



Be seen. Be heard. Be empowered.

Process

- Could this be used in a punitive way, against instructor if their students under perform.
 - Inflation
- Reporting data
 - The reporting mechanism needs to identify different ways to report students rated at 1 and students who did not complete the assignment. Maybe 0 should be an option.
- Overall assessment report
 - Have a place to report attendance (unexcused or not made up) If they are not there it is not an accurate measure.
- Rubrics do not work for online learners. Selections do not fit.
- For both IP2 and CCS4 there is more content (some classes) directly related to the developmental content than others.
- Description of assignment does not match current practice – changing instructor. - Spring (March/April) ?-if assignment changes does that skew the data.
- Student passes the course but fails or does not complete the gen. ed. assignment / project. Yet they still fulfill the gen. ed. requirement.
- Student Classification. Student may have junior status but is taking a freshman or sophomore class Make sure to put students campus connection classification in student year. Not the class the student is in. Similar to flaws in State Assessment K-12.
- Fundamentals of assessment plan Assessment assignments.
 - Assessment committee should show the campus a few examples of assignments that work well for gen. ed. assessment.
- Foundation Content
 - Why are there no results for foundations content FC1-FC2-FC3?
- Overall assessment of Gen. Ed.
 - Are we really evaluating the entire Gen. Ed. program or are the foundational/core portions overlooked as such?
- My understanding is that I'm (as the instructor) charged with assessing the skill in my class, not necessarily teaching it in the class. Is this accurate or a misconception? If I'm to teach the skill (if we are to be teaching if – i.e. all
- Where (on the website) do I find the rubrics for specific developmental content areas?
- We need to process to recertify, revise and make changes to assignments?
- General concerns:
 - Not all seniors have been exposed to Gen. Ed. assessment requirements due to timing of rollout of the assessment program.
 - Are students being given a rating if they don't complete the assignment at all?



Be seen. Be heard. Be empowered.

Rethinking GE

- Gen. Ed. should be grouped on broad topics such as global perspectives, critical thinking etc.
- Get rid of needless complexity. Cut down the categories of assessment. No one can ever tell what is being assessed.
- Students frequently take these classes early in career and then forget knowledge.
- ND has limited cultural diversity so maybe we are missing the mark of exposing / teaching about sensitivity / awareness / curiosity.
- Fundamentals of Assessment plan
 - There's a built in assumption in this plan of assessment that seniors should out perform freshman. But that assumes that the seniors have already completed coursework that develops them in these areas. That's not necessarily true.
- Are we leveraging gen. ed. knowledge in down stream classes via pre reqs?
 - If gen. ed. provides a basis of knowledge, our programs ought to sue pre reqs to build upon that foundational knowledge.

Methodology

- Are there enough upper level classes measuring the skill? Many of the lower level sample sizes are incongruent with upper level sample sizes. Are we missing certain groups of students. (i.e. certain majors) at the upper levels. Methodology – suggestion – welcome weekend.
 - Pre assessment and discussion about general education.
 - Post assessment @senior capstone semester
 - Can look @ progression from ind. Student perspective
- Are we looking for growth over time of a specific skill level?
- If we are looking for a specific skill level, how do we gain a shared understanding of what that is?
- Courses that are part of Gen. ed.
 - Think its possible that some courses have been inappropriately accepted into a Gen. Ed. category because a program attempted to have as many of their own courses on these lists as possible.
- Which pieces of our process are still missing that might lead us to failure?
 - Applications for assignments
 - Verification – documentation of assignments
 - Verification across sections
 - Role of pre requisites, etc.
 - Think very broadly



Be seen. Be heard. Be empowered.

- Rubric / Assignment Mismatch
 - Are we sure that the assignments used in each course have been specifically designed to each and address each component of the rubric?
- The assessment rubrics are still subjective. We should have inter-rater reliability established for all areas. Is it possible.
- Reporting
 - Include P value for each item in your results charts. Just saying the data were 'significant' it doesn't actually inform the reader very well.
 - Try to be completely transparent.
- CCS4 & IP1 T & P values are not listed so we cannot ascertain if it was completely non-significant, close?
- Methods: ^ is low, probably because it is online, not on paper in regular courses. Therefore students do not take or complete the surveys. Also, not all the classes each semester.
- MSU General Ed. Assessment – does this mean anything? Does the assessment tool indicate any concrete advice for instructional improvement?
- Concerns – no inter-rater reliability training.
 - Instructors – shouldn't we have a protocol and methodological training for teaching the skill?
 - At the least, shouldn't we have conversations about best practices in teaching that critical capacity?
- How do we know we have met our overall goal when we are not measuring each student from freshman to senior.
- Interpretation
 - Small sample size for the 'quirks' items should be consideration #1
 - Don't make decisions on these data – they are not likely valid or reliable.
- Asking professors to assess their own classes / students is introducing bias. We should consider third party blind assessment.
- You said during report – out
 - If we are not measuring student growth, why do we have all the comparisons of freshmen to seniors?
 - Each student is only assessed once. (This gets changed when gen. ed. was approved by F.S.)
- Inter-rater reliability. More training and on-going training required.
- General concern – subjective nature or process for scoring or measuring against rubric by various instructors.

IP 1

- Two categories cultural worldview and cultural self-awareness.
 - Is the data showing the lack of culturally rich activities on campus and a culturally responsive campus climate?



Be seen. Be heard. Be empowered.

- Seniors might be expected to perform at a higher level than freshmen.
 - Expectations are different.
- Students delay taking IPs until almost graduation, hence, they do not exert effort or they lack focus in the task at hand.
- With IP1, most experiences are at senior level, how can we look at 'development' when students don't take IP1 at lower levels.
- Limitations – different assignments.
 - Inter-rater reliability
 - Within rater reliability
 - Demographics of courses, are freshmen culturally diverse (MSU becoming diverse?)
 - Not only are there mis-matches b/w assignment and rubric but also b/w assignments.
 - Suggestions – growth model to reflect learning. What are we measuring?
- Is not evenly distributed across all grade levels. We're not able to assess the same group of students as freshman, soph., juniors, then seniors.

IP2

- Example IP2 – N=Freshman N=162 seniors
 - N=13 freshman N= 188 seniors
 - What are we actually measuring? What is our question?
- Few opportunities for freshmen to sophomore for this gen. ed. requirement, hence the very low .
- Numbers of students
 - Probably the case that freshmen are not advised to take courses/experiences for IP2d very often and instead focus on foundational areas.

Updating Assignments

- When the assignment changes, to whom and by whom does it need to be filled?

CCS4

- Methodology – CCS4
 - Are there less course/faculty offered in this category?
 - How do we pinpoint what is working when different students are assessed?
 - Should 1 course have two rubrics assessed during the same semester?
- Classes are very different that measure this skill. Are we sure they address this still in a similar way?
- Are most quantitative literacy courses offered early and not enough application activities are provided to maintain the skills?



Be seen. Be heard. Be empowered.

- For CCS4 – some classes – we don't understand why they are there. Ex: ATR 410, LANG 105, THEA 270, SPAN 120.
- ICCS4 – Some issues may be related to math – phobic students delaying these courses until senior year for from their last math courses in high school. Hence, no significant differences between freshmen to seniors. Tracking students could sort this out.