

GEA TASK FORCE
JANUARY 29, 2008
MEETING NOTES

1. MAPP Report – Lynn Crosby gave a brief report on the course sections that have agreed to participate in the administration of the MAPP.
2. Report on use of Web resources – Crosby gave a brief report on the number of “hits” registered on the GEA web page.
3. Evaluation Report – Deborah Morris reported on the results of the January 24, 2008 GEA program. The results are as follows

Please circle the number that best describes your level of satisfaction with today’s program.

1. I have been provided with valuable information regarding the various approaches to the assessment of general education student learning outcomes. Average rating 4.6
2. I have a greater understanding of the process of assessing general education student learning outcomes as a result of having participated in the program today. Average rating 4.5
3. My knowledge and understanding of the availability of various assessment models that could be applied at FCCJ has increased as a result of having participated in the program today. Average rating 4.5
4. My ability to evaluate assessment models has increased as a result of having participated in the program today. Average rating 4.2
5. I am better able to determine the more appropriate method or assignments that could be used as evidence of student achievement of the communication skills competency as a result of having participated in the program today. Average rating 4.0
6. The assessment workshops that have been offered so far have been most helpful to me. Average rating 4.4

COMMENTS (Continue on back of sheet if necessary):

One comment that time was too short, and that we have not discussed the list of outcomes
Two comments that “this is starting to gel” and that “I now understand the focus of the meetings”
One comment that the process was interesting and well presented
Three comments that scheduling is limiting participation
One “thank you” for the snacks

4. Attendance –

- Social/Behavioral: 10 (2 deans and 8 faculty)
- Science – 7 (4 dean/administrators, and 3 faculty)
- Communications – 12 (1 dean and 11 faculty)
- Workforce – 11 (5 dean/managers/administrators, and 6 faculty)
- Mathematics – 7 (1 dean and 6 faculty)
- Humanities – 5 (2 deans, 3 faculty)

5. Assessment Models – Karen Stearns distributed a document that summarized the group reports for each of the assessment models presented. Stearns informed the members that she would create a table that shows the summaries across the models discussed.
6. Debriefing of Jan. 24 Meeting – what worked; what could be improved
 - a. Multi-disciplinary grouping worked well.
 - b. The group and color organization worked very well.
 - c. The handouts were helpful.
 - d. The signing in procedure worked well.
 - e. The time structure for the opening and closing were about right.
 - f. The time reserved for group discussion was still not sufficient.
 - g. Some attendees still had difficulty understanding the task assigned to their group. Definitions were missing; e.g., define classroom embedded, give examples.
 - h. Some attendees still had difficulty understanding the charge to the task force, the faculty meetings and how it all fits within an assessment model to be constructed.
7. Decisions:
 1. Continue to use the multi-disciplinary grouping.
 2. Use the same group and color organization and sign-in procedures.
 3. Reiterate the “big picture,” and explain how what we are doing fits into the “big picture.”
 4. Develop definitions for and explain the function of whatever we will be discussing; e.g., rubrics.
 5. Instead of developing rubrics from “scratch,” collect a number of rubrics currently available and use those in groups – do not reinvent wheel.
 6. Consider extending the meeting time from 9 – 11:30 to 8:30 to 12.
 7. Come to next meeting, February 19, prepared to finalize the presentation scheduled for February 29; assign tasks and responsibility