

## MINUTES

*Learning Assessment Committee*

*Friday, Oct. 4, 2019, 11:00 a.m.*

**AA 177 (Lee Campus); E-105 (Charlotte Campus); M-201 (Collier Campus)**

<b>Member Roster</b>	<b>Dept./Division</b>	<b>Membership Type</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<i>Elijah Pritchett</i>	Humanities	LAC Chair	X	
<i>Renee Hester</i>	Academic Success	Coordinator		X
<i>Jennifer Patterson</i>	Business	Coordinator	X	
<i>Roger Webster</i>	Computer Science	Coordinator		X
<i>Caroline Seefchak</i>	Education	Coordinator	X	
<i>Amy Trogan</i>	English	Coordinator	X	
<i>Fernando Mayoral</i>	Foreign Language	Coordinator	X	
<i>Colleen Moore</i>	Health Professions	Coordinator		
<i>Mike Molloy</i>	Humanities	Coordinator	X	
<i>Jane Charles</i>	Libraries	Coordinator	X	
<i>Mark Cevallos</i>	Mathematics	Coordinator	X	
<i>Marius Coman</i>	Natural Science	Coordinator	X	
<i>Mary Conwell</i>	Paralegal Studies	Coordinator	X	
<i>Richard Worch</i>	Public Admin / Crime	Coordinator	X	
<i>Eric Seelau</i>	Social Sciences	Coordinator	X	
<i>Jennifer Summary</i>	Speech	Coordinator	X	
<i>Leroy Bugger</i>	Accounting	General Member	X	
<i>Cara Minardi-Power</i>	English	General Member	X	
<i>Margaret Kruger</i>	Health Professions	General Member	X	
<i>David Licht</i>	Mathematics	General Member	X	
<i>Terry Zamor</i>	Mathematics	General Member		X
<i>Lisa McGarity</i>	Natural Science	General Member	X	
<i>Tom Donaldson</i>	Social Sciences	General Member	X	
<i>John Connell</i>	Speech	General Member	X	
<i>Paula Tropello</i>	Health Professions	Dean	X	
<i>D'ariel Barnard<sup>1</sup></i>	AASPIRE	Administrative	X	
<i>Joseph van Gaalen<sup>1</sup></i>	AASPIRE	Administrative	X	
<i>Eileen DeLuca<sup>1</sup></i>	Provost	Administrative		

**\*AASPIRE – Assessment, Accountability, Sponsored Programs, Institutional Research, and Effectiveness**

**<sup>1</sup>Non-Voting**

**Guests: None**

- I. E. Pritchett opens the meeting at 11:06am.
- II. E. Pritchett asked committee to review minutes from September meeting.
  - a. Several corrections (minor) were made with respect to typos that could affect content.
  - b. Motion to approve: L. Bugger, 2<sup>nd</sup> by T. Donaldson.
- III. J. van Gaalen gives Assessment Updates
  - a. Course Level Assessment Focus Updates
    - i. All verification emails for Course Level have been sent.
    - ii. J. van Gaalen shared the current list of Course Level Focus additions with the committee before they are added to the webpage.

AY2019-2020 Course-Level Assessment Focus Courses

Social Sciences	Humanities/Fine Arts
AMH 2010, AMH 2020	HUM 2020, 2211, HUM 2235, HUM 2250
PSY 2012, DEP 2004	PHI 2010, PHI 2600
ECO 2013, ECO 2023	REL 2300
POS 2041	ARH 1000
	MUM 2600C, MUM 2601C, MUM 2604C, MUS 2360
Science	Education
BSC 1010, BSC 1011	EDF 2005
ISC 1001C	RED 4012, RED 4519
Speech and Foreign Languages	Mathematics
SPN 1120, SPN 1121, FRE 1120	MAC 1105, MAC 1114, MAC 1140
SPC 1017, SPC 2608	MAT 0057, MAT 1033
Academic Success	Health Professions
SLS 1515	EMS 2119, EMS 2661
REA 0019	HUS 1101, HUS 1320, HUS 1400, HUS 1640
EAP 1640	HUS 2200, HUS 2302, HUS 2315, HUS 2404
Business and Technology	English
CJE 2670, CJE 2671	ENC 0022, ENC 1101, ENC 1130
BCN 2710, SUR 1100	

Adding...

