

GE Assessment Sub-Committee Agenda 10 October 2018

Members Present: Melissa Jordine, Amila Becirbegovic, Lisa Bryant, Sankha Banerjee, Luis Fernando Macías, Silvana Polgar, Xiaojun Li, Sara Juarez, Pei Xu, Cory Brooks

Members Absent: Katherine Fobear

Minutes by: Sara Juarez

1. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Moved to approve: Lisa
 - b. Seconded: Luis Fernando
 - c. Motion approved unanimously
2. Approval of Minutes from last meeting
 - a. Melissa proposed revisions
 - b. Moved to approve: Luis Fernando
 - c. Seconded: Silvana
 - d. Motion approved unanimously
3. Announcements
 - a. Copy of Memo Exempting Pre-2018 students: will go out to advisors, department chairs, faculty who advise students for the major. Drs. Fu and Nef have been notified that the memo will go out.
 - b. APM 215 will return to one document. New document related to assessment policy. Anything specifically stated in policy we are bound by, and changes would go back to GE Assessment committee. Issue of breaking enrollment did not come up, but was deferred at the end. Many cases would be settled by this committee.
 - c. Please read through APM 215 to see what Senate has and has not set.
4. Elect a new Chair of the Committee
 - a. Sara and Lisa have both volunteered.
 - b. Lisa was voted to be the new chair of the committee.
5. GE Area B1 rubric for outcome 1 and outcome 2
 - a. Chemistry, physics, and earth and environmental science
 - b. Kept the rubrics broad because there are different assignments in classes (e.g., lab reports, 1-page papers, 4-page summative papers).
 - c. Area B1, Outcome 1
 - i. Motion to approve the rubric for Outcome 1: Melissa
 - ii. Seconded: Sankha
 - iii. Open for discussion
 1. Wording of outcome--Change to multiple aspects

2. Some classes only look at one theory, but multiple aspects of that theory. Some have multiple papers that will be submitted, some will include a culminating paper.
3. Students can upload multiple documents in Pathbrite. Person who is assessing will see these in a cluster.
4. Discussion about level 4 “explain in detail” and level 3 “clearly explains”
5. For consistency, how many aspects should be expected in the rubric?
6. Goal of portfolio is to determine proficiency: Committee will need some criteria of what should be included in the assignments, such as examples of what should be expected in the assignment (e.g., grading criteria) and exemplar assignments. Someone with content knowledge
 - iv. Friendly amendments:
 1. Clearly explains in detail for level 4
 2. Number of aspects added to level 4
 3. Made student singular instead of plural
 - v. Motion to approve revised rubric: Melissa
 - vi. Seconded: Lisa
 - vii. Motion approved
- d. Area B1, Outcome 2
 - i. Move to approve rubric for Outcome 2: Melissa
 - ii. Seconded: Amila
 - iii. Open for discussion
 1. Number of aspects should be specified
 2. How to measure extensively? Is this another in detail?
 - iv. Friendly amendments
 1. Remove extensively and include discussed in detail with number of examples required for level 4
 2. Changed enough detail to some detail for level 3
 - v. Motion to approve the revised rubric: Sara
 - vi. Seconded: Melissa
 - vii. Motion approved
6. GE Area B2 rubric for outcome 1 and outcome 2
 - a. GE Area B2, Outcome 1
 - i. Motion to approve: Luis Fernando
 - ii. Seconded: Amila
 - iii. Open for discussion
 1. Level 4: Details beyond the minimum. How is this quantified across instructors?

2. Language differs from levels 2 and 3
 3. Question about insufficient column: Revise to OR instead of AND to have differences between
 4. Unacceptable column: Suggested revisions about accuracy
 5. Question about “complete understanding” for level 4. Recommend removing “complete.”
 6. Regarding use of “vague” for level 2: Rubrics are more for the committee and faculty, but students may have different understanding if these are used in class. Recommended changing “vague” to “inappropriate”
- iv. Send friendly amendments back to Biology
 1. Melissa made a copy of the rubric and made revisions on this copy
 2. Change Level 4 to two or more examples
 3. Last row to recognize and explain data has more specific language. Recommend repeating this language for first 2 rows, for level 4
 4. Change AND to OR in insufficient column in each row
 5. Revisions to Level 1 Unacceptable proposed related to inaccurate assignments
 6. Changed labels of levels to keep consistent with other rubrics (Advanced, proficient, developing, unacceptable)
 7. Removed “complete” from level 4 in regards to understanding
 8. Changed “vague” to “inappropriate”
 - v. Motion to approve revised rubric, pending no changes from Biology: Melissa
 - vi. Seconded: Sangka
 - vii. Approved
- b. B2 Outcome 2
 - i. Motion to approve rubric: Melissa
 - ii. Seconded: Luis Fernando
 - iii. Open for discussion
 1. Wording about details and making these quantified
 2. Usually teaching assistants cover these sections. Some variance, but mostly covers the same principles. More flexibility in how principles are covered.
 3. Rubric goes beyond the outcome: E.g., outcome states “recognize” but explanation is expected to be thorough and detailed.
 4. Questions about partly correct or in correct in level 2, which is not consistent with levels 3 and 4.
 - iv. Send friendly amendments back to biology

1. Melissa made a copy with suggested revisions.
 2. Level 4: clearly identifies instead of thorough and detailed explanation. Add with some detail. Differentiate from level 3 with “some detail” and level 3 just “clearly identifies.
 3. Add “assignment is inaccurate” to level 1
 4. Remove partly correct from level 2 and leave incorrect.
 5. Change levels 3 and 4 for apply scientific method to align with recognize scientific principles.
 - v. Motion to approve revised rubric, pending approvals from Biology: Sara
 - vi. Seconded: Sangka
 - vii. Motion approved
7. Review of Potential Reflection Questions discussing following issues
- a. Tabled for next meeting
 - b. Melissa will post what could be guidelines and could be criteria
 - i. Information from students about their own learning
 - c. To prepare for next meeting, think about the following for the prompts:
 - i. Are broader or more specific questions preferable
 - ii. Should all questions be either broad or specific or should both be included
 - iii. Review of actual questions and revisions if time permits
8. Adjourn meeting
- a. Motion to adjourn: Melissa
 - b. Seconded: Amila
 - c. Motion approved