

Off-Cycle GenEd Assessment Meeting with Jonathan Keiser

October 31/2014

2:30-3:45

Attendees:

Geoff Martin, Jonathan Keiser, Ana King, Akbar Ebrahim, Derek, Harry Sdralis, Farzana Najam, Sarah McLaughlin

- **Background Discussion:**

- Purposes of Assessment of GenEd. Outcomes?
 - HLC: the hallmarks of what students can do at your institution
 - What do you/your institution know about its student outcomes and what are you doing as a result?
 - Design studies based on this question: “What are you intellectually curious about student learning?”
- Assessment Academy of HLC
 - Ask Adviser to recommend to student that they enroll in ENG 102 and Biology 114/121 (or any science class) at the same time.
- ICCB has 5 Gen Ed. Areas (many institutions assess one area on rotating basis)
 - Math
 - Science
 - Humanities
 - Social Science
 - English Communications

▪

- **General Education Assessment of Written Communication**

- Guiding research question?
 - How well do students communicate in various written forms in their courses that count to graduation?
 - What do they do well? Where do they struggle?
 -
- Artifacts?
 - Request written artifacts that meet the GenEd Outcome
 - Reflection writing, essays, lab assignments,...
- Sample size?
 - Approx. 6000 FT Equivalent students – do we want 15% of FTE? 20%?
 - District Institutional Researcher can help for the sample size
 - Jonathan: “structured/stratified random sample” – select courses that matter the most and then randomize within that list

- Match Student ID#s to their written artifacts?
 - If no IDs, then the study is not controlling for other variables (just a “snapshot” of student writing)
 - Including IDs allow for much more comprehensive study.
 - Can still design basic study with efficient/quick results, with the opportunity of “drilling down” later/after the fact. (ie. The data set can be mined for further answers in the assessment cycle)

- Reading/Assessment Process?
 - Collect 1st Draft artifacts from Midterm to End-of-Semester

 - Opt.A: Faculty member reads his/her own students against rubric
 - Opt.B: Two-day faculty read-a-thon with norming at beginning
 - Opt.C: Two-week faculty reading groups (rotate sets of 30-50 artifacts)
 - Opt D: Use Writing/Reading center consultants as readers
 - Pay for reading time between end of SP15 and beg. of SU15
 - Adjunct involvement in study
 - Talk to vice-president for funding

- Institutional Review Board?
 - Jonathan is head of CCC’s new IRB process
 - Not necessary if your internal study is for operational purposes
 - At this point, all IRB submissions need to go through the *entire* process (too excessive, according to Jonathan)
 - Recommends proceeding without IRB submission, but check in with him in March/April about possibility of completing Step 1 (notification) to IRB so that there is record of study