- BCN 2710
  - CJE 2670, 2671
  - EMS 2119, 2661
  - ENC 1130
  - HUM 2020
  - HUS Suite
  - MUM 2600C, 2604C
  - MUS 2360
  - RED 4012, 4519
  - SUR 1100
- Cycled out...
- ACG 1001
  - ENC 1102
  - GEB 1011
  - LIT 2000
  - MAN 2021
  - MUL 1010

- iii.
- b. General Education Updates
  - i. All emails for General Education assignment identification have gone out. (example below)

Example



Date: September, 2019  
 To: All Professors Selected for GenEd Assessment for 2019-2020  
 From: Dr. Joseph van Gaalen, AVP, Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness  
 Subject: General Education Assessment Focused on "Analyze"

Professor Last, First,

At the April 2019 meeting, the committee voted to assess the "Analyze" and "Research" General Education Competencies during the 2019-2020 Academic Year.

In the new assessment plan, courses which were identified by faculty of that discipline as "Analyze" at the *integral* level can be randomly selected for General Education Assessment during Fall 2019 as part of the AY 2019-20 assessment plan. The following class has been randomly selected to provide an assignment:

- ii.
- iii. Details on sampling:
  - Fast Facts*
    - ☐ Analyze Sampling
      - ☐ 32 of 241 course sections (13%) spanning 644 of 4105 possible artifacts (16%)
      - ☐ 20 Traditional, 10 Online, 2 Dual Enrollment (Concurrent/Offsite)
    - ☐ Research Sampling
      - ☐ 30 of 263 course sections (11%) spanning 691 of 5904 possible artifacts (12%)
      - ☐ 13 Traditional, 10 Online, 7 Dual Enrollment (Concurrent/Offsite)
- iv.
- v. PD workshops are scheduled for October 25<sup>th</sup>. J. van Gaalen noted that LAC members can direct faculty who have been sampled for GenEd to potentially attend that workshop, bring any questions, and have their concerns addressed before the November 1<sup>st</sup> deadline to submit a General Education assignment. One example of a nontraditional assignment submitted already includes three-dimensional elements in a sculpture class that will be collected via 2-dimensional pictures for General Education

scoring. This is an example where LAC members can help faculty understand how to “submit” the assignment and the importance of including the guideline instructions that may accompany the assignment which can significantly assist a scorer, whose field of expertise may be in a different area, understand the requirements and standards of that particular assignment.

- vi. J. van Gaalen also noted that if discussions at the workshop lead to concerns about alignment of a course with its integral competency, faculty are encouraged to bring that up with their Chair and then Dean to have a course re-aligned with a different integral competency.
  - vii. E. Pritchett plans to send out a breakdown of how the PD will serve to ease confusion and anxiety for those who are new to General Education assessment.
  - viii. J. Charles confirmed with the LAC chair that a library representative would be on the panel.
    1. Arenthia Herren and Catherine Carney have both agreed to be library representatives on the October General Education Assessment PD panel.
  - ix. E. Pritchett noted there are still more spots for panelists.
  - x. J. van Gaalen noted that there are many courses with Analyze or Research in a supplemental competency and faculty teaching those as well could lend their expertise.
    1. The committee discussed how every department had a different way of aligning courses to competencies and that conversations about the alignments are ongoing.
  - xi. E. Pritchett & J. van Gaalen reminded the committee that the December meeting will be a breakout meeting. The General Education subcommittee will look a little different than in the past. This time, the Office of Assessment will bring an example from all assignment submissions. As there is a rubric in place for one of the competencies being assessed this year, Research, the subcommittee can go through the assignments and how they speak to both the competency and the rubric to streamline the scoring process.
  - xii. J. van Gaalen noted that the data for Research will not be limited, whereas sampling for Analyze resulted in a smaller amount of data for concurrent artifacts.
- c. E. Pritchett introduced how the Spring PD workshops will incorporate feedback information, an idea introduced by E. Seelau.
- i. E. Seelau shared how useful it would be to help faculty see the full side of the story after they submit artifacts. For example, if one assignment can only be scored on three dimensions of a rubric, that is good for faculty to know. There is nothing out of place about using assignments in the classroom that may only incorporate part of one of our GenEd rubrics, but it could still serve useful to help faculty understand how they can take the results of GenEd assessment back to their classrooms.
    1. J. van Gaalen reiterated that students are often already entrenched in the faculty’s dialogue from weeks in the classroom, but that dialogue is not always communicated to the general education assessment scorers or in place in the submitted assignment guidelines
    2. T. Donaldson added that making all parties aware of those places for communication improvements between faculty and general education scorers could raise awareness.
    3. J. van Gaalen noted that our office can reach out to members of the LAC and let them know ahead of the spring PD workshops which faculty members were sampled for GenEd that may be particularly interested in being a part of the

