

General Education Assessment Committee
Sept. 4, 2019
MSU Room 322

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

Absent: Student Representative, Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty), Yongjae Kim (COB).

A. Cirucci called the meeting to order at 11 am.

Minutes: No minutes were presented to review.

Announcements: No announcements were provided.

New Business:

Scope of Committee Work: Our job is to assess General Education classes and report back to the General Education Committee.

New Institutional Learning Outcomes: A handout was provided to the committee members with the information about the new Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) that were proposed by the Implementation Team for Institutional Effectiveness. The new ILOs are not identical to the Gen. Ed. SLOs, but they are mapped to one another. K. Rauch noted that programs do not need to do mapping again to the new ILOs, since they were mapped to the Gen. Ed. SLOs.

Assessing SLO 1: A. Cirucci asked how do we plan to assess SLO 1A (oral communication). There was discussion on viability of watching presentations in class or videotaping the presentations to review, or have the professor of the class use the rubric to assess the presentations. The committee also discussed assessing SLO 1A in Modern Language Studies courses, where the presentations are not in English. K. Newlander suggested getting volunteers to go into classrooms and rate presentations for the SLO. D. Beougher went over the reasons for using external reviewers: expertise not needed to use the rubric, and when self-assessment is used professors tend to evaluate their teaching and have inflated scores. There could be difficulty in aligning schedules of raters with the classes when presentations are being held. The committee discussed having a small group of volunteer raters for classes that have speeches in English, for CMP courses use a group of volunteers to rate, and for Modern Language Studies courses use special language raters for in-class observations.

For SLO 1B, the committee decided to use a separate method than for SLO 1A. It was noted that CMP courses are not just in the English Department, and that some A4 courses also have writing to be assessed. There was a question about providing feedback to the professors, and K. Prock

noted that feedback was only given about FYS courses previously because they were still being developed. There was concern about variety of assignments across different sections of a course. K. Prock said that courses with multiple sections need to have a common assignment. G. Sirkakos also suggested having the professors of the sections show the range of assignments in the course.

The committee chair will email all faculty who have speeches in English that they may have visits by GEAC raters to class, but still need to self-assess, and will contact the Modern Language Studies Department about the rating structure for foreign language courses. It was also suggested that GEAC host a training session for raters.

Spring 2019 GEAC Report Update: G. Sirkakos provided an update on the Spring 2019 GEAC report and the assessment of SLO 2A and SLO 2B. He noted that he doesn't have all the descriptive statistics for SLO 2B, but that the main thing is that high school GPA is a factor in how well the students perform for these SLOs. He plans to send draft report to GEAC next week. K. Rauch reminded him that the Implementation Team wants all Assessment Reports to include recommendations at the end. There was discussion on a recommendation of suggesting an assessment (placement) test for incoming students.

Next meeting is September 18, 2019 at 2 pm in MSU 322.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.

/bf
9/10/2019