

AAG Meeting Minutes 10/19/2015

Attendees: Sarah Muhall Adelman, Sheree Arpin, Kristin Chon, Marian Cohen, Stephanie Grey, Stephanie Grey, Zhe Li, Satish Penmatsa , Patricia Lynne, Vinay Mannam, Brianna Plummer, Charles Sachs, Rebecca Shearman, Rui –Rui Zhang

Time: 1:30PM – 2:30PM

Location: North Hall Common Hall Room

Introductions

The meeting began with brief introductions since new members had been added during the 2015-2016 academic year.

Assessment Plans

Nicholas went over the assessment plan template for undergraduate academic programs and let AAG members know that the Office of Assessment will be hosting workshops in the spring that focus on program assessment. A stipend will be available for participants. Faculty will be hearing about this opportunity from their department chairs.

Analyzing Results from FSU participation in Multi-State Collaborative Pilot Study

Nicholas shared the results from the Multi-State Collaborative Pilot study.

Brief Overview of MSC Study

The Multi-State Collaborative pilot study consisted of 53 institutions from 9 states who submitted student work that met the outcomes critical thinking, written communication, and quantitative literacy. The student work had to be from students who had completed 75% or more of their credits needed to graduate. The student work was then rated using the AAC&U Value rubrics. The presentation shared showed the aggregated scores based on all the student work rated and the aggregated score of the FSU student work rated.

During the presentation all the members were given time to review the aspects of the results on their own.

Weaknesses in the Pilot Study

- The sample sizes and demographics are different for each institution.
- Multi State raters were not given copies of the assignment prompt.
- The Value rubrics used for rating do not have a Not Applicable (N/A) option therefore if the paper did not include an aspect of the rubric it would be given a 0 which would bring down the score.

- Only had one rater per artifact unlike FSU which has two raters for each artifacts and a third rater.
- Shearman shared how the norming sessions for the Multi-State were troublesome as well since there were first time raters who had never seen a rubric prior to the session.

FSU and MSC Mirror Evaluation

The Framingham State University Office of Assessment also conducted a FSU and MSC mirror evaluation. In this evaluation FSU faculty:

- Rated the same set of CT and WC artifacts submitted to MSC.
- Received the same training as MSC raters; however FSU faculty used the FSU Gen Ed rubrics for CT and WC while MSC raters used the Value Rubrics for CT and WC.

The Mirror Evaluation also used a comparison group. This comparison group comprised of Davis artifacts (President's Initiative artifacts) and Gen Ed artifacts. MSC artifacts were collected from students who had completed 75% or more of their credits, representing junior and senior work, while the Davis and Gen Ed student work represented freshman and sophomore work.

Future Steps for FSU

The following are suggestions from AAG members on how to utilize the MSC data along with FSU comparison data.

- Lynne suggested creating a clear narrative that portrays the limitations of the MSC study and data. She also suggested utilizing our results and detailing how we used more rigorous guidelines in our mirror analysis.
- Adelman indicated since there may be critique's about our MSC results that we should find ways to explain and refute these critiques.
- Find a way to align with the MSC study while maintaining our own artifact rating results.

The meeting ended at 2:30PM. The next AAG meeting will be held on November 16, 2015 from 12:30PM – 2:00PM.