

October 11, 2016

**General Education Program Assessment Subcommittee (GEPAS) meetings #3
12:00- 1:30 AM**

Present: Elif Akcali, John Krigbaum, Eva Czarnecka (Chair)

Guest: Vickie Sarajedini

Agenda:

1. *Vickie*: detailed report on course AST 1002
 - AST 1002 has the **P** designation
 - **550** students this semester; all range of students, such as freshmen, sophomores, but also some seniors
 - There are four sections taught by four different instructors; all four sections of AST 1002 are being assessed
 - There are an additional 100 students online, who are **not assessed**, but still getting the P credit for the course
 - Assessments used for evaluating the SLOs:
 - **Content only: 2 exams**, multiple choice;
Grade- **60%** from exams
 - **Critical thinking and Communication: 1 Observing Project**;
Grade- Content **20%**, Communication **10%**, Critical thinking **10%**
 - **Homework/quizzes: 20%**; format variable
 - All instructors currently collect data and maintain them individually for each student in a spreadsheet of scores; these will be given to Vickie at the end of the semester for compilation; Vickie then determines *Mastery* or *Non-mastery* for each SLO for each student

Vickie: "We had hoped to collect the grading data in Canvas, but had difficulty implementing the rubric for the TA to use into each section of the course. After talking with David Julian last spring, I realized that we would have to download the data from Canvas anyway to provide to the GEC committee. Therefore, we realized it would be more straightforward to have the TA keep a spreadsheet of the scores for each question for each student as she grades them and provide that to me at the end of the course. The professors for each section will send me the exam scores for each student at the end of the semester. I can use this information, along with the rubric, which describes the criterion for mastery and non-mastery, to get the data to the committee after the course is finished."

- A *quadripartite* course-specific grading rubric, which correlates grades with points, is used for five questions of the **Observing Project**:
 - Outstanding A **9-10** pts;
 - Very good B **8** pts/**or 7-8** pts;
 - Satisfactory C **6-7** pts/**or 6** pts;
 - Unsatisfactory D/E **0-5** pts;
- For Gen Ed SLOs the *tripartite* rubric is used:
 - **Content** *Exceeds Mastery (211-300), Meets Mastery (210) and Non-Mastery (0-209).*
 - **Critical Thinking** *Exceeds Mastery (14-20), Meets Mastery (13) and Non-Mastery (0-12).*
 - **Communication** *Exceeds Mastery (13-20), Meets Mastery (12) and Non-Mastery (0-11)*

2. Issues

- a) The course so far does not collect grading data in Canvas.
- b) The main part of the Gen Ed Program assessment is based on the **content** SLO acquisition (**80%** in total).
- c) **Critical thinking** and **communication** SLOs constitute each only **10%** of the assessment, respectively.
- d) Observing Project is based on a minimum one visit at the Campus Teaching Observatory, where students view two objects for approximately 60 seconds each, sketch what they viewed, answer series of questions about the objects, and formulate testable hypothesis, which they prove or disprove theoretically. Sketching of the objects in the AST 1002 course is not considered to be a part of the **communication** SLO, albeit technically it might be a form of **graphic** communication. (Unrelated issue-*There might be concerns regarding the scientific rigor of the AST 1002 course*).
- e) The course-specific rubric for grades Very Good B and Satisfactory C have a range threshold for some questions (out of five) and not others: *i.e.* 8 vs. 7-8 pts.; 6-7 vs. 6 pts.; however, if B grade covers the range of points threshold, then C grade sets a single point threshold, and *vice versa*.

3. Conclusions

- a) Connect Vickie with the Canvas experts Tim Brophy, Jennifer Smith, and/or Cheryl Gator.