

**MINUTES**  
**General Education Assessment Committee**  
**Friday, January 15, 2010**  
**1:00 pm - 3:00 pm**  
**ETA 101, Lake Worth**

---

<b>Attendance:</b>	Louise Aurelien <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Campbell <input type="checkbox"/>
David Childers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Millas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Karen Pain <input type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input type="checkbox"/>	Andrew Plotkin <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Carole Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Syeda Qadri <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Terry Randolph <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Magdala Ray <input type="checkbox"/>	Matilde Roig-Watnik <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Helen Shub <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.      Workshop on holistic grading**

Discussion:      Prior to today’s meeting, Professors Patrick Tierney and Karen Pain graded all the Quantitative Reasoning Scenarios. The first step in their process was to grade a number of scenarios together and calibrate their scoring. This involved reviewing the rubric and determining how to interpret each dimension of the rubric vis-à-vis what to look for in each written response. Using the criteria they developed, Tierney and Pain then graded the remainder of the scenarios and compared their scores. They found that the grades they assigned to each scenario were almost identical indicating a high level of agreement between the graders – exactly the desired result of holistic grading.

At today’s meeting, Professor Tierney presented this information about the grading process he and Professor Pain undertook and led the committee through a hands-on training session. The purpose of the training session was to practice scoring papers together so that when each group has to grade its own set of scenarios, they will have a good idea of how to arrive at a consensus for scoring.

Highlights from the discussion include:

- Read the Scenario out loud before beginning the process to make sure that all of the graders know exactly what it says.
- Encourage the graders to highlight key things in the Scenario to make sure everyone is on the same page.
- Some ambiguities were noted regarding the Quantitative Reasoning Scenario. Some students may have done calculations based on twice a month rather than 26 times a year.

- Only 7 out of 75 students actually showed the math in their response. This raises the question as to whether the directions were clear enough when asking students to show their work.
- In grading this group of Scenarios, Professors Pain and Tierney essentially looked at only the math, since that is all they were scoring. They were able to save a lot of time in the process by ignoring things like grammatical errors (which will be considered when grading the same Scenario for the communications learning outcome).
- A question came up about whether this Scenario actually tested college level math. This is something that will be addressed when considering revisions for the next implementation.
- Although the rubric was designed with a number of attributes, it was ultimately used to grade the Scenario in a holistic fashion.
- Most of the problem with split scores among graders is alleviated by discussions beforehand. The rubric drives the scoring so before the scoring begins, it is critical the graders agree upon how each category of the rubric will be defined, i.e., the graders need to clarify what constitutes exemplary, proficient, developing, etc.
- Create a set of “anchor papers” – samples of papers that exemplify each score. In this case, there would be five anchor papers – one that represents a paper that would receive a score of “Exemplary”, another for “Proficient” and so on. These anchor papers can help guide the scoring as each group goes through their whole set.
- In holistic grading, it is common to begin the process by looking for papers that represent the upper and lower scores.
- It was suggested that each group read the same four or five papers, use the rubric to score them, then swap the papers and see if there is agreement in scoring. Once there is agreement on scoring (using the rubric), read and score the remainder of the papers separately.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action:           None

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe