

GEA TASK FORCE
NOTES
March 4, 2008

1. Web Resources/MAPP Report/Faculty Survey

Lynne Crosby gave a brief overview of the status of the MAPP collection and faculty feedback. Crosby stated that the completed tests would be sent to ETS and the Task Force will be receiving information on the results some time in April. Crosby also briefed the task force on the number of faculty who either took the on-line version of the MAPP or reviewed the hard copies available. Crosby made available to the task force two survey instruments used by other educational institutions to assess the culture of assessment at the institutional level. The two instruments were provided to the task force electronically and will be discussed at a future meeting.

2. Analysis and Evaluation of Feb. 29 Meeting

It was agreed that the rubrics work begun at the February 29 meeting needed to be completed with input from the individuals who participated in the four rubrics development groups. Additionally, it was decided that once the feedback was received, incorporated and finalized into a draft, such draft would be sent out to all faculty and academic administrators for further input and feedback. The process to be used for completing this task is as follows:

- a. Julie will set up four learning communities: Communication – Reception; Communication – Written; Communication – Oral Content; and Communication – Oral Delivery. Within each of the communities, Julie will set up sub-groups corresponding to the indicator categories identified by the faculty for each of the four rubrics. The group leaders will be set up as instructors of the learning community for which they are responsible and will monitor the activity of that learning community.
- b. Charles will identify faculty who are willing to serve as an ombudsperson for each of the indicators identified under each rubric. The ombudspersons will draft the definition of each of the levels of achievement for the assigned indicator. Once this is done, all of the ombudspeople assigned to work with a given rubric will share the draft statements with each other and the group leader to reach consensus on the language and to ensure that there is clear distinction among the different levels of achievement. Upon reaching consensus, the ombudspeople will post to the discussion board what has been developed for each of the indicators to give the learning community group and opportunity to review, feedback, and input. The ombudspeople will also facilitate the discussion.

Once the discussion is over, the ombudspeople will review the input, incorporate the changes as appropriate, create a new draft, make it available to the group and secure a vote. The ombudspeople will share their second draft with each other and create a

final draft by combining all of the indicators and the definitions of levels of achievement. The final draft will then be posted so that all group members can see the final product. The groups members can, at that point, look at the final product and participate in the final discussion.

- c. The final draft will be presented to the task force and then eventually sent out to all faculty and academic administrators for one final review.
 - d. Lynne will compose the instructions of the process which will then be sent to the group leaders. The group leaders will create an electronic distribution list for their particular rubric and send the instructions to the ombudspeople. Since e-mails can only come from one person, the leaders of each group need to decide who will send the e-mail out which can be “signed” at the bottom by both leaders.
 - e. Jennifer will update the list of participants with e-mail addresses and will send electronically to the group leaders and other task force members.
 - f. Karen will update the rubrics and will send electronically to the task force members.
 - g. The deadline for completing all these tasks is Friday, March 28 it at all possible.
3. Definitions – Tessie Bond distributed a draft definition of Information Literacy and asked the task force to review the definition so that it could be discussed at a future meeting date. Bond explained that the librarians had already done considerable work on this student learning outcome and that the task force might wish to build on what has already been developed. The librarians have already identified indicators, and even though the final FCCJ assessment plan may not assess this particular learning outcome as is currently being done, Bond explained that what is already available related to this outcome can certainly be used as a spring board.

Bond also distributed a draft definition of Critical Thinking and asked the task force to review for further discussion at a later date.

4. March 27 Faculty Meeting Planning – To be discussed at the March 11, 2008 meeting.
 - a. Rubrics
 - b. Model
 - c. Time Line for Assessing Communication Learning Outcome
 - d. Time Line for Developing Assessment Process (Four other Learning Outcomes)
 - e. Discussion of Implementation Requirements
 - f. Handouts
5. Discussion - To be discussed at a future meeting.
 - a. Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning
 - b. Global Sociocultural Responsibility
6. Task Force Composition – To be discussed March 11, 2008.