

MINUTES
General Education Assessment Committee
Friday, January 8, 2010
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm
ETA 101, 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 Wolesensky <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

ITEM 1. Review of administration of Scenarios and MAPP exam

Discussion: Helen Shub presented to the committee an overview of the implementation of the Scenarios and MAPP exam. Overall, the process went very smoothly, however, there were a few issues that did arise:

- There was some confusion on the part of the proctors regarding the instructions. Although they were told not to let students do either assessment if they arrived late, some proctors did allow students to do that. This problem affected only a handful of students.
- Students taking the Quantitative Reasoning Scenario asked if they could use calculators. This was not anticipated so proctors used their own discretion in making this decision.
- Although a great deal of information about this assessment process was disseminated throughout the College, the information was primarily received by full-time faculty. The adjunct faculty who participated in this process were, for the most part, unaware of what was happening and confused as to why their class was chosen for this process. In the future, communication will be specifically directed to adjuncts about the project.
- Several participating faculty commented that it would be better for them if this assessment could be done earlier in the semester.
- For the most part, this process was received very well by students. There were, however, a few instances where students refused to participate. In future implementations, it is recommended that we publicize this process beforehand to students to make them aware of what the assessment process is all about. (It may still be necessary to avoid giving students advanced notice of when the

assessment will take place – to avoid the problem of skipping class on that day, however, this does not preclude raising student awareness generally about what the assessment process is and why we do it.)

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: The comments that were received from the proctors, faculty and students will be addressed in the design of future implementations.

ITEM 2. Review of sample completed Scenarios

Discussion: Helen Shub provided the committee with several samples of each scenario for their review. The committee took their time reading them and gathering initial impressions of how the answers looked. The samples were selected randomly from the entire group of responses – no attempt was made to select good or bad items.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: None

ITEM 3. Initial issues about Grading Scenarios

Discussion: The committee had a lengthy discussion about how to approach the grading of the scenarios. Many different options were considered, but what was ultimately decided is that during the next meeting, Professor Patrick Tierney will conduct a training session in how to do holistic grading. He and Professor Karen Pain will meet before the meeting and grade all the Quantitative Reasoning scenarios. They will use examples from those scenarios to demonstrate how to develop consensus among the graders as to what qualifies a response as “Exemplary” or “Proficient”, etc. Professor Tierney described this process as identifying “range finder” – papers that demonstrate the essence of what each level of the rubric stands for. These are anchor papers that can be used as a reference throughout the grading process.

Following the training session, the committee agreed to grade all the scenarios in one half-day meeting. Each scenario will have two readers. If the readers are more than one point different, then a third reader will be asked to break the tie.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Professors Patrick Tierney and Karen Pain will grade the Quantitative Reasoning scenarios. Following that, Professor Tierney will use samples from the Quantitative Reasoning scenarios to conduct a training session on holistic grading. Helen Shub will prepare spreadsheets for Professors Tierney and Pain to record the grades for the Quantitative Reasoning scenarios.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe