

## General Education Academics

5 October 2021

### Minutes

*Mission: Cloud County Community College prepares students to lead successful lives and enhances the vitality of our communities.*

1. **Roll Call:**

Present: Don Benjamin (Interim Dean/ Agriculture), Cathy Forshee (Business), David Shirkey (Math), Brent Phillips (Humanities and Dean of Communication, Humanities and Business), Stefanie Perret (Nursing), Dennis Smith (Sciences), Kit Thompson (Renewables), Kristina Frost (Behavioral and Social Sciences and Criminal Justice), Suzette Ghent (Communications), Cindy Lamberty (Director of AIEP).

Absent: Dr. Kimberly Zant (Vice President of Academic Affairs)

2. **Minutes**

Minutes of May meeting. Moved by Kit, second by Dennis to accept the minutes. All in favor, minutes approved.

3. HLC update:

Taskforce currently working on Assurance Argument and will be sent out soon. This committee may be asked to review information for sections dealing with General Education.

4. Review proposed monthly agenda items: (attached at end of minutes)

The TBA mostly for reviewing small sample set of Fall 2021 General Education artifacts. Assessment professional development opportunities mentioned

5. General Education Artifact Report: (attached at end of minutes)

Overall positive experience and good data to discuss. Evaluator suggestions on length and types of student submission for artifacts. Consistency in assignments is needed based on evaluator comments; especially since assignments are not attached to the student work. Common assignments will also aid adjunct faculty to know what to assign for artifacts.

Tables show evaluators scores (top line) compared to instructor score per semester. Evaluator scores lower than instructor scores. Many of the evaluator scores did not meet mastery overall. The artifact scores cannot be broken down by course as they were randomly chosen from all submissions. Math did not have 50 artifacts to select, only 45 were submitted, and several of them were multiple choice exams. The multiple choice exam questions do not allow student to demonstrate the outcomes. Common assignments in Science have been used for several semesters but it was not always used and the "reports" were not addressing all outcomes. Strengths and areas for improvement available in the report.

Discussion: The communication evaluators used a rubric from one of the Communications instructors. Discussion about math and how can that be completed? A suggested general education assignment is available (attached at end of minutes). This assignment does require written work. A common assignment is clearly indicated by artifact report. Artifacts

must be able to be submitted and outcomes evaluated.

Common assignments available so far have been compiled by AIEP. The purpose of common assignment is that they can be modified for each course in the general education discipline. Foreign language poses a problem for artifact evaluation.

Question was posed about having outside evaluators (from other colleges). This could be investigated in the future.

While the focus of this report and this committee is general education, program learning outcomes can also benefit from common assignments.

6. Other: Assessment Day will focus on norming and looking at student work and common assignments.
7. Professional Development: Reminder to sign up for upcoming Assessment Institute.
8. Adjournment:  
Moved by Kit and second by Dennis to adjourn. Meeting adjourned

Attachments

Attachments

Proposed Agenda for year

General Education Artifact Report

Proposed Math General Education Common Assignment

## General Education Committee

*The General Education Committee, comprised primarily of faculty, reviews, develops, and approves General Education outcomes and their implementation in courses, as well as evaluates the assessment results of those outcomes for continuous improvement of student learning.*

*General Education is a sub-committee of Assessment, and all recommendations are presented for approval by the Assessment Committee.*

**Members:** Don Benjamin (Agriculture and Industrial Technology and interim Dean of Math Science and Technology), Cathy Forshee (Business), Suzette Ghent (Communications), Spencer Farha (Education and Health & Human Performance), Brent Philips (Humanities and Dean of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Business), David Shirkey (Math and Engineering), Sara Beikman (Nursing and Allied Health), Kit Thompson (Renewable Energy), Dennis Smith (Science), Kristina Frost (Social and Behavioral Sciences).

**Ex officio:** Dr. Kimberly Zant (Vice-President of Academic Affairs), Cindy Lamberty (Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Planning).

