

**General Education Assessment Committee Oct. 30, 2019  
McFarland Student Union Building, 322**

**Present:**

Angela Cirucci (VPA), Sudarshan Fernando (CLAS), Khori Newlander (at large teaching faculty), Krista Prock (at-large non-teaching faculty), Karen Rauch, and George Sirrakos (COE).

**Absent:**

Student Representative, David Beougher (Academic Dean), Yongjae Kim (COB), Amy Lu (at large teaching faculty), Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty), and John Stanley (GEC).

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

**Announcements:**

Almost all COM 10 classrooms visits have been conducted and data collected, a few classes remain to be analyzed.

A. Cirucci plans to meet with the Modern Language Studies department early in Nov. to continue discussion on how to assess speaking in their courses.

A. Cirucci also noted she has received data from Natalie Cartwright on students to begin analyzing assessment data for COM 10 courses.

There will be a notice going out to faculty soon to ask for volunteer raters, all members of GEAC are asked to talk this up to other faculty and be GEAC ambassadors.

Departments have been emailed about A4 courses and what they plan to assess. D. Beougher had included in his email that he recalls they should all be assessing writing.

Discussion ensued regarding GE courses and GEC proposal process.

**Minutes:**

The minutes from the October 16, 2019 meeting were presented for review. Motion to approved the minutes by S. Fernando, seconded by K. Prock. Motion passed.

**Old Business:**

**Spring 2019 Annual Report:**

A. Cirucci reviewed feedback and suggested edits from the Academic Assessment Committee. There was discussion on the AAC feedback. G. Sirrakos noted that the number of results was

limited by the number of raters available, and K. Prock added that it is also limited by the amount submitted correctly or incorrectly.

S. Fernando believes that recruiting raters is a bigger challenge than getting correct submissions from courses and departments. There was discussion on how to recruit volunteer raters more effectively. K. Rauch asked if it would be better or worse if the request for raters came from her or her office, and A. Cirucci replied it might, but that the thank you letter should come from Dr. Rauch and the Office of Assessment. It was agreed that K. Prock would send out the email requesting volunteer raters.

Conversation about eventually changing rating system since having the professor teaching the course act as the second rater may mean KU is shifting back to just faculty rating. There are questions on how to do it logistically, since D2L is not able to be set up to facilitate this action at this time. S. Fernando suggested that that's not necessary, and that professors should incorporate rating as part of their regular grading. K. Rauch agreed that it is a good idea to start moving that way, but not yet ready to move to faculty-only rating system. G. Sirrakos recommended that volunteer raters could act as the double-rater.

K. Prock noted that if instructors begin rating their own courses, then GEAC should reiterate that rating is done every time the course is taught. A. Cirucci said this was another suggestion from AAC, to have continuous data gathering and therefore have more data to analyze when it is time to review. G. Sirrakos was concerned about additional levels of analysis of the data. K. Prock also shared that if the instructors do this more often they will become more familiar and comfortable with the rubric. K. Rauch said that GEAC needs to get data storage figured out first.

A. Cirucci also shared that AAC was concerned about length of time between ratings of SLOs, and that contributed to the conversation about continuous data gathering.

At AAC, the Provost shared her concern about the language used in the rubric levels and expectations for students. S. Fernando asked if GEAC needs to revisit the rubric. K. Prock said that GEAC could initiate discussion, but change needs to come from the GEC. Discussion continued on rubric levels and their wording for SLO 2B. A. Cirucci concluded discussion, and will be adding changes to the rubric as part of the Report recommendations.

#### Raw Data Storage:

There are concerns about space and length of time to store raw data, both digital and physical artifacts. K. Prock stated that she and K. Rauch will talk with Troy Vingom again about having enough digital storage for the raw data. A. Cirucci said she would like to eventually see all artifacts go digital.

#### New Business:

## January Assessment Day:

The planned Assessment Day for January will now focus on academics, not administrative units, and will only be held from 9a-12n, with three hour-long sessions. A. Cirucci shared that part of the day will be focused on General Education, such as how to structure courses, explain how to best develop courses, and how to evaluate a course based on the rubrics, with time for a question & answer session at the end.

K. Rauch noted that, while the order is not set, the Office of Assessment is considering the three sessions be on a Gen Ed focus, a Panel Discussion about Assessment process (with KU faculty on the panel), and an Interactive Workshop.

Discussion ensued on Assessment Day sessions. G. Sirrakos stated that we need to share a consistent message on how to make a Gen Ed course, with K. Newlander noting that there are complaints that the college curriculum committees and General Education Committee are not consistent in their expectations.

## As May Arise:

K. Rauch stated that Middle States is clearly asking KU when we talk about Assessment? K. Prock also said that the second Middle States team went over the flow chart for Assessment and asked about what happens with the information and data? Where does it go? Who is responsible for it? She suggested tying data to the instructor. G. Sirrakos raised the concern of what point Assessment becomes evaluatory of the instructor instead of the course material, and if that action would be in violation of the CBA. K. Newlander asked if GEAC has power to remove courses from GE program if students' work does not meet requirements. A. Cirucci added that GEAC has not reported departmental level data. K. Prock said that data will eventually be needed to examine why students/courses are not meeting benchmarks and plan what to do about it. S. Fernando shared that at LAS meeting some professors were still asking if we can stop Assessment now, and that the culture of Assessment is still being developed. K. Rauch stated that KU is not the only institution to struggle with this topic, and that faculty often fear it will be used to evaluate them. K. Newlander said that he feels it is connected to how well he is doing his job as a professor. S. Fernando added that we could work on giving people a feeling that this is not a "gotcha" and that we are out to catch them. Just because we are not perfect doesn't mean we don't do it all. K. Prock added that sometimes we discovered projects may not always fit the SLO.

Next meeting is Nov 13, 2019 at 2 pm in MSU 322.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.

/bf

11/10/2019