



**MINUTES**  
**General Education Assessment Committee**  
**Friday, October 9, 2009**  
**1:00 pm - 3:00 pm**  
**ETA 101, Lake Worth**

---



---

<b>Attendance:</b>	Louise Aurelien <input type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Campbell <input type="checkbox"/>
David Childers <input type="checkbox"/>	Tcherina Duncombe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Millas <input type="checkbox"/>
Karen Pain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ginger Pedersen <input 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 type="checkbox"/>	Connie Tuisku <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bobette Wolesensky <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

**ITEM 1. Sample Selection**

Discussion: Helen Shub distributed to the committee the list of classes that were selected for the administration of the MAPP exam and the Scenarios. Ms. Shub explained that the process for selecting the random sample involved selecting classes which contain students who were likely to have finished or nearly finished their general education requirements. It was determined that the best way to do this was to select classes in which the median number of credits (for the class as a whole) equal to 35 credits or greater. At first, the number of credits was set higher and the sample was drawn from those classes where the students had completed a median of 45 credits or greater. This resulted in a sample that was very heavily skewed toward the sciences and math. By reducing the completed credits required to 35, the sample was expanded to include classes from the humanities, social sciences, computing, athletics, business and physical education.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: None.

**ITEM 2. Anonymity of Student Responses**

Discussion: Ms. Shub and Dr. Jennifer Campbell described for the committee what they learned in a conversation with representatives from the MAPP exam. They strongly recommended that the assessments not be anonymous, because one way to increase student

motivation and effort is to provide some kind of reward for high achievement. Some of the suggestions given to us by the MAPP representatives included prizes or student recognition.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Ms. Shub and Dr. Campbell will investigate the possibility of securing meaningful prizes to give away for top performances on the assessments.

### **ITEM 3. Scenarios Pilot**

Discussion: It was determined by the committee that there is no time this semester to pilot the Scenarios. Because it is necessary to provide the faculty with an ample window of time to administer the actual Scenarios, there would be very little time to do any kind of pilot prior to that, especially since it would also involve time for the committee to grade the piloted Scenarios and make changes to the final product based on those results.

It was suggested that each group could pilot their Scenario informally with some of their own students. Several committee members volunteered to do this and report the results back to the committee. One member stated that she wanted to take the assessment herself to see how she would answer the questions.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Committee members will attempt to pilot the Scenarios with some of their own students and report back to the committee at the next meeting.

### **ITEM 4. Review of Scenarios and Rubrics**

Discussion: The committee will select six Scenarios – one for each learning outcome (the seventh – Communications – will be measured using the Quantitative Reasoning Scenario.)

The committee reviewed each of the Scenarios and made a number of suggestions to improve them. In some cases, wording was clarified while in other cases they were shortened to allow students to complete them in the allotted time.

A discussion ensued about the difference between prompts and instructions for students. It was decided that the prompts should be what the students should think about as they are formulating their response. The instructions should state what the student are expected to do.

Data/data source: (where appropriate)

Action: Ms. Shub will send the most recent versions of the Scenarios to the committee for their review. Each group will prepare the information for the section labeled “Information for Raters” for their own Scenario to make it clear what part of their Scenario measures which learning outcomes. Each group will also develop clear instructions for the

students. Once Ms. Shub receives all this information, she will compile it and distribute it to the entire committee for review.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

Helen Shub, Scribe