

MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, January 29, 2010
12:00 noon - 4:00 pm
CE 201, Lake Worth

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Attendance: | Louise Aurelien <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Campbell <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| David Childers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Joseph Millas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ginger Pedersen <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 Wolessensky <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

ITEM 1. Grade Scenarios

Discussion: Today's goal was to grade all the Scenarios. As part of the preparation for this meeting, Professors Patrick Tierney and Karen Pain had already graded all the quantitative reasoning scenarios, so that left the remaining six learning outcomes to be graded. The committee split into six groups – one for each learning outcome. The groups were as follows:

Communications

Professor Carole Policy
Professor Melissa Stonecipher
Dr. Syeda Qadri

Critical Thinking

Professor Tcherina Duncombe
Professor Matilde Roig-Watnik

Ethics

Professor Joseph Millas
Professor Victor Schlesinger
Dr. Ginger Pedersen

Global Awareness

Professor Terry Randolph
Professor Bobette Wolessensky

Information Literacy

Professor Louise Aurelian
Ms. Connie Tuisku
Professor Andrew Plotkin

Personal Development

Professor David Childers
Dr. Jennifer Campbell
Ms. Helen Shub

The first step each group took was to review the rubric and arrive at a consensus as to how to define each of the components of the rubric. Once the group reached that agreement, they selected a number of scenarios that they would grade together. By grading and discussing the sample scenarios, the group members were able to calibrate their scoring and make additional tweaks to how the rubric should be interpreted.

All of the scenarios were graded by two readers. Those groups that had three readers divided up their scenarios so that each participant read two-thirds of the scenarios. In those groups that had two readers, each reader read all of the scenarios for that particular learning outcome. Each reader had his or her independent scoring sheet so no one knew how the other reader scored the scenario. Once the scenarios were graded, the scores of the two readers were compared. If the scores were the same, that was the score. If the score was different by one point, i.e., one grader gave the scenario a "3" and the other gave it a score of "4", the two scores would be averaged so the score for this scenario would be a 3.5. If the two readers differed by more than one point, the readers were given the opportunity to reread the scenario and discuss their views. If they were able to come to an agreement, the readers could change their scores to reflect their consensus. If no consensus was possible, a third reader graded the scenario. This third grade was then averaged with one of the two original scores that it was closest to.

By the end of the meeting, almost all the groups had completed the grading of the scenarios. Those groups with only two graders had significantly more work than those with three graders, however, so they were unable to complete the task during this four-hour meeting. The members of both of those groups continued working on their scenarios beyond the adjournment of the meeting. During the next implementation of the scenarios assessment, it will be a topic of discussion to better insure that there is a more equitable distribution of the scenarios for grading.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Helen Shub will prepare handouts for the committee displaying the results of the scenarios along with other assessment data for the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe