

**General Education Assessment Committee October 19, 2022**  
**9am, Online via Zoom**

**Present:**

Michele Baranczyk (Office of Assessment), David Beougher (Academic Dean), Lauren Levine (CLAS), Liaoliao Li (COB), Amy Lynch-Binieck (at-large teaching faculty), Dannell MacIlwraith (VPA, interim chair), Feisal Murshed (At-large Teaching Faculty Representative), Meg Norris (COE), Megan O'Byrne (GEC), Karen Rauch (Academic Affairs), and Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty), and Dan Stafford (at-large non-teaching faculty).

**Absent:**

Undergraduate Student Representative.

**Guests:**

Bethany French

D. MacIlwraith called the meeting to order at 9:02am.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the October 5, 2022, meeting were presented for review.

Motion to approve the minutes by D. Stafford, seconded by L. Levine. Motion passed.

**New Business**

**Rubric Revision Updates:**

L. Levine shared the feedback she has received about the rubric for C1 with the committee, and reviewed the new rubric draft that was sent to the committee with the agenda. Feedback was received from a variety of disciplines, including the hard sciences, Sport Management and Anthropology/Sociology. There was some criticism from those who felt their previous feedback was not utilized in prior revisions, and concerns about the wording of the SLO itself. L. Levine noted that some expressed confusion over the use of the rubric the way it was set up, and asked for written instructions to be included on how to use it. Discussion ensued.

B. French shared her screen with the committee to review the new draft of the C1 rubric. K. Rauch brought up that this draft changes the type of rubric: this draft is an analytical rubric, and all the GEAC rubrics to date have been holistic rubrics. She added that we need to be consistent with the type of rubric and assessment done across all SLOs. Discussion ensued.

D. Stafford suggested creating a formalized revision process for editing the SLO rubrics.

D. MacIlwraith asked about how well this rubric draft would work with D2L, and L. Levine stated that this is set up the way D2L rubrics are set up, so this accessibility would be possible. D. MacIlwraith added that it would be more familiar to use for faculty members.

It was noted that holistic rubrics don't isolate areas for improvement as well as analytic rubrics do, so moving to this style of rubric would help in the goal of improving student learning overall. The committee expressed thanks to L. Levine for her efforts on this project.

For the C2 rubric revision, the subcommittee had not made much progress to date, but they will take this discussion into account and work on an analytic rubric for the new draft. M. Baranczyk noted that they have requested feedback for the most recent revision of the C2 rubric. This will be discussed further at the next GEAC meeting.

#### Raters for Spring 2023:

M. Baranczyk opened discussion for this topic and shared her screen showing a document with a drafted plan for Spring raters. Discussion on the numbers and how many artifacts to request from each class ensued. The committee discussed double rating one third of all submissions, and L. Levine suggested that a number divisible by 3 is selected for the number of items to request per class.

D. Beougher asked about the expected time commitment for faculty doing their own ratings, as some faculty primarily teach GE courses, so would have that amount of time commitment per each class. Example: if 20 items are expected to be rated per course, a professor with 4 GE courses would be rating 80 items. Discussion ensued.

The committee discussed the possibility of making assessment more efficient by providing a D2L add-on to facilitate rating and submission of ratings. It was noted that not all faculty use and are familiar with D2L.

Discussion will continue at the next GEAC Meeting.

#### Full-Cycle Report Update:

This discussion was moved to the next meeting due to time constraints.

#### Bylaw Amendment Update

A. Lynch-Binieck provided an update on the discussion that occurred at APSCUF Representative Council regarding the proposed bylaw amendment. She stated that there was much discussion among the representatives, and that the Representative Council suggested proposing a Resolution naming a temporary chairperson for a certain period of time rather than an amendment of the bylaws. They have not yet voted on the amendment, but will vote on what the committee decides to use via email. Discussion ensued. The committee members will vote via email no later than Friday via email on whether to continue moving forward with the amendment or to change to using a resolution.

*As of 10/25, the vote was 6 for the Resolution, 0 for the Amendment and 0 Abstentions.*

## ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by D. MacIlwraith, and seconded by L. Levine, to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:58 am