Notes from LAC GenEd Subcommittee 11/4/16

Present: Colleen Moore, Katie Paschall, Jennifer Patterson, Joe van Gaalen, Barbara Miley, Eric Seelau, Elijah Pritchett, Fernando Mayoral, Marius Coman, Megan Just

12:00 Noon

* Joe van Gaalen opened discussion on GenEd Subcomittee with talking points regarding last year’s calibration procedure and how it will develop for this year.
	+ Joe highlighted:
		- Office of Academic Assessment goal of removing plagiarized material based on TurnItIn reports and the plagiarism criteria as defined by the LAC in a 2015 survey.
		- Full calibration will be completed in the early weeks of February but a preliminary session with early samples will be conducted in this meeting
		- Scoring principles in terms of defining unscoreable items (consulting scoring partner) will remain unchanged from 2015
* Joe also noted that currently 28 GenEd submissions have been volunteered by faculty spanning both CT and QR.
* Scoring teams were defined based on areas of expertise and experience in General Education scoring (such that returning scorers are paired with first-time scorers, where possible). Scoring teams are as follows:
	+ CT 1A – Elijah Pritchett
	+ CT 1B – Fernando Mayoral
	+ CT 2A – Jennifer Patterson
	+ CT 2B – Katie Paschall
	+ CT 3A – Amy Trogan
	+ CT 3B – Barbara Miley
	+ QR 1A – Rebecca Harris
	+ QR 1B – Marius Coman
	+ QR 2A – Eric Seelau
	+ QR 2B – Colleen Moore
	+ QR 3A – Megan Just
	+ QR 3B – Joe van Gaalen
* Joe then led a preliminary scoring session based on scoring teams. The CT team was assigned a sample assignment with AAC&U scoring rubric while the QR team was assigned a sample assignment with the FSW Scientific & Quantitative Reasoning scoring rubric.
* CT team noted the sample, since it included little to no instructions, made it difficult to define rubric achievement levels in some areas. Joe noted that once submissions are fully collected, avoiding this sort of problem will not be an issue when sampling for scoring. Despite the assignment instruction limitations, CT scoring team members converged successfully in 2 of 5 rubric dimensions. In the others, it was agreed the limited assignment instructions was likely the problem.
* The QR team was successful in converging on scoring in all rubric dimensions. Eric Seelau noted that in many cases scoring was troublesome because the answers provided did not always conform with the assignment instructions (e.g., correct answer provided did not actually adequately suffice the directive of the instructions) and so scorers could be confused as to what is considered a strong response as a result of this. Joe noted that, in this case, we must go by the assignment instructions, not the answers provided as a guide for scoring. Additionally, Joe noted that the scoring partners are paired based on expertise, and that submission samples will be divided based on these strengths as well so as to alleviate scoring concerns such as these as much as possible (e.g. a Physics exam or similar will be scored by a scoring partner pair that includes a Physics Professor or similar).
* Scoring teams agreed they were satisfied with the early stage calibration session.
* Joe stated that he will send out potential dates for a calibration session in late January/early February in the coming weeks to coordinate everyone’s schedule.

1:15 pm: Meeting adjourned
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