



**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT
JOINT MEETING OF AAIC,
GEAC, AND CAGE
FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 2010
1:30 PM**

Present: Damron, Davis, DeVuyst, Drab, Farr, Gates, Hill, Martindale, Miller, Najd, Ownbey, Payton, Penn, Ray, Rohrs, Swinney, Thompson, Wilber

1. Introductions

-Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Purpose of meeting and organizational chart

Penn provided an overview of the history of the joint meeting between GEAC, AAIC, and CAGE.

The institutional portfolio assessment method was implemented by a faculty task force (later renamed the General Education Assessment Committee) in 2001 for assessment of general education learning goals. Since 2001, institutional portfolios have been established for writing, science problem-solving, analytical reasoning, critical thinking, and diversity. In 2006, an annual joint meeting of these three groups was established to provide a more systematic process for considering assessment results and planning action for improvement.

Penn shared a copy of the organizational chart. Gates noted that entry-level assessment is primarily the responsibility of DSAS and there is possibly a change to how the Regents will request data on entry-level assessment related to the ongoing work on the OSRHE's modifications to the assessment policy.

3. Review of minutes from previous joint meetings and progress on recommendations
Copies of the minutes from the previous joint meeting in 2009 were shared. No changes or modifications were suggested.

Penn summarized activity related to the recommendations from the 2009 joint meeting. Specifically, letters from the Provost were sent at the beginning of the spring semester reminding instructors of general-education designated courses that they are required to submit samples of student work upon request. In addition, the sampling of student products for the 2010 general education process has been split into three approaches:

1) traditional: volunteers submit samples of student work

2) by request: a random sample of courses was developed and course instructors asked to submit a sample of student work

3) Provost's initiative workshops: as a condition for completing the workshops, participants were required to submit samples of student work

Penn noted this 3-part sampling strategy had been moderately successful and will be continued, with some tweaking, in the future. It also resulted in new interest in the

general education assessment process from faculty members who were otherwise unaware of the process.

The *Provost's Initiative: Focus on General Education* workshops were continued in response to the recommendations from the 2009 joint meeting and will be continued in 2010 (see #4).

4. Summary of presentation to HLC by Penn, Ray, and Swinney and possible modification to the workshops in 2010-2011

Penn, Ray, and Swinney reported on their presentation to the Higher Learning Commission at the start of April. The session was well attended and there were many positive compliments received about the *Provost's Initiative* and about the presentation. The group discussed possible ways to continue to expand participation in the Initiative and to grow the impact beyond those who are able to attend.

One suggestion was to share a list of attendees so they could share work with each other and communicate with each other.

Based on feedback from the session, Penn suggested, in addition to individual faculty members attending, a department could send a group of 3 together to the workshop. Then this would allow the 3 participants to work more closely with each other during the year and provide an opportunity for the trio to present a mini-workshop in their home department. Upon completion of the mini-workshop Penn suggested the department could receive some extra stipend (perhaps \$500) to spend however desired (in addition to the individual stipends received for completing the workshop series). Other suggestions included a recognition program or process or perhaps some other kind of incentive for completion of the mini-workshops. Other suggestions included buying access to the writing fellows. The timing for the workshops was discussed, with a suggestion for the week after grades are entered (although several colleges have reserved some of this time for college-level events).

5. Update on sampling process for summer, 2010

Penn provided an update on the status of sampling of artifacts for the 2010 general education assessment process.

6. Plans for general education assessment in 2010

Penn discussed plans established by CAGE for general education assessment in 2010.

Writing

165 artifacts sent to 2 review teams

Pilot of standard setting process

Critical thinking

165 artifacts sent to 2 review teams

Pilot of rubric to evaluate "level of critical thinking demand" of assignments

Diversity

85 artifacts sent to 2 review teams

Pilot of VALUE rubric (artifacts double-scored using VALUE rubric and OSU rubric)

The attendees discussed the plans.

It was suggested CAGE consider alternate methods for assessing diversity as there is some concern that writing quality plays too large a role in the achievement in this area. As an alternative, some pre- and post-questionnaires could be used. Darla Deardorff has developed a tentative instrument in this area that could be considered. It was also suggested that the diversity goal overlaps with the critical thinking goal and it would be valuable to explore the connection between these two goals.

The piloted elements for the general education process will be evaluated – if they are effective, they can be rolled out to other general education outcome goals.

7. Plans for 2011 and beyond

- Discussion on improving general education assessment process

- Discussion on improving student achievement of the general education goals

Writing is still an area of concern for many attendees. It was suggested an upper-level writing course in the discipline could be an approach to address this concern. The writing fellows program also is an approach that can address this concern.

Another attendee noted how well students respond when writing is taken into account in the grading process – when you grade for writing in addition to content, students pay attention and their writing does improve.

Critical thinking also continues to be an area of concern. The critical thinking study group is continuing to exam the issue and working on developing specific recommendations. Required capstone courses with critical thinking elements and writing elements were suggested as an approach to address both the critical thinking concern, the writing concern, and, as noted by Penn, capstone courses also provide high-quality student artifacts for program-level outcomes assessment. An attendee asked how many programs don't yet have capstone courses. Many programs currently lack capstone courses although there are some that do have them.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00.

General Education Assessment

