

AAG Meeting Minutes 11/16/2015

Attendees: Sarah Muhall Adelman, Lori Anderson, Juliana Luna Freire, Andrea Gorman, Patricia Lynne, Vinay Mannam, Mark Nicholas, Charles Sachs, Rebecca Shearman, and Niall Stephens

Time: 12:30PM – 2:00PM

Location: North Hall Common Hall Room

Overview of General Education Assessment at FSU

Shearman began the meeting by giving an overview and history of General Education Assessment at FSU and presenting the AY 2014 – 2015 General Education Assessment results.

Results

In the AY 2014- 2014 General Education Assessment cycle objectives overarching objective: critical thinking and objective 2: written communication were assessed. During this cycle an objective 4: human diversity rubric was also developed.

Contribution of Artifacts based on Academic Colleges

Outcome	Arts and Humanities	Social Science	STEM
Critical Thinking	5	6	2
Written Communication	10	3	0

We were unable to obtain a sufficient amount of STEM artifacts for WC since many do not select WC as an objective that is met in their course.

Overall Results

- The overall mean score for overarching objective: critical thinking was 2.03. Meaning the 50th percentile scored a 2.03.
- The overall mean score for objective 2: written communication was 2.49. Meaning the 50th percentile scored a 2.49.

Rater Feedback CT

- Use discipline specific raters that match discipline of artifact
- Assignment prompts for certain artifacts and not others was confusing
- Terms in rubric can be interpreted differently by different raters
- Scores differed when raters relied on prompts differently

Rater Feedback for WC

- Found it easier to score without prompts

- Current WC rubric does not encompass all genres and types of writing
- Criteria used in ratings were not distinct enough
- Unsure how to score student artifacts if it scores well on the rubric however does not meet the requirements of the assignment prompt

Areas of Improvement based on Results and Rater Feedback

- Data Collection:
 - increase disciplinary diversity of artifacts
 - increase alignment of assignments with rubrics
- Scoring:
 - improve inter-rater reliability
 - increase alignment of assignments with rubrics
 - establish the uniform use of prompts by raters
- Reporting/Dissemination:
 - Day in May
 - AAG reports back to departments
 - Mark Nicholas reports to department chairs

AAG Members feedback based on results and feedback

- Collect qualitative data from raters, this may help with rubric creation / edits and rating.
- Record the norming sessions in order to help better understand rater difficulties and pairings.
- It may be difficult to rate STEM artifacts for WC because STEM writing is harder to align with the WC rubric.
- Difficult for raters to assess the quality of evidence in an artifact if it is not from their discipline. We should align raters with discipline.
- The norming sessions should be modified based on suggestions from raters and the Assessment Advisory Group.

Steps FSU should take

- Adelman let the group know that the University Curriculum Committee is taking feedback from departments and faculty about the CT and WC definitions.
- Lynne suggested that prior to making any edits to the CT or WC rubric we should wait for university definitions for CT and WC to be created.
- Lynne also suggested starting a conversation with faculty about creating faculty development to learn about assessment and rubrics.

The meeting ended at 2:00PM. The next AAG meeting will be held during the Spring 2016 semester.