AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Approval of Minutes from September 25, 2015, and October 9, 2015. No quorum, Chair advised minutes will be reviewed at the November 13, 2015 meeting.

II. Assessment Discussion: HEIghten update, VALUE Rubrics pilot review; UNCG Rubric development

Chair advised there are a number of things that council should be updated on. Assessment is one of those, we should think of our assessment of a suite of assessments, an assessment portfolio, have a variety of instruments, outcomes, data sets to demonstrate what we are doing. An interesting question was posed – What is the story we would tell about our students around assessment?

Terry Brumfield provided a brief history and update on HEIghten, which is part of the UNC system General Education Council. UNC system faculty chose Written Communication and Critical Thinking as two core competencies to assess (2013-14). Working with UNC system General Education Council, ETS created two pilot tests to assess the two competencies and requested a minimum of 170 students to take both tests. UNCG had 115 students taking both tests. As this was a pilot, only mean scores were available. UNCG students were within the ETS average scores. We will administer the operational tests in February. ETS has requested 100 students for each test, 60% seniors and 25% freshmen. Each test is 45 minutes and can be done in class time. The Provost asked Deans to assist with the classes for the pilot tests. Discussion continued concerning the timeframe of pilot results and use of the data, e-portfolios. We are required by GA to participate in the Voluntary System of Accountability, [http://www.collegeportraits.org/NC/UNCG](http://www.collegeportraits.org/NC/UNCG), used by participating institutions to communicate consistent and comparable data to the public. We’ve recently received information that the VSA will move to a transparency framework, simply an assessment wheel, continuous improvement, allows us to pull in more information. This allows us to paint the picture of what is important in terms of data and continuous improvement.

Terry provided an update of the Value Rubrics Pilot Review. We currently have a General Education Program Assessment Process, developed by faculty, created in May 2011. Generally there are two parts, course faculty/instructor, they determine which student assignment is aligned with the category or marker SLOs, student work product (SWP), faculty are then provided with six randomly selected student names, and then provide a work sample for those six students. This is then reviewed during the second part – Peer Review, faculty teaching the same category/marker. The same scale of highly proficient, proficient, or not proficient is used in both steps. In the past there was no rubric for the scale, piloted using the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics. Terry provided an explanation of the VALUE Rubrics. Jessica McCall advised rubrics are helpful in that they provide a definition of critical thinking, problem is that
this particular set of criteria are not being used at UNCG to define critical thinking. Discussion continued, this would be a way to assess competencies in a way which might be more localized to the campus. The process was time intensive on the faculty end, and also in determining how to use the rubrics. Students may have a good grade in the class, but not meet benchmark 1. Using e-portfolios also proved to be difficult with using the rubrics. Calibration workshop was necessary to use the rubrics, Dr. Ashley Finley with AAC&U facilitated this. Plus side of using the rubric is that we have a system to use, consistency on scoring. Discussion continued concerning use of rubrics, SLOs, UNCG specific rubric, revise AAC&U rubrics to fit UNCG needs. Suggestion to include the definition of what proficient looks like for each specific SLOs, as part of the ad hoc committee recertification process. Is the structure of our Gen Ed program correct? What if the category/marker isn’t associated with the SLO, but the competency? The competency would then be reflected in those criteria and that definition, so that the SLOs would not be revisited with each recertification. SLOs could be the criteria in the rubrics. We would not need to revise the Learning Goals, as the competencies are named in them. Timeline for this type of restructuring discussed. Chair advised recertification begins again in the spring, and this could be a good time to begin the restructuring process. Discussion continued concerning general education courses and levels of proficiency (general education program). Students should have the opportunity to be proficient in every general education course.
Chair distributed copies of the General Education Core Category/Marker Descriptions (from the 2015-16 Undergraduate Bulletin) as they speak to some of the recent council conversations.

III. Curriculum Streamlining Report: Next steps
Chair advised there were items other than Form A which were recommended in this report. The Library is a division of faculty without representation on council. Discussion followed concerning adding the Library member as a voting member of council. Librarians are well acquainted with the curriculum; as interest grows in Information Literacy, it would be helpful. This would affect the quorum, we could change the by laws concerning voting. Chair will draft a resolution for council to review. Chair asked if there were any other items from this report, council would like to consider.

IV. Announcements
Chair advised we will no longer use Blackboard, all council items will be posted in BOX. Lynn provided a brief overview of BOX. Chair provided information regarding the AAC&U General Education and Assessment Conference (2016). Please let David know if anyone is interested in attending.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Next meeting is November 13, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.