

General Education Assessment Committee
Feb. 24, 2020
McFarland Student Union Building, 322

Present:

David Beougher (Academic Dean), Sydney Fisher (student representative), Sudarshan Fernando (CLAS), Amy Lu (at-large teaching faculty), Khor Newlander (at-large teaching faculty), Krista Prock (at-large non-teaching faculty), Karen Rauch, Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty), and John Stanley (GEC).

Absent:

Angela Cirucci (VPA), Yongjae Kim (COB), and George Sirrakos (COE).

Guests:

Bethany French, Crystal Horninger

K. Prock called the meeting to order at 2:00pm.

Announcements:

There is a new member, representing the Student Government Board, Sydney Fisher. She is a senior in the College of Business and will be joining GEAC for the remainder of the Academic Year.

APSCUF elections have been completed for positions on this committee: Robert Ryan has been re-elected to his seat and Christine Núñez has been elected to fill Khor Newlander's position.

A. Cirucci will be leaving KU at the end of this Academic Year, and her position will need to be filled. Her position is appointed by the Dean of the College of Visual & Performing Arts.

Minutes:

The minutes from the Feb. 10, 2020, meeting were presented for review. They were moved by R. Ryan, and seconded by K. Newlander. MOTION PASSED.

Old Business:

Nominations for GEAC Chair:

There are currently no nominations for chair for GEAC, the position will begin Fall 2020. D. Beougher asked if anyone knew who may be appointed from CVPA for A. Cirucci's position, and

K. Rauch noted that while she has discussed the appointment with Dr. Kiec, no decision has been made yet.

Spring 2020 Assessment Sample:

K. Prock reminded the committee that SLO 6, which corresponds with Categories B and D, are up for assessment this semester. There are over 4,000 possible artifacts, and K. Prock suggested not requiring all items, but requesting samples. K. Prock also provided a handout that showed courses and enrolled numbers for the committee to review and discuss. One side shows 6B category courses, and the number of courses in progress students have taken, the other side shows 6D category courses. K. Prock noted that she has already received 100% of artifacts from 2 faculty members, and that A. Cirucci had requested digital artifacts from professors this semester. D. Beougher suggested winnowing down by not requesting artifacts for students who have taken 4 or more courses in the category, but focusing on students taking their first through third course in that category to establish a baseline.

Discussion continued regarding broad offerings in these categories, and students taking many courses within a particular category. S. Fernando asked if we should assess majors taking these courses, and K. Prock responded that we can't tell if the student is taking it as a GE or a major requirement. J. Stanley said that the professor teaching the course would know who in the class is a major in the subject, and could be asked to only submit work products for those who are not majors.

K. Prock brought the discussion back to defining the sample, suggesting requesting products only from students who are in their first, second or third instance of taking a course in this category, and excluding any students who are a major in the subject (ie: no Anthropology majors who are taking an Anthropology course). D. Beougher asked if this overcomplicates things. It was noted this may enable comparison of majors and non-majors in ability, and may be able to compare to previous versions of General Education.

The amount of work products to actually assess will depend on the number of raters. The Committee plans to change when to conduct rating, with rating happening in the Fall, and not over the summer, since quick turnaround is not needed. J. Stanley asked when in the Fall rating would be conducted, and D. Beougher recommended doing it in weeks 2 and 3. S. Fernando also suggested conducting norming sessions immediately before rating and set them up in advance.

K. Prock also brought up the issue of storing the work products digitally. D. Beougher asked about using a D2L dropbox and having IT transfer it into storage. K. Prock also asked how long we need to keep items: does it need to be forever? D. Beougher suggested keeping items for 1 year, since we have a limited storage system.

J. Stanley asked about the difference between 6B and 6D. K. Prock noted she will need help with the statistics to help with explaining that in the report, and that it was also recommended to do more sampling from all four colleges. D. Beougher noted that this could lead to interesting questions, such as if B course students do better or worse than D course students.

FYS assessment in Fall 2020:

K. Prock asked about re-assessing the First Year Seminar (FYS) courses in Fall 2020, since the previous assessment was a very small sample. The committee discussed samples and data. J. Stanley noted that he wants changes to FYS program to be based on data, and asked if there were other issues to look at or just the SLO? K. Prock responded by asking if GEAC should assess anything other than the SLO? Discussion ensued.

D. Beougher noted that he plans to meet with the Student Government Board (SGB) about FYS classes in the near future, and will report back to this committee about that conversation. K. Prock proposed creating a sub-committee to review FYS assessment, and nominated G. Sirrakos to run the sub-committee.

K. Newlander asked about what the FYS SRIs reveal, and if they provide information about the courses and program. D. Beougher replied that he has seen them and they are informative. He also stated that if students need a tutor for an FYS course, that is a problem. He stressed that commonalities, conversations and excitement make a difference in the quality of the course.

Rewording SLO #2b Rubric:

K. Prock began the discussion asking for volunteers to review this and reword the rubric to present a draft to the committee at the next GEAC meeting. K. Newlander, S. Fernando and A. Lu will work on this draft.

K. Newlander asked if the idea is to stay the same, but use less negative language, not a complete reworking of the categories in the rubric. K. Prock replied that is the main idea, but we would look at suggestions. K. Newlander suggested having the current level 2 read like level 3, and then re-work the upper levels (3 & 4). Discussion ensued about the levels and difficulty in approved courses.

As May Arise:

Discussion on keeping and storing work products. S. Fernando asked if faculty have to save information every time a course is taught, and how they should do that. J. Stanley suggested they save docs with a Zip file. D. Beougher noted that if we continuously keep documents over a 3-year cycle, there could be over 25,000 documents per SLO. K. Prock said it's time to discuss document and data storage with IT.

/bf

03/19/2020