

General Education Assessment Team Meeting

9/9/2016

Great Plains Room – Memorial Union

3:00 – 5:00

Minutes

1. Documents were distributed for the GEAT including the meeting schedule for the remainder of the fall term; a list of approved substitution courses for Goal One, d. – Information Technology, a binder of documents including the GE Goals and Objectives and the AAC&U Value Rubrics; and a binder for the Assessing General Education Workshop.
2. In reviewing the documents available for Goal 1, d – Information Technology it was noted that the syllabi area was not yet complete as the courses in the approved substitution list were not uploaded in the evidence area. These ‘substitution courses’ were not identified as general education courses in the curriculum map, and it was determined that many faculty teaching the courses may not be aware of the role the course has in the GE curriculum. The list also showed the number of students who had used a particular course to fulfill the general education requirement.
 - a. The syllabi for these courses will be uploaded the week of 9-12-2016.
 - b. The GEAT was given the charge to review the syllabi and to take notes to the extent that the Student Learning Outcomes listed in the courses aligned with (recognized to be a part of the curriculum being taught) any of the general education goals, and specifically the ‘Information Technology’.
3. In further discussion, Cynthia Kane provided some in-depth explanation about how the professional organizations linked to the University Libraries and Archives had been changing and transitioning on their stances about goals and learning outcomes. She noted that the AAC&U Value Rubric had some areas of alignment, but that there could be changes in the near future. Currently, the UL100 course uses student learning outcomes that align with the value rubric and some new ideas for information technology learning. This ‘Information Technology’ piece appears to be somewhat of a moving target.
4. Discussion on assessing at different levels was appropriate for this particular meeting as the GEAT is looking at the GE Goal 1 objectives from many perspectives. It was important to GEAT that their roles would not be to give directives to their faculty colleagues about how to assess their courses. The group was assured that this wasn’t the charge of the GEAT. The charge is to take into account all evidence and document the current state of assessment affairs and to make recommendations to the Council on General Education for change strategies.
 - a. The levels of assessment that were discussed were:
 - i. **Course Level:**
 1. How do we know that the course contributes to the student learning for general education goals?
 2. How do we measure the quality of the student learning experience?
 - a. does the structure exist to identify the contribution of the course to student learning of general education goals and objectives?

- b. is there a connection between course student learning outcomes and the general education goals and objectives?
- c. is this language directly stated or is it vague or assuming?
- d. are course assignments linked to measuring student learning of the specific general education goal(s) and objective(s) as a part of the measuring of student learning?

ii. GE Goal Level and Objective Level

1. It was noted that in some instances analysis of the relevance of the existing goals and objectives was in order. Specifically, if there have been advances in the way that goals are grouped according to context; and if there has been further or changing definition of contexts related to specific objectives.
2. This presented a question in relation to Goal 1, objective d., as the question was asked if this objective ‘Information Technology’ as stated was all encompassing to the inclusion of both information literacy and technology literacy? This provoked quite a bit of dialogue about institution history, where we are now, and what the future may bring. It is anticipated that further discussion will be appropriate once the substitution courses have been analyzed for alignment with GE goals and objectives.

iii. The Four Quadrants of Assessment (Terminology and Context)

1. There was a general agreement that terminology associated with assessment wasn’t common across the disciplines and that words can be confusing and serve as barriers to progress. We will be intentional about developing a common set of terms for the GEAT to share among themselves and their colleagues. We begin with the four quadrants of assessment.
2. There are two types of assessments:
 - a. Direct – this measures **actual** student learning and presents in the form of any assignment type that occurs as a part of a course or an external standardized test.
 - b. Indirect – this measures an individual’s **perspective** of their learning experience and presents in the form of a reflective narrative, survey, or questionnaire.
3. Assessment occurs either **Internally** (within the University) or **Externally** (provided by an entity separate from the University).

iv. The Four Quadrants with Examples

Internal-Direct (Course Embedded Assessments – tests, papers, speeches, drawings; what we evaluate and grade in our courses)	Internal-Indirect (Senior Surveys, Student-Faculty Technology Survey, Discipline or Major Surveys, Faculty or Student Focus Groups)
External-Direct (ACT-CAAP Tests, Praxis Tests, GRE, GMAT, LSAT, MAT)	External-Indirect (National Survey of Student Engagement; Faculty Survey of Student Engagement; Noel Levitz – Student Satisfaction Inventory, Institutional Priorities Survey)