**FYS Assessment Meeting**

**April 28, 2016**

Data Observations

1. In general, the ratings differed by a score of 1 (0 vs. 1, 1 vs. 2, or 2 vs. 3) for the two raters. There were some exceptions, but overall similarities between raters.
2. Ruben didn’t rate Americanish Essay, Compare and Contrast Essay, or ES 1101-Research Paper. Mark didn’t rate Rough Draft or Upload Rough Draft Peer Rubric. Scott didn’t rate Final Research Paper.
3. Quick results:

SLO 2A: Avg 1.53, Med 2

SLO 2B: Avg 1.11, Med 1

SLO 3: Avg 1.36, Med 1

SLO 4: Avg 1.68, Med 2

SLO 5: Avg 1.10, Med 1

SLO 6A: Avg 1.88, Med 2

SLO 6B: Avg 1.64, Med 2

479 duplicated pieces of student work rated. SLO 6A and 6B rated the most. SLO 5 rated the fewest.

Questions/Considerations

1. How difficult was it to apply the rubric to the student work? What were some of the difficulties?
2. Are the assignments explicit enough that we would expect to see the SLOs demonstrated in the student work? Or are some of the SLOs implicit and that is why the might not have been demonstrated?
3. Can one assignment cover all the SLOs/5 out of the 6 SLOs? Should we be encouraging faculty to provide examples of student work with fewer outcomes?
4. For some readers, they didn’t evaluate a specific SLO at all even if the instructor said it was there. For other readers, they gave a score for some examples of student work and not others for a particular SLO. How did readers decided to do this? Thoughts?
5. What observations do you have that could help inform future conversations with FYS faculty (e.g. May’s faculty colloquium and future FYS workshops)? What changes would you make on your assignments based on participating in this process and teaching FYS?
6. What were some of the themes that you saw in the student work?
7. What do we think of the results? Should we think about setting goals for the different outcomes? Ex. Maybe we want to see a median score of 2 for each outcome by the end of FYS?

Next Steps:

1. Do we need to revise the rubric further?
2. Should we revise rubric before or after rating the remainder of the student work?
3. Work left to rate: (1) work outlined in #1 above under “Data Observations,” Anthropology, Engineering Science, Kinesiology, and Erika’s UWYO 1101 class.
4. We should spot check outcomes/assignments that had different ratings differences (3 vs. 1, 2 vs. 0).
5. Need for norming session?
6. Further data analysis
7. Recommendations for enhancement to FYS assessment process and identification for future training opportunities
8. Creation of an assignment bank for FYS?