

General Education Assessment Team Meeting

December 2, 2016

Great Plains Room – Memorial Union

3:00 – 5:00

Minutes

1. The minutes from the November 4th meeting were reviewed. Cynthia motioned and Christa seconded to accept the minutes. There was no discussion. The vote was called and all voting members in attendance approved.
2. Rich presented his findings from mapping course embedded writing assignments based on the coursework that had been completed by his sample of one. The types of writing assignments were research papers, lab assignments, and variety of others including book reviews, classical papers, short reaction papers, etc. One of the key findings was that these written assignments were embedded in major program courses. Based on this information, Rich believed that the kind of assignments that are given in general education courses lack the complexity to adequately be used to score student performance in written communication based on the contexts of the AAC&U written communication value rubric. To determine if appropriate assignments exist, it was suggested that a faculty survey would be necessary to quantify the types and complexity of writing assignments being employed in General Education Courses.
3. In reference to item 4. in the November 4th GEAT meeting minutes, the team was engaged in a conversation about the Direct Assessment Proposal for Written Communication submitted by Rachelle, whereby Rachelle, Kat, and Cynthia had consulted with Rich prior to the November 4th meeting. When the discussion of the efficacy of the project was occurring in the November 4th meeting, the status of the proposal had yet to be determined. In the meeting minutes (November 4th), it is written that the status of the proposal was in the discussion phase and it was tabled due to meeting time constraints. During the November 4th meeting discussion, Jo and Rich had raised concerns in terms of faculty response. This item was revisited as a part of the conversation dedicated to the December 2nd meeting agenda item 1, when Rich was sharing information about research he had done to identify the availability of assignments to be scored via the written communication assessment proposal. At this time, Rachelle questioned the status of the project. Jo reiterated the concerns for being able to gather an appropriate sample of student assignments. Rich mentioned that if the student assignments did exist that the faculty teaching the courses may or may not agree that the use of the rubric was a good fit or even a fit at all. Jo stated that the proposal as currently written would not be endorsed because there were methodology issues that would need to be addressed. Rachelle asked for a written rationale for denying the proposal. In response to Rachelle's request for written substantiation for rejecting the proposal, the co-chairs of GEAT will provide a written response.
4. Cynthia provided an overview for the purpose of assessment statement related to the core skill of "information Technology". The proposal rationale included establishing a common definition of information technology. The use of personal and group interviews using a short set of standard questions was determined as the tool to gather the information.
5. Jo shared a model example for assignment 1) Draft an Executive Summary. This was a rough draft example of a potential way to approach the assignment.

6. Summary of GEAT deadlines and next meeting:

All writing assignments (draft) completed and sent electronically to Jo; please cc: Rich. See document: Clarification: What do we need GEAT members to do this semester?	<u>No Later than December 15th.</u> To date, Christa has submitted the first two assignments, all other members have yet to submit any documents.
Submit survey questions for implementation of the faculty surveys as outlined in proposals.	January 9 th
GEAT Meeting	January 20 th 3:00 – 5:00 in Roosevelt Hall

7. Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m., next meeting Friday, January 20th from 3-5 p.m., in Roosevelt Hall Room 109.