conversation of continuous improvement by attending the workshop and talking about the results from their particular assignment submission.

4. The discussion on General Education Feedback PD workshops for the spring closed with a reiteration of the spirit of continuous improvement as the goal of these larger conversations and that general education assessment is not meant to be a faculty evaluation tool.

IV. E. Pritchett opened the floor for new business items

- a. M. Kruger asked if there would be an official procedure for revisiting the competency alignments.
  - i. J. van Gaalen noted that the Provost has expressed approval for revisiting competency alignments in the near future.
  - ii. A. Trogan noted that we are now at the stage of assessing the original choices, this is an ideal opportunity to reflect on the choice, which will be a different process than choosing one for the first time.
  - iii. J. Charles noted that the GenEd committee with the Provost desired that faculty would have freedom when choosing the competencies.
    1. J. van Gaalen noted very few courses are aligned with more than one Integral
      - a. T. Donaldson noted that one department used the logic of keeping things simple.
      - b. E. Pritchett noted that every department had a unique way of handling competency alignments.
      - c. Discussion ensued about the formal procedures in place for accountability of GenEd competency changes in a course syllabus. The deadline for putting information items through curriculum committee is Nov 1<sup>st</sup> for 2020, but there may be more time before a course will come up again in the assessment cycle.

V. E. Pritchett brought up a new business item of limiting or not limiting committee numbers for the LAC

- a. J. Charles noted there are cases where some committees can get too large for productivity so it becomes a matter of common sense.
- b. C. Seefchak noted large committees are not an issue so long as representation is present from all appropriate areas.
- c. R. Worch brought up the fact that every faculty member is asked to serve on a committee, and that if a committee imposes membership limits it could contradict those COP's in place.
- d. C. Seefchak noted historically that faculty were appointed to committees by the provost
- e. T. Donaldson noted that historically term endings were more challenging to fill when members were only brought in by appointment.
- f. L. McGarity reiterated with R. Worch that faculty participation in committees is part of the faculty portfolio evaluation process, and also noted from experience that large committee meetings can be productive when led by a focused chair.
- g. R. Worch stated that he wants the meeting minutes to record the potential conflict between a COP requiring committee membership and committees mandating limits on numbers of members.
- h. P. Tropello agreed this should be in the minutes and asked how many committees are there and how many faculty are required to be on a committee?
  - i. E. Pritchett responded: 210-220 faculty.
  - ii. J. van Gaalen responded: Over a dozen committees.
  - iii. P. Tropello followed up by saying there are enough committees for participation from that number of faculty, though 100 members in a committee would be too large. Our institution does not have as large a problem with this as other institutions.

- iv. R. Worch added that if it is difficult to get people to serve on the GenEd scorer subcommittee for example, we could increase our membership, then new faculty members could be part of those subcommittees to get their foot in the door and be more involved. Three or four members in a PD subcommittee is not a full representation of the college.
  - v. J. Charles added that there are committees as well as working groups or task forces, so there are still plenty of opportunities for faculty to meet college service requirements.
    - 1. P. Tropello agreed.
    - 2. M. Kruger verified with E. Pritchett, who recently participated in explaining about committee membership at new faculty seminar, that these options are communicated and available to new faculty.
- VI. E. Pritchett thanked the committee for giving their thoughts on this membership numbers issue and asked for a motion to adjourn.
- a. R. Worch motioned to adjourn.
  - b. J. Summary seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 11:58am

Meeting minutes submitted by D. Barnard & J. van Gaalen