**Agenda Topics (from After HLC Board Meeting Timeline) for AY 2021-2022**

Date	Topic
7 September 2021	Review and analyze General Education Assessment Data from Canvas and Artifact Evaluation (from Academic year 2020-2021) Recommend Changes FREE Registration for Assessment Institute (closes 11 Oct) <a href="https://assessmentinstitute.iupui.edu/overview/index.html">https://assessmentinstitute.iupui.edu/overview/index.html</a>
5 October 2021	Review tools used for ILO assessment. Look for common themes or assignments. Make recommendations FREE Registration for Assessment Institute (closes 11 Oct) <a href="https://assessmentinstitute.iupui.edu/overview/index.html">https://assessmentinstitute.iupui.edu/overview/index.html</a>
2 November 2021	Continuing work from October: Review tools used for ILO assessment. Look for common themes or assignments. Make recommendations Reports from Assessment Institute
7 December 2021	Review submissions of artifacts to date and reach out to those who have not submitted to give encouragement and support.
1 February 2022	Review and analyze General Education data from Canvas for Fall 2021
1 March 2022	TBA
1-5 April 2022	HLC Annual Conference
5 April 2022	TBA
3 May 2022	TBA. Request for evaluators for Artifact Review.
June 2022	Artifact Review

*Mission: Cloud County Community College prepares students to lead successful lives and enhances the vitality of our communities.*

General Education Artifact Evaluation  
2020-2021 Artifacts  
Report compiled and submitted by Cindy Lamberty  
Director of Assessment, Institutional Effectiveness, and Planning (AIEP)

On 10 June 2021, 12 faculty members evaluated student work submitted as artifacts for Communication, Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences and Mathematics. General Education outcomes for each discipline had been approved in 2019 by the full-time faculty. This is the first comprehensive review of all the artifacts by outside evaluators. Ten of the faculty members were readers and two were floaters. The floaters were to read and evaluate artifacts if the assigned readers differed by more than two points on an outcome. There were only two instances where this happened. The scores of the two floaters were averaged in with the original scores.

Full-time faculty were assigned to content area outside of their expertise. As much as possible, adjuncts were also assigned outside their area. Two of the adjunct faculty did evaluate within their area.

Student artifacts were submitted in Spring 2021, except for Science which had Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 submissions. Science has been collecting artifacts since Fall 2019 but they have not been evaluated by outside readers.

Collection of artifacts is through Canvas. Artifacts submitted or obtained from courses were pooled into discipline specific folders. A random sampling (every second, third, fifth, as appropriate) of the files was completed until the sample set of 50 were selected. For Communications, the artifacts were separated by course and approximately 15 each from CM 101, CM 102, and CM 115 with the remaining 5 from CM 240 (smallest set of artifacts as the course is was only taught face-to-face at GCC and Concordia). For all other disciplines, all student work was pooled into one folder. In none of the sample sets were artifacts separated by modality. The rationale: the distribution of artifacts collected skewed toward full-time faculty (face-to-face and online). The Director of AIEP did obtain some of the work directly from course shells from assignments deemed to meet the outcome to ensure a large enough pool of student work. Once the 50 (45 for Math) artifacts were pulled and placed in Artifact folders for each discipline, they were renamed using the convention of discipline moniker and number. The monikers used include CM for Communication, HU for Humanities, MA for Math, SC for Science and SS for Social Science. All identifying information (student name/course/instructor) was removed by Director of AIEP in all possible cases. In the instances involving videos, identifying information cannot be removed. All written student work was copied for readers. All images (photos) and videos were available via shared folders with the readers.

**Artifact Collection process:**

**Submission of Artifacts**

Not all faculty submitted student work in the department shells as instructed. In some cases, Director of AIEP went into individual course shells to find assignments. In some cases, these were labeled or connected to general education outcomes via rubrics. In other cases, an assignment that seemed to closely match the discipline outcomes were selected. [NOTE: Permission to go into course shells given by VPAA].

**Style of Artifacts**

- *Textboxes:* Use of textboxes for student response caused some problems for Director of AIEP. The student work had to be copied into a blank word document to remove identifying information. Use of word document would remove this issue.

## General Education Project (PROPOSED)

For the college to assess general education outcomes in math, samples of student work will be evaluated. All student work is used in the evaluation process will have names removed/redacted. The math general education outcomes to be addressed in this project:

GEM1. Recognize the mathematical concepts that are applicable to a scenario.

GEM2. Apply technology in analysis.

GEM3. Accurately interpret, validate, and communicate the results.

For this assignment, select one of the [application problems made available]. When answering the problem, your answer should include:

1. The full problem and an explanation of the concepts that are involved in solving the problem.
2. An explanation of the concepts involved in solving the problem. (GEM1)
3. The technology used in solving the problem. (GEM2)
4. The clearly indicated answer to the problem (GEM3)
5. Discuss the results—is your answer reasonable? (GEM3)