plan that would include a meaningful embedded assessment component. Helen Shub outlined for the committee a sampling of the variety of ways an assessment plan can be constructed. Things to be considered include:

- What kind of assessments should be utilized and who should develop them?
- How will the assessments be reviewed for quality and effectiveness?
- How are the artifacts collected and graded?
- Where should the assessments be administered?
- How often should the assessments be administered?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of the various people/committees in the assessment process?

The committee agreed that the most important aspects of embedded assessment is that it should provide useful information to students and faculty, be directly tied to what happens in the classroom, and lead to better targeted improvements in order to increase student learning. The committee also felt strongly that the process itself should be one

that encourages faculty to participate and to take responsibility for the general education curriculum and the assessment of its outcomes.

Ms. Shub explained to the committee that Dr. Sharon Sass has asked that a draft of a plan should be ready to show the academic deans by April. In order to do this, the committee must complete the plan draft by the March 30th meeting.

Length of Plan

The members of the committee indicated that they felt comfortable drafting a three-year plan as long as there is some flexibility in the implementation phase to make necessary changes.

The current assessment plan including Scenarios, the ETS Proficiency Profile and a variety of institutional measures will continue to be administered throughout the plan. As an augmentation to this holistic approach, embedded assessments will be added for each learning outcome in the following manner:

First year. The two outcomes that will be focused upon in the first year will be critical thinking and communications. Because critical thinking is the topic of the QEP, there has already been an extensive plan outlined for the development of better assessment for this particular learning outcome. Therefore, the committee's main focus for this first year will be to work on the development of embedded assessment instruments for oral and written communications, as well as a plan for how to administer these assessments and how to utilize the results to make improvements.

Second Year. While the committee continues its work with communications and the QEP also continues its work with critical thinking, the committee will select a third (and possibly fourth) learning outcome and will begin the process of developing embedded assessments for that outcome.

Third Year. The third year will follow the same approach – continue with the outcomes already in process and add a new outcome or two to focus on. By the third year, it may be appropriate to rotate out one or more of the outcomes as a point of focus, if the work in that area is considered complete by the committee. This pattern will continue until all six general education learning outcomes have embedded assessment plans developed and implemented.

Creation of Assessment Instruments

The next question the committee dealt with is how to create assessment instruments that faculty with content knowledge have had a hand in developing. Ms. Shub explained that in many institutions a panel of content experts is created for this purpose. In other institutions, it might be the equivalent of the cluster or the general education committee that develops the instruments. After much consideration, the committee determined that it was very important to give the faculty the opportunity to take responsibility for creating these instruments. It was recommended that the cluster chair for the English and Speech clusters send an email to their clusters asking them to identify what they think are the top problems that students encounter in their disciplines. For example, in English the answers might include things like "sentence structure" or "organization".

From these responses, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff will create a survey to be sent to all faculty. A drop-down menu will be created from the suggestions provided by the English and Speech clusters and all faculty throughout the entire College will be asked to select the top two areas of difficulty that students display in their classes, for both written and oral communications. Once these survey results are tallied, the top answers will be provided to the English cluster (for written communications) and to the Speech cluster (for oral communications). The clusters will be given the opportunity to draft a meta-rubric for these two items that will be used to measure these skills in a wide variety of courses. If for some reason the cluster chooses not to do this, a panel of content experts will be appointed to complete the task.

Melissa Stonecipher is the cluster chair for English and will be sending an email to the cluster asking for their input next week. Helen Shub will contact David Childers, the Speech Cluster chair, and ask him to do the same thing with his cluster. The IRE Office will send out an electronic survey to all faculty within a few days after receiving the results from the two clusters and plans to have the survey results back in time for the February 3rd committee meeting.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Professor Stonecipher will send an email to the English cluster asking for their input. Ms. Shub will contact Professor Childers to ask him to send a similar email to the Speech cluster. The IRE Office will create a survey based on those results and send it to all faculty and instructors. The results of that survey will be shared with the committee at the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:40 am.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe