General Education Council (GEC) Retreat
August 10, 2017
1:00 – 4:00 p.m.
Prillaman Hall, Room 1103

Voting Members Present:
Margaret Baldwin Pendergrass (Theatre and Performance Studies)
Natalie Berry (Dance)
Cathy Bradford (First-Year and Transition Studies)
Joy Brookshire (Biology)
Nancy Burney (Statistics)
Sam Delgado (College of Architecture and Construction Management)
Murat Doral (Economics)
Edward Eanes (Music)
Monica Gerda (Health Promotion and Physical Education)
Emily Holler (Communication)
Debbie Hutchinson (Art)
Lee Langub (Bagwell College of Education)
Timothy Mathews (Economics)
Corinne McNamara (Psychology)
Huggins Msimanga (Chemistry)
David Parker (History)
Tom Pynn (Interdisciplinary Studies)
Debarati Sen (Anthropology)
Lynn Stallings (Honors College)
Brian Starks (Sociology)
Brad Suther (Geography)
Bruce Thomas (Mathematics)

Non-voting Members Present:
Rachel Blasé (Teacher Education Advisement Ctr.)
Sarah Holliday (Academic Affairs)
Chris Hutt (Academic Affairs)
Julie Newell (Academic Affairs)
Kelley Price (Technology Enhanced Learning)
Val Whittlesey (Academic Affairs)

Guest(s)/Visitor(s):
Tom Pusateri (CETL)
Sarah Matta (Academic Affairs)
Chien-Pi Li (CHSS)
I. Welcome and Sign-in
   - Sarah Holliday opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Individuals in attendance were asked to introduce themselves and provide a “fun fact”.

II. Schedule of Meetings
   - Sarah Holliday announced that the schedule of future GEC meetings is located on the curriculum.kennesaw.edu/gened website and listed at the end of today’s agenda.

III. Membership of the GEC
   - Sarah Holliday announced that the current list of voting members is also on the curriculum.kennesaw.edu/gened website.
   - Sarah announced that the GEC information has been updated in the 2017-2018 University Handbook (Pages 43-44), handbooks.kennesaw.edu.
     i. In the handbook, section b, item i., TF24 discusses representation in the core areas. The Composition and Literature disciplines have separated into two and other departments are considering doing the same for more representation on the Council.

IV. Guest Speakers (#1)
   - Chris Hutt and Sarah Matta, Academic Advising, presented on the Early Alert Intervention Pilot program for G2C courses. Highlights of the presentation:
     i. KSU’s Athletics Department has been using an Early Alert program for several years. Now KSU is broadening its use by piloting the program in some of the general education courses and student groups (i.e. African American Male Initiative, Veterans, and some 3000-level courses).
     ii. Early Alert Intervention pro-actively identifies students who are at risk of failing these classes. With this early identification, the university can offer these at-risk students additional resources to assist them in successfully completing the course. Some of these resources are KSU’s Writing Center, SMART Center, and tutoring centers.
     iii. The students will be followed, through the collection of data and progress reports, to determine if they have availed themselves of the resources and the resulting effectiveness.
     iv. After the Drop/Add Classes date, faculty who teach the pilot GedEd courses will receive an email that introduces them to the program.
     v. The faculty, next, will receive a link that enables them to receive progress reports on their students. They will be asked to rate every student and submit the completed report to Academic Advising.
     vi. Sarah Matta will receive the report and send to the appropriate college advisor a notification of the at-risk students in their area. The advisor will contact the student to discuss and inform them of the available resources to assist them in improving their class grade.
     vii. The Early Alert program directly correlates and connects with the G2C initiative that KSU is implementing.
viii. Question: Is participation in this program required by all faculty who teach the pilot courses? Response: It will not be mandatory; however, they hope that everyone will participate.

ix. Question: Will the program be available in the future for any course that requests it? Response: The desired outcome is for departments to identify which programs need this service and be able to offer it to them.

V. UPCC Representative
   - A call was issued requesting someone to represent the GEC on the UPCC (and there cannot be two representatives from the same department and/or college).
   - Brian Starks was nominated and no one opposed.

VI. Current Curriculum
   - The current KSU curriculum and curriculum requirements are posted on the following websites:
     i. catalog.kennesaw.edu
     ii. gened.kennesaw.edu/genedsuper.php
   - Sarah Holliday and Danielle Bueher, Institutional Effectiveness, met during the summer to review the general education requirements. Danielle, a SACS specialist, indicated that KSU had too many documentation requirements and too many pieces to its process. The catalog website has been updated to reflect some of Danielle’s recommended changes.

VII. Approval of Past Minutes
   - The minutes of the April 19, 2017 meeting were approved as written.
   - Brian Starks moved to approve and Joy Brookshire seconded the motion. No one opposed. (A correction to the attendee list - Mural Dorat was present.)

VIII. Faculty Award Proposal
   - The proposal for a General Education Faculty Award is still pending. A meeting with KSU Foundation has not yet occurred to discuss the proposal. Ron Matson, Sr. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, is to schedule the meeting in the near future.

IX. Curriculog
   - Website address: curriculum.kennesaw.edu/curriculog/index.php
   - Future Proposals: Program proposals will be more closely reviewed to verify that 42 hours are being used and are not restricting or encouraging enrollment in overburdened classes. The Board of Regents requires, but does not enforce, that students enroll in an Area A class their first 30 hours on campus (usually in the fall or spring). The Area A requirements have been corrected in Academic Maps and DegreeWorks.
   - Past Proposals: The council adjudicated six proposals last year.

X. Guest Speakers (#2)
   - Tom Pusateri, CETL and Professor of Psychology, presented on Specifications Grading. Highlights of this presentation:
     i. Tom Pusateri announced that the ebook for Specifications grading: Restoring rigor, motivating students, and saving faculty time by Linda Nilson is available through KSU’s library. On October 5, 2017, CETL will facilitate a Book Club featuring the book.
ii. Tom began the presentation with an excerpt from the book: “How do you know by a transcript grade that all of the course Learning Outcomes have been met?”

iii. Partial credit grading is subjective. The student receives partial credit for almost anything they submit. Judgement on the level of quality, and even correctness, of the work is subjective. Some rubrics have been written to contribute to this type of grading.

iv. Specifications Grading identifies the core Learning Outcomes and assigns a specification to each one. The specifications clearly outline what is required of the student if they want to achieve an A, B, or C. If you set the specifications a level higher for each grade, the student actually will do more and higher quality work. A “C” student will achieve a “B” level of learning.

v. The characteristics of Specifications Grading provides a clearer path and understanding to the students on how to achieve the level of grade they desire. It also provides some flexibility and responsibility for the student to decide how they will meet their desired goal. There is also use of a “token” system that, again, provides a level of flexibility, strategizing, and decision-making that enables the students to be responsible for their own level of work.

vi. Question: Does this work for either online or an in-person course? Response: This example is for an in-person course, but it does work for both. The students know the number of points required to achieve the grade outcome desired.

vii. Tom stated that he began using this concept of grading last semester. It did take a lot of work on his part, at the beginning, to redesign his course accordingly. He uses an Excel spreadsheet to manage the data of points and to be able to disseminate the data into individual reports.

viii. Question: How do use a grade scale? Response: You are using specifications not percentages. Outside of academia, there is only “meets” or “exceeds” for evaluation.

ix. Question: How will students clearly understand this concept? Response: You will need to change your grading ranking/rating system.

x. Question: Is the “token” system part of the Specifications Grading concept? Or, did Tom add it himself? Response: It was part of the system concept.

xi. Question: How many students were initially scared or worried about this concept and dropped out of the class? Response: None. Tom introduces and includes the concept in the syllabus so students have an opportunity to review it prior to the start of class. In addition, the concept is reviewed and discussed in class.

xii. Question: Is the concept feasible in a large class (i.e. 90)? Response: Tom is available to discuss how it could be adapted. Marina Koether, Professor of Chemistry, has recently redesigned her course. After Tom Pusateri redesigned his course, his course evaluation ratings increased.

xiii. Sarah Holliday reminded the group that CETL has many resources to offer faculty. Moreover, anytime you can tie assessments to outcomes is best.

XI. Guest Speakers (Future)
   - G2C Action Plan (Scott Reese and Valerie Whittlesey, G2C Co-Chairs)
   - Sampling Techniques (Jennifer Wells, and Donna DeGrendel, Institutional Effectiveness)
• Academic Program Maps (Marilee McClure and Valerie Whittlesey, Academic Affairs)
• Syllabus Website (Valerie Whittlesey, Academic Affairs)

XII. Outcomes
• Website address: kennesaw.campuslabs.com
• There is data available and it is showing that Outcomes is working.

XIII. Goals for AY18
• In AY17, the following goals were accomplished:
  i. Students GenEd website: gened.kennesaw.edu
  ii. Outcomes software
  iii. Handbook updated
  iv. Strategic Plan action item created
• Proposed for AY18:
  i. Hire a permanent Faculty Director
  ii. Trainings (Samplings, D2L)
  iii. Website improvements
  iv. More guest speakers
  v. Development of the GenEd Faculty Award
• At this point, Val Whittlesey, Associate Vice President for Curriculum, called for volunteers to serve on the search committee for the permanent Faculty Director. Sarah Holliday has been in the interim role for 2 years. Val would like to start the process in September, have the advertisement and posting issued, and complete the interviews and visits by the end of fall semester.
• The group discussed and deferred the selection of a committee until the September meeting and after all the GenEd representatives have been elected.

XIV. Assessment (of General Education Programs and Student Learning)
• Direct Assessment (Are the students learning the material?)
  i. Sarah Holliday reported that she was not aggregating the totals and she is still receiving last year’s data. Therefore, there is not an accurate year-to-year comparison available yet.
• Indirect Assessment: (A student’s opinion of what they are learning.)
  i. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) compares peer institutions. Their survey contains 40 multiple-choice questions. NSSE collects data from a student’s first year and senior year.
  ii. The comparable data for KSU was skewed due to the consolidation of Southern Poly and KSU because the institutions were not comparable when they were universities.
  iii. A review of the 2016 data (post-consolidation) shows that KSU did not do as well compared to their peer institutions. This should improve by 2018.
• University Policies
  i. A full assessment is required the first three years. After this time, individual departments will be put on a rotating schedule based on their external reporting schedule and others in the same core area.
  ii. Again, due to consolidation, July 1, 2015 is KSU’s official beginning date as a university for assessment.
• Who reviews the results?
i. SACSCOC, Associate Vice President for Curriculum, Improve KSU, and the CPR/USG-BOR.

ii. The data sent for review is aggregated.

- New IRB
  i. Co-principal investigators: Val Whittlesey and Rochelle Harris.
  ii. A call was issued inquiring if anyone wanted to be added as a principal investigator. The only requirement is completing the CITI online training. Direct Assessment Coordinator (DAC)
  iii. Some departments use this as a service expectation for a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA).
  iv. Other departments include it as part of the faculty’s position.
  v. If a faculty receives compensation for serving, that is handled differently for the FPA.

- The Process
  i. Identify the Sample – Will you use:
     a. All of one course
     b. Some of some courses
     c. One of each course
     d. All of all courses
  ii. Educate the Instructors
  iii. Design the Instrument
  iv. Administer the Instrument
     a. Is cheating a concern? The group discussed various methods and those used by others were offered.
  v. Score the Instrument
     a. Most agreed that D2L or Scantron is the easiest method.
  vi. Collect Responses
     a. Response rates are low and how to increase them is an ongoing issue.
     b. Adjunct or part-time instructors, and some teaching assistants, teach most of the GenEd courses. It is a challenge for the university to ask or require them to do more work above their teaching load.
  vii. IRB
     a. If you do not use a pedagogical practice for grading, you must submit an IRB.
  viii. Aggregate the Scores
  ix. Reflect on the data, evaluate and/or set new goals.
  x. Reflect on the Process
  xi. Identify Improvements
  xii. Report - Analysis, discussion, and planned improvements

XV. Upcoming Events

- Next meeting: Wednesday, September 20, 2017
- Dr. Saundra McGuire to visit KSU and conduct workshops for students and faculty on Metacognition - September 7-8, 2017.
Definitions:
CETL Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative
G2C Gateways to Completion
GEC General Education Council
GenEd General Education
KSU Kennesaw State University
NSSE National Survey of Student Engagement
UPCC Undergraduate Policies and Curriculum Committee

Attachments:
GEC Presentation
Minutes: April 19, 2017
Early Alert Intervention Presentation
Specifications Grading Presentation (http://tinyurl.com/SG-08-10-17)
Dr. Sandra McGuire Metacognition Event

SH:djh
I. Welcome
   a. Present: Debarati Sen (Anthropology), Debbie Hutchison (Art and Design), Lee Langub (College of Education), Joy Brookshire (Molecular and Cellular Biology), Huggins Msimanga (Chemistry), Emily Holler (Communication), Natalie Berry (Dance), Nirmal Trivedi for Cathy Bradford (Learning Communities), Matt Waller (Geography), Mia Oberlton (Wellness), David Parker (History), Bruce Thomas (Mathematics), Susan Rouse (Philosophy), Russ Patrick (Physics), Valmiki Sooklal (College of Engineering and Engineering Technology), Ashley McClure (CCSE), Chris Totten (Criminal Justice), Seneca Vaught (ISD), Brian Artese (Literature), Tom Doleys (Political Science), Corinne McNamara (Psychology), Mural Dorat (Economics)
   b. Guests: Val Whittlesey, Amy V Jones, Chris Hutt, Rachel Blasé, Julie Newell, Brichaya Shah for Elke Leeds,

II. Approval of past minutes
   a. Minutes of March 2017

III. Proposal for a faculty award – Case for Support
   a. Natalie Berry (Chair), Cathy Bradford, Mia Oberlton, Natasha Thornton, Brian Artese
   b. No word from the Trustee yet

IV. Definition of the General Education Council; proposal to the Faculty Senate
   a. Approved by Faculty Senate and Chair’s and Director’s Assembly.
   b. Will visit the Dean’s Council on 5/18/17

V. Membership of the General Education Council
   a. Last meeting of the year! Who is coming back for the fall?

VI. Curriculum
   a. Current Proposals
      i. None!

VII. Guest speakers
   a. None!

VIII. Notifications
   a. AGLS Awards deadline is April 20, 2017.
   b. Outcomes updates
      i. Kennesaw.campuslabs.com/outcomes
      ii. Using software will be optional this year. DACs can either use the .doc file OR the Outcomes software.

Revised 8/10/17
iii. Q-are there predetermined goals, like 70% of the sample will earn a C or better? A-NO! It’s up to the academic department to choose its own standards, hopefully in line with best practices.

iv. Deadlines are June 1 for Pilot, July 1 for Legacy. Area B1, E4 are in Pilot, and almost everyone else is Legacy.

v. DACs have access at the course level – not just the class level. DACs should be entering data at the SHHH 1101 course level, not at the SHHH 1101-03 section level.

vi. Q-will we be assessing individual sections or individual instructors? A-not as part of Gen Ed. If your department chooses to do that, they can, but I’m asking for only aggregated data.

c. GEAR IRB
   i. Opt-out forms are no longer necessary
   ii. DACs will remove under-18s.

d. Curriculog, IRB, FERPA trainings are available online.

IX. If we have time / Future items
   a. There’s a new QEP on the horizon.
   b. Improve KSU updates
   c. Syllabus website
   d. Excel and D2L data collection and manipulation trainings, incl sampling techniques.
   e. Gened website

X. Things that have been reported elsewhere
   a. Report to Barbara Brown
   b. MATH 1111 + MATH 1112 = MATH 1113 (and transfer rules associated)
   c. Awesomeness!

XI. Upcoming events:
   a. Next meeting: Fall kickoff.
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Welcome

- Sign in!

General Education Council Retreat

1pm – 4pm
August 19, 2017
Prillaman Hall, Room 1103

Schedule of meetings

- Link to curriculum.kennesaw.edu/gened
- Thanks to Debra Hill for booking rooms so efficiently! (and taking our minutes this year)

Membership of the GEC

- Here's the current list of voting members: Link to curriculum.kennesaw.edu/gened
- Note that we have an updated presence in the University Handbook according to the changes we made last year: handbooks.kennesaw.edu (p.43-44)

Scrappy wants you to be our UPCC Representative!

Current curriculum

- Catalog.Kennesaw.edu
- gened.kennesaw.edu/genedsuper.php
Approval of past minutes

- Minutes of April 2017

Proposal for a faculty award

- Natalie Berry (Chair), Cathy Bradford, Mia Oberlin, Natasha Thornton, Brian Artese
- Ron Matson is meeting with the Foundation

Curriculog

- Current Proposals
- Future Proposals
  - We may start looking at program proposals to verify that they are using 42 hours and they are not restricting or encouraging enrollment in overburdened classes.
  - 30 hours for area A.
- Past Proposals
  - We adjudicated 6 proposals last year.

Curriculog

- curriculum.kennesaw.edu/curriculog/index.php

Guest speakers

- Today:
  - Dr Pusateri on Specifications Grading
  - Dr Hutt, Ms Matta, Drs Reese & Whittlesey on Early alert intervention pilot for G2C courses

Upcoming Guest Speakers

- Dr Saundra McGuire on Metacognition
- Faculty workshops (Convocation Center 2016):
  - Friday Sept 8, 10:15-11:45
  - Friday Sept 8, 1:15-2:45
- Book Signing (Convocation Center):
  - 3:00-3:45
- CETL book club – Sept 6, 11:00-12:15, RSVP at cetl.kennesaw.edu
September 20 GEC
- Sampling techniques (Dr Wells, Dr DeGrendel)
- Drs Reese & Whittlesey on G2C action plan

October 18 GEC
- Syllabus Website (Dr Whittlesey)
- Academic program maps (Ms McClure, Dr Whittlesey)

Outcomes!
- Kennesaw.campuslabs.com/outcomes

Goals for 17-18!
- Hire a permanent Faculty Director
- Trainings you can use
- Super awesome website
- More / better guest speakers
- ELSE?

Search for Faculty Director
- Dr. Whittlesey

Break!
- Stretch!
Assessment

- Overall notes:
  - Direct results
  - Indirect results
- University policies
- Places this gets sent
- The current IRB
- A walk through the process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. During the current school year, to what extent have your instructors done the following?</td>
<td>FY</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>FY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly explained course goals and requirements</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing numerical and statistical information</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Policies

- Full assessment for the first 3 years, and then we go to a rotating schedule.
- The exact rotation will depend on your departments’ other assessments and who else is in your area of the core.

Who gets to see these results?

- There is a mighty aggregated report over all General Education, which goes to AVP Curriculum.
- Sections are distributed to:
  - SACSCOC
  - Improve KSU
  - CPR / BOR-USG

The new IRB

- Does not require under-18s to opt out at the beginning of the term.
- Allows all students equal opportunities for course credit.
- Burden is moved from the student to the investigator, and only occurs if the assessment is outside pedagogy or the individual artifact is displayed (redacted, of course).
The new IRB

• Change to PIs: removes CITI burden from as many folk as before.
• Current PI: Sarah Holliday, Val Whittlesey
• Current Co-PIs: Just two right now... if you'd like to be added, maintain your CITI training and we'll gladly add you on.

Name the DAC

• Some departments do this by service expectation from the FPA (e.g. Math who has a separate DAC from the Gen Ed coordinator)
• Some do this as a part of a position (e.g. Director of First Year Composition)

Identify the sample

• All sections of one course
• Some sections of some courses
• One section of each course
• All sections of all courses

Educate the instructors

• Again, variety of techniques. Participation varied accordingly. At 64% response rate:
  - "It must be a writing assignment of 400 to 600 words. It should require students to write expository prose in bullet points or documented notes. It must require the student to interpret and analyze a work of literature, on a per sonal level.
  - The assignment did not focus on one particular text or on a single course. Instead, it was a broad assignment that could be used in any number of courses, and it was designed to give students an opportunity to express their own interpretations and insights.
  - It must not require analysis of more than one text. The assignment must focus on a single text and must encourage the student to refer to other texts or to class lectures. It must require the student to discuss, at least briefly, how the text is connected to other texts or class discussions. The connection between the text and the other texts or lectures must be clearly identified by the student.
• These were graded using a common rubric

Design the instrument

• Academic freedom vs Consistent assessment, and what about dishonest students?
• One DAC had faculty choose from two writing prompts.
• One DAC used questions from a discipline-standard test.
• One DAC will be having a series of meetings to debate MC vs Essay

Administer the instrument

• D2L, external forces, photocopies, emails.
• One DAC used Turnitin to receive lab reports on a common lab.
• One DAC sent 3 questions by email, and individual faculty inserted them in the final exam.
• One DAC gave faculty a choice of Multiple Choice or Essay
Score instrument
• One DAC used two graders to set the baseline, and one after that.
• Some departments used multiple independent graders
• Many used Multiple Choice that D2L scored.

Collect responses
• Many DACs collected whole quiz/test grades from D2L.
• Many had instructors email/mail artifacts.
• One DAC used a reporting template: Faculty scored assessments and reported scores to DAC.

-IRB-
• Very few assessments were not directly related to pedagogical practices.
• Those assessments that are not part of the class experience get a front-end opt-out notification, much like any IRBed survey or assessment.

Aggregate scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Proficiency</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Accomplish</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students in 1101</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students in 1111</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students in 1112</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students in 1113</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Students</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report aggregated scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUBRIC (N=849)</th>
<th>Exemplar</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Begin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.13%)</td>
<td>(25.32%)</td>
<td>(45.58%)</td>
<td>(18.96%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.49%)</td>
<td>(19.08%)</td>
<td>(27.56%)</td>
<td>(40.87%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49.59%)</td>
<td>(23.91%)</td>
<td>(15.19%)</td>
<td>(11.31%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22.97%)</td>
<td>(20.38%)</td>
<td>(20.73%)</td>
<td>(35.92%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.21%)</td>
<td>(36.67%)</td>
<td>(27.56%)</td>
<td>(20.87%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30.39%)</td>
<td>(27.41%)</td>
<td>(24.02%)</td>
<td>(23.91%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.21%)</td>
<td>(34.21%)</td>
<td>(32.95%)</td>
<td>(35.92%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflect on the data
• Did you get the success levels you expected?
• One DAC has set its own goal of 70% E or A, and was able to use that as its personal benchmark in discussing the three LO results
Reflect on the process

- One DAC noted that they believe they'd have better results with embedded assessments and began preparing an education plan.

Identify improvements

- In two cases, faculty had commentary on the content of multiple choice questions after the assessment was distributed.
- One DAC had a list of clear action steps towards better coaching faculty about the Learning Outcome.
- Several DACs were more vague about process and pedagogy.

Report

- Analysis (reflect on the data)
- Discussion (reflect on the process)
- Planned improvements
  - One DAC planned to share their results with their department
  - One DAC included redacted sample artifacts.

Upcoming events:

- Next meeting: September 20!

If we have time / Future items

- There's a new QEP on the horizon.
- Improve KSU
Fall 2017
Early Alert Pilot
Completing Reports

When a Progress Report Campaign is initiated, you will receive a request notification email. This email includes a direct link to the Progress Report screen where you can enter your feedback.

At-Risk to Fail Your Class?
Use this field to indicate whether this student is currently at-risk to fail your class.

Alert Reasons - This field is only used if the At-Risk field was selected as “Yes”. If “Yes”, then the faculty must select a reason.

Absences - The number of absences this student has accumulated thus far.
Current Grade - The grade the student has earned in this course.
Comments - Enter a narrative regarding how this student is progressing in their course.

Submitting Reports: Two Options

Submit only marked students (but I’m not done):
This can be very helpful if you only have time to fill out part of the feedback form. You can submit your completed work and finish later by clicking the link in the request notification email.

Submit unmarked students as not At-Risk (I’m all done):
After you've entered all your feedback and marked certain students at-risk, you can use this option to mark the remaining students as not at-risk and complete your feedback.
Specifications Grading

Tom Pusateri
Associate Director for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Presentation at the General Education Retreat
Kennesaw State University
August 10, 2017

Download files at: http://tinyurl.com/SG-08-10-17

Ebook available via KSU's Library (Permalink)

Linda Nilson will deliver the Keynote at the 2017 Research on Teaching & Learning Summit, Friday, October 13
http://www.rotsummit.com/
"In the current grading system, instructors are expected to give partial credit for almost anything correct a student submits, including largely wrong or vague responses.... The partial credit point system turns grades—and really all college course work—into a game, the object of which is to maximize the number of points toward one’s grade with the lowest possible investment of time and effort...."

"If we structure our courses around students’ achieving learning outcomes, shouldn’t our students’ course grades correspond to the learning outcomes they have achieved?... Outcomes achievement is not a matter of degree; a student either achieves an outcome or does not achieve it in any given assessment.... In [specifications grading], students receive grades based on the number of work requirements and/or the specific work requirements they complete at a satisfactory level by given due dates. In other words, students earn higher grades by jumping more hurdles that show evidence of more learning... and/or jumping higher hurdles that show evidence of more advanced learning, or both.”

from Linda Nilson, Specifications Grading (2015)

---

Some Problems with Typical Grading Systems

Fall 2015: Scoring rubric for article analyses

Comments on articles (140 points): Prior to most class meetings, you will have the opportunity to submit comments on readings for that class via the discussion boards on D2L Brightspace. Check the course calendar for due dates and times for each comment. You will receive up to 10 points for each entry based on its timeliness, clarity, accuracy, focus, and analysis (see rubric below). If you submit more than 14 comments, your total score for comments will be based on your 14 best comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Criteria</th>
<th>6 or 10 points above</th>
<th>8 points below</th>
<th>7 or 6 points C or D below</th>
<th>0 to 5 points Inadequate or Unsubmitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>5 points submitted by the deadline.</td>
<td>2 points submitted no more than 1 hour after the deadline.</td>
<td>1 point more than 1 hour late but no more than 24 hours late.</td>
<td>0 points (on all criteria) Submission was more than 24 hours late (or no submission).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>7 points clarity, accuracy, focus, and analysis are all high.</td>
<td>5 points clarity, accuracy, focus, and analysis are all adequate, but not all of them are high.</td>
<td>3 points analysis is present, but there are deficiencies in clarity, accuracy, focus, or analysis.</td>
<td>1 point Analysis is absent or there are serious deficiencies in clarity, accuracy, or focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Analysis how well did you discuss core concepts from the article? Here are some suggested analyses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>How are core concepts from this personality theorist similar to or different from concepts presented in articles by other personality theorists covered earlier in this course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which of the personality theorist’s core concepts did you find most difficult to understand and or would like more information to more fully understand those concepts? Describe why you believe you’re having difficulty understanding those concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With which of the personality theorist’s core concepts do you agree or disagree? Provide your reasons for your reactions. Don’t just restate the concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How have the core concepts from this personality theorist been presented in another course you took or are taking? What are the similarities or differences in the theorist’s views and what you learned in that course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjectivity: Awarding points for level of quality (partial credit) and justifying point deductions

Hairsplitting and Grade Grubbing: “Why did you give me 8 of 10 points? Why not 9 or 10?”

Time complaints: “I can’t always read before class.” or “I find the articles difficult.”
Fall 2016: Specifications chart for analyses

Specifications for analyses of articles: You will receive 1 credit for submitting analyses of course readings that meet all of the following specifications.

Timeliness: You submitted the analysis to the appropriate Assignments location in DL Brightspace no later than 11:59pm on the Sunday after the class date.

Length: You wrote an analysis of 250+ words or met all other specifications in fewer than 250 words.

Clarity: Your analysis is written clearly, is well-organized, and has no errors in spelling/grammar.

Accuracy: You accurately discussed the contents of the article and did not misrepresent its content.

Focus: Your analysis is focused on the author's core/central (not peripheral/superficial) concepts.

Comparison: You provided a convincing comparison of the article to at least one of the following:
- How are core concepts from this personality theorist similar to or different from concepts presented in articles by other personality theorists covered earlier in this course?
- How have the core concepts from this personality theorist been presented in another course you took or are taking? What are similarities or differences in the theorist's views as discussed in the article and what you learned in that course?
- How do the personality theorist's core concepts help us understand or explain current events in the news, historical events, or your experiences in college, work, or family? Provide informed reasons that connect the core concepts to the events or experiences. Don't just summarize the concepts.

I will review your work and indicate whether or not you have met all of these specifications. If your entry does not meet all specifications, I will indicate which specification(s) you did not meet. If you meet the Timeliness deadline but do not meet one or more of the other specifications, you may use 1 token to revise and resubmit an entry within one week of the date and time that I post my review of your work.

Specifications for class preparation: One of the objectives in this course is to build your skills and confidence in reading and comprehending difficult articles without assistance from your instructor. In order to encourage you to develop these skills, you will receive 1 credit for submitting an analysis prior to the start of the class during which we will discuss that article (7:59am the day of class) and for meeting at least three of the following specifications for Analysis: Length, Clarity, Accuracy, Focus, Comparison. You may use 1 token to apply to an entry submitted after the start of class. (Strategy: Submit all analyses prior to class to increase your opportunities to obtain active participation credits.)

---

Characteristics of Specifications Grading

Do not assign partial credit
Score all work "satisfactory/unsatisfactory" or "pass/fail"

Clarify the specifications for each assignment
Articulate what constitutes satisfactory work in advance

Set rigorous expectations for "satisfactory" work
Set "satisfactory" work at the B-level or even higher.

Provide opportunities for second chances
Allocate "tokens" to revise work, submit work late, etc.

Bundle work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0+4</td>
<td>0+3</td>
<td>0+2</td>
<td>0+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0+4</td>
<td>0+3</td>
<td>0+2</td>
<td>0+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students choose which bundles to complete.

C = Essential outcomes for the course
B = More work &/or more challenging work
A = Even more &/or more challenging work
### Minimum Credits for a Grade of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Tokens (5 maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance for a full class (8:00am - 9:15am)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 token = 1 class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Preparation</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Tokens (5 maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit article analyses prior to class period</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 token = 1 analysis after class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Article Analyses

| Overarching Theories: Submit at least: | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 token = Revise and resubmit 1 analysis |
| Trait Theories: Submit at least: | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Learning & Cognition: Submit at least: | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Clinical & Abnormal: Submit at least: | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Developmental & Social: Submit at least: | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Biological/Need Theories: Submit at least: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

### Paper (Analysis of Muhammad Ali's traits)

| Score __ of 25 credits on the paper | 16 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 1 token = Revise and resubmit before Oct 17. |

### Tests (T1 & T2: 5 sections each; T3: 6 sections)

| Score 8+ of 10 points on each of __ sections | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 16 |
| Score 16+ of 20 points on __ take-home essays | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 token = 1 test on __ section |

---

## Sample Specifications

### Chart from my Course

---

## Fall 2017 Specifications

### Grading Chart

---

## Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

---

### Kennesaw State University

---
Some CETL Services on Teaching Effectiveness

cetl.kennesaw.edu/syllabus-review
cetl.kennesaw.edu/learning-focused-syllabus-research
cetl.kennesaw.edu/small-group-instructional-diagnosis
cetl.kennesaw.edu/teaching-enhancement-services

cetl.kennesaw.edu/online-course-development
cetl.kennesaw.edu/teaching-enhancement-services

Rubrics & Other Scoring Systems


Available for online reading via KSU's Library.


Available for online reading via KSU's Library.
Common Errors in Rubric Design (Selke, 2013)

Avoid vague, nonspecific descriptors (e.g., Poor, Somewhat, Very)
Prefer: Exceeds; Meets; Working to meet, Does not yet meet expectations
Prefer: Outstanding, Acceptable, Needs revision, Unsatisfactory/Fragmentary

Avoid combining criteria in any row
Separate criteria, one per row

Avoid a range of numbers in a column
Better yet, avoid using numbers entirely

Avoid averaging final scores
3+3+3+3+3= 15/20 = 75% for all “meets”

Avoid simply weighting all criteria equally
SLO1 may be more important than SLO5
Consider patterns of scores for grades
B = No Fragmentary, no more than 1 Need revision
A = At least 3 Exceeds and all others Meets
(Perhaps require Exceeds in SLO1 and SLO2)
Choose patterns that make sense for the assignment

Holistic Rubric:  EMRF (Stutzman & Race, 2004)
Does this work demonstrate understanding of the concept? AND
Does this work meet the expectations outlined in the assignment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it complete and well communicated?</td>
<td>Is there evidence of partial understanding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: E</td>
<td>Yes: R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent example</td>
<td>Needs Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets or exceeds expectations</td>
<td>Partial understanding is evident, but significant gap(s) remain. Needs more work, teaching, communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete, clear communication</td>
<td>Rc = Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear understanding</td>
<td>Rs = Significant error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any error is trivial</td>
<td>Ri = Incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Available online via KSU’s library.
Dr. Saundra Yancy McGuire is the Director Emerita of the Center for Academic Success and retired Assistant Vice Chancellor and Professor of Chemistry at LSU. Prior to joining LSU, she spent eleven years at Cornell University, where she received the coveted Clark Distinguished Teaching Award.

“My interest has been in improving student learning by teaching students metacognitive learning strategies. I work actively with university faculty and students to increase their understanding of the application of cognitive science and learning theory to increasing student academic performance . . . . and increasing the number of underrepresented minority and women students who are interested in and prepared to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.”
METACOGNITION:  
The Key to Acing Courses!  

Attend this interactive workshop!!!

Student Success Speaker Series  
Thursday, September 7  

Pizza * Drinks  
Prillaman Indoor Plaza  
5:45 – 6:30 p.m.

Workshop with Dr. Saundra McGuire  
Prillaman Hall, Room HS2010  
6:45 – 8:00 p.m.

“All students who are admitted to college have the ability to ace their courses. However, most students did not acquire effective learning strategies in high school, and resort to memorizing information just before tests. This strategy usually yields poor results, with students earning grades much lower than their ability. This interactive workshop will introduce students to cognitive science based learning strategies that help all students experience meaningful, transferable learning, resulting in A’s in their courses!”

Dr. Saundra McGuire

Dr. Saundra Yancy McGuire is the Director Emerita of the Center for Academic Success and retired Assistant Vice Chancellor and Professor of Chemistry at LSU. Prior to joining LSU, she spent eleven years at Cornell University, where she received the coveted Clark Distinguished Teaching Award.