



University Assessment
Joint Meeting of AAIC, GEAC, and CAGE
Friday, February 4, 2011
1:30 PM

Present: Comer, Damron, Fry, Hathcoat, Hawkins, Ormsbee, Ownbey, Paustenbaugh, Penn, Schatzer, Swinney, Thompson

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. This year's meeting was held at an earlier date in order for ideas mentioned in meeting to be discussed and possibly implemented.

3. Review of minutes from previous joint meetings. Copies of the minutes from the previous joint meeting in 2010 were shared. No changes or modifications were suggested.

4. Jon Comer and Jeremy Penn gave a presentation on General Education Assessment and processes involved in reviewing artifacts. Dr. Comer reviewed the following points related to General Education Assessment:

- What papers are assessed
- How papers are reviewed and rated
- What is done with the information that is collected
- How do we incorporate data that is found

Jeremy Penn then lined out an overview for the process of scoring artifacts and the general results of 2010 for seniors (on a 1-5 scale).

- Writing 3.07, best-thesis statement, worst-citations
- Critical Thinking 2.89, best-perspective, worst-context
- Diversity 2.33, best-historical context, worst-values

Dr. Penn also discussed with the group pilot activity goals:

- It was mentioned that we should consider options on how to provide feedback to contributing faculty members (artifact distributors).
- Control for differences in assignment attributes (e.g. no clearly defined problem statement)
- Results will be studied more summer 2011

The numbers for freshman and senior writing were up and will be assessed to see if higher scores continue into 2011.

5. It was also mentioned by the group that CAGE should consider assessing diversity as there is concern that writing quality plays too much a role in this area (somehow I missed the full concern of this and cannot finish this thought, I have notes though.)

Also mentioned that maybe there should be a requirement more writing in phases for students. Such as a draft, 2nd draft and a final paper, thus making it easier to measure improvement in the student's writing capabilities. There is great concern that the current processes of measuring writing is not working.

There were many ideas mentioned for improvement for general education to be better implemented into the classroom, they are as follows:

- Faculty need education cases for writing correctly implement writing practices into everyday general education classroom settings.

-Maybe it should be all or none, when it comes to papers being pulled from a classroom (one class).? (Doesn't sound right.)

- A general protocol for student's papers should be implemented, such as mandatory first draft for papers or no draft. This way you could compare credentials in freshman writing.

-We need a clear definition of transfer students for general education assessment. ACT and Correlation?

6. ACC&U-Report of High Impact Educational Practices

Dr. Penn discussed the ideas of this publication to the meeting members. Penn told members about this publication and its ideas of educational practices that could change student learning and retention. Questions that arose were how do we get students involved and how do we implement new ideas.

7. It was discussed that CAGE has made modifications to the assessment model, the rotation scheme, just freshman and seniors be evaluated, a three year cycle, and implement a growth model. Teams of 2 would be evaluating papers. A written document for CAGE will be put together, AAIC will review the model next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00.

General Education Assessment

