

General Education Assessment Committee

Apr. 13, 2020

Online via Zoom

Present:

David Beougher (Academic Dean), Angela Cirucci (VPA), Sudarshan Fernando (CLAS), Amy Lu (at-large teaching faculty), Khori Newlander (at-large teaching faculty), Krista Prock (at-large non-teaching faculty), Karen Rauch, Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty, George Sirrakos (COE) and John Stanley (GEC).

Absent:

Sydney Fisher (student representative), and Yongjae Kim (COB).

Guests:

Bethany French

A. Cirucci called the meeting to order at 2:00pm.

Announcements:

The Middle States team site visit has been rescheduled to Nov. 11-13, 2020.

Minutes:

The minutes from the Feb. 24, 2020, meeting were presented for review. They were moved by G. Sirrakos, and seconded by K. Prock. MOTION PASSED. The minutes from the Mar. 30, 2020, meeting were presented for review.

They were moved by S. Fernando, and seconded by K. Prock. MOTION PASSED.

Old Business:

Review revisions to the rubric for SLO 2b: Quantitative Reasoning:

J. Stanley asked about the difference between explanations and inferences in the first grid. K. Newlander said that one could argue that “explanation” is being able to talk through a topic, and “inference” is a just being able to look at the bigger picture. R. Ryan said an “inference” would be putting together two pieces of information and getting to new information (like putting together 2 and 2 to get 4). A. Cirucci noted that we need to be ready to explain the difference if the question comes up.

S. Fernando asked about the second from the bottom (?), stating that number 3 and 4 looked the same, both stating “provides recent accurate information...” K. Newlander suggested adding qualifying words like “all”, “most” and “some” to help distinguish between different levels.

A. Cirucci asked the committee about cleaning up the rubric to how we like it, then sending it to professors who teach in this category for feedback, or is asking for feedback too risky? J. Stanley believes that feedback isn’t risky, and can provide valuable information for GEAC to make revisions. A. Cirucci agreed, and noted that at some point the faculty teaching with this rubric, and suggested perhaps picking 5-10 people who taught it last time it was taught to review the new rubric. Discussion on feedback and how to test the rubric continued.

A. Cirucci stated that Revision 1 should work well, and asked for the committee to test the rubric by applying it to work samples prior to the next meeting. D. Beougher suggested also testing against the work samples that did not work well under the previous version of the rubric to see if it’s more inclusive of the work products being used.

K. Newlander also noted that the AAC&U rubrics included a column that explained terminology, and asked if it would be useful to include a column like that in KU’s rubric. Discussion ensued. A. Cirucci stated she would review all the rubrics to see if including an extra column is possible, and the committee will discuss it at the next meeting. G. Sirrakos shared that AAC&U is offering a training on scoring with a rubric, and sent a link to the committee.

The overall revision looks good and is much less negative in tone than before, with a goal for revision being to clarify, not change, the expectations for general education.

Spring 2020 assessment update:

A. Cirucci has emailed all the faculty that have not yet submitted, and reminded them that the due date for submission is one week after grades are due. She has been emphasizing flexibility and willingness of GEAC to work with the faculty considering the ongoing situation. Most people are good, and only one has responded negatively. K. Prock noted that the Office of Assessment is still receiving submissions every day, and that the response is better than she expected.

A. Cirucci stated that doing a sample size has made the assessment process feel less daunting. K. Prock noted that the work products will not be analyzed until fall starts, and GEAC may move toward faculty conducting rating on their own students/courses.

New Business:

Assessment of SLO 8:

Assessment of SLO 8 is planned to be done in Spring 2020 by utilizing a transcript audit that analyzes transcripts by prefix. This would be used to see how many different general education courses students are taking. K. Prock spoke to Natalie Cartwright in Institutional Research who told her the program cannot delineate which major prefix courses are taken by the student for GE credit versus major program credit. A. Cirucci asked if that was taken into consideration when the

SLO and new Gen Ed program were created? If so, that shouldn't be a problem. K. Prock noted that the timing means that the assessment should also capture students who are in their fourth semester of the current Gen Ed model, showing what variety of courses students are taking through the Gen Ed program.

D. Beougher spoke to Ted Witryk, Registrar, about this audit, and said that GEAC needs to determine which populations to look at. Does the committee want to include spring 2020 graduates, or graduates from Spring/Fall 2019 in this audit? D. Beougher noted that GEAC could do either, as those who applied for graduation, actual graduates or past graduates, since the goal is to assess the breadth of GE courses being taken by students.

S. Fernando asked whether majors can or can't use courses with their major prefix for GE credit? A. Cirucci confirmed they cannot, but that only applies to the first listed major on their transcript, so would not include a second major or any minors. A. Cirucci asked K. Prock how the date would come to GEAC; K. Prock responded that she was under the impression that GEAC would not need to count, but will ask to clarify.

K. Rauch suggested conducting this assessment in the summer and analyze just this year.

Volunteer rater training and recruitment:

Discussion over when to recruit volunteers and conduct the ratings. Planning to conduct the ratings in early September. A. Cirucci will look at the link G. Sirrakos sent on the AAC&U rubric scoring training to see if that will be helpful.

Considering if having the faculty rate their own students would help the process.

As May Arise:

First Year Seminar (FYS):

D. Beougher has heard concerns from faculty that the majority of students taking FYS courses in the Spring semester had failed the course in the fall, and are coming into the course with a bad attitude. Most of the students failed by not attending or doing the course work. There is concern that this low morale is potentially spoiling the course and college experience for the few new students in the course. Discussion ensued about whether or not students should be allowed to retake FYS and when. G. Sirrakos asked about data points and amount of students retaking FYS, and D. Beougher said it looks like about 2/3 of the students taking FYS this Spring are repeats.

J. Stanley suggested creating a group for those teaching FYS courses to provide guidance and support for one another, possibly as a sub-committee of GEC. As a sub-committee of the GEC, they could provide guidance to the GEC and GEAC on changes or adjustments to FYS, and also provide help to new FYS professors.

K. Newlander suggested pairing FYS and CMP courses, so students go through both together, similar to a cohort. The hope would be that the students would have more support from one another to curb the amount of DFWI students. D. Beougher shared that something similar was done 5 years ago and made no noticeable difference in the DFWI rates.

A. Cirucci stated she will contact Natalie Cartwright about FYS data, too.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:58pm

/bf

04/21/2020