

**General Studies/Academic Foundations Assessment Group Meeting
Minutes
October 11, 2007**

Present:

Claudia Stanny	Klaus Meyer-Arendt	Tom Westcott	Sally Ferguson
Valerie George	Sheila Freeman	Nestor Arguea	
Melanie Sutton	Kuiyuan Li	Matthew Crow	
Bruce Swain	Chandra Prayaga	Jason Mosley	
Sharon Simmons	Steve Kass	Glenn Rohrer	
Judy Young	Laura Koppes	Anna Shiplee	

Meeting called to order at 12:05 PM

1. Update on Accreditation. Claudia Stanny reviewed the current status of UWF with respect to assessment work for SACS reaffirmation of accreditation. The second monitoring report was sent to SACS on August 27. She was pleased that UWF could report that all departments were engaged in the assessment of student learning in all areas: General Education (Academic Foundation / General Studies), undergraduate programs, and graduate programs. It is important to continuing this work on assessment. SACS and other accrediting bodies expect assessment to be an important part of the routine examination of curricula and efforts to continuously improve student learning. We will be expected to file a report with SACS in two years on the impact of the Quality Enhancement Plan and could be asked to provide an update on the continued use of assessment evidence for program evaluation and improvement in this report.
2. Departments affirmed that they were currently engaged in the assessment of student learning in their General Education courses this year, continuing the work begun last year.
3. Some of the assessment data collected this year will be useful for evaluation of the impact of the QEP. Because the theme of the QEP was active learning and student engagement with a focus on project management, assessment data relevant to student learning in these areas will also be useful for the assessment of the QEP.
4. Last year CUTLA engaged in an overarching assessment project that was presented to the group at its January meeting (a review of transcripts of December graduates to determine whether the pattern of course selection for General Studies would provide adequate "coverage" of the 16 learning outcomes in the four domains for Academic Foundations). Claudia proposed that the group engage in a second overarching project this year in which CUTLA would examine all syllabi for Academic Foundations / General Studies courses and determine which Academic Foundations learning outcomes are described on these syllabi. Data collection would be based on syllabi for the fall term. A rubric for this syllabus review was distributed. Claudia requested questions, comments and concerns about this project. The group agreed that this would be a useful project. A few departments indicated that they were engaged in similar syllabus reviews for courses in the major. Discussion centered on whether the review work would take place within departments with aggregated results sent to CUTLA or whether staff in CUTLA should do the review. The group agreed that CUTLA would compile these data. Aggregated data for all Academic Foundations courses will be distributed at the end of the fall term. CUTLA will also create a report of aggregated data within each department, which will be sent to department Chairs for use within the department. Claudia would like to repeat this analysis annually for 3 years to document progress in the adoption of best practices in syllabus construction and changes in frequency with which syllabi discuss active learning

strategies and project management assignments. These data will serve two purposes: evaluation of the Academic Foundations curriculum and evaluation of the impact of the QEP.

5. Time lines for assessment work in Academic Foundations were discussed. We agreed on the following deadlines:
 - a. Data collection based on embedded assessments of two learning outcomes in at least one General Studies course within each department will take place during the fall term.
 - b. CUTLA will provide reports to departments from the syllabus review project by the end of the fall term.
 - c. The “making sense” meeting at which assessment data will be discussed will take place in the **first or second week in February**. During this meeting, we will organize breakout groups for each of the four domains (Critical Thinking, Communication, Integrity/Values, and Project Management). Departments that assessed student learning in a common domain will discuss their findings and share best practices for improving student learning in that domain. Departments that assess student learning outcomes in two different domains (e.g., one outcome in Critical Thinking and one outcome in Project Management) should send two representatives so that one representative can participate in each domain group. The interpretation and use of data from the syllabus review will also occur at this meeting. We will probably need **2 hours** for this meeting.
6. Claudia asked that departments tell her what their needs are for assistance. She is willing to consult with department assessment or curriculum committees, attend faculty meetings or retreats, or consult with individual faculty or chairs. Chairs should send requests by email (cstanny@uwf.edu) or contact Mary Hallford (mhallford@uwf.edu) to arrange a meeting time. Bruce Swain expressed his appreciation for Claudia’s availability to the chairs and faculty and willingness to help.
7. Announcements:
**Mini-Conference on Best Practices: Best Practices for Assessment and Curricular Reform
Friday, February 29, 2008**
Plan to make a presentation of your success stories on curriculum changes motivated by assessment evidence, useful assessment methods, etc.

Meeting adjourned at 12:45 PM

NOTE:

The attached rubric is a modified version of the one distributed at the meeting. The modification will allow data collection on each of the 16 SLOs in the Academic Foundations matrix. Departments are obliged to assess only two learning outcomes in a course, but many courses include more than two SLOs related to Academic Foundations in course syllabi. The more detailed analysis will allow us to obtain accurate information about the distribution of SLOs described in syllabi across the Academic Foundations matrix (departments are **not** expected to address all of these SLOs in any individual course). See TIP Sheet 19 on the CUTLA web site for the full Academic Foundations matrix and more detailed description of the 16 student learning outcomes.

Attached:

Meeting Agenda
Rubric for Syllabus Review
Criteria for Rubric Elements
CUTLA Handout