

General Education Assessment Committee
Oct. 16, 2019
Graduate Center 200

Present: Angela Cirucci (VPA), Sudarshan Fernando (CLAS), Khori Newlander (at large teaching faculty), Krista Prock (at-large non-teaching faculty), Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty), George Sirkakos (COE), John Stanley (GEC).

Absent: Student Representative, David Beougher (Academic Dean), Yongjae Kim (COB), Amy Lu (at large teaching faculty), Karen Rauch.

Guest: Amy Lynch-Binieck (Dept. of English)

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

Guest Presentation: Amy Lynch-Binieck presented on a Campus Writing Coordinator position. She noted that the former position of Composition Coordinator was eliminated when the new General Education program took effect, and she is advocating for changing the position into a Campus Writing Coordinator position since composition is no longer taught only in the English Department. This position could provide assistance to many department and committees in assessing writing and composition. J. Stanley noted that the General Education program is moving away from using the term “writing intensive” and adopting “writing instruction” for courses in the program. A. Lynch-Binieck would like to eventually move to using a term that is more reflective of GE goals for composition, which includes incorporating writing across the curriculum that is more focused on teaching students how to write in their discipline. A. Cirucci reiterated that GEAC is under GEC and can only follow their direction and can not take action on this proposed position in any way. Discussion continued on how to describe General Education and craft SLOs for composition. A. Cirucci closed discussion.

Announcements: Two classroom visits to assess SLO 1 have been completed.

Minutes: The minutes from the September 18, 2019 meeting were presented for review. Motion to approved the minutes by J. Stanley, seconded by K. Prock. Motion passed.

Old Business:

Classroom Visits: Two professor’s courses opened up that need volunteers to rate and assess speaking. A. Cirucci reminded the committee to check the shared Google Doc to sign up for classroom visits.

MLS Speaking assessment: A. Cirucci still working with MLS to determine how to assess speaking for foreign language classes. K. Prock noted that they had not had a MLS class as a sample to assess in the past. A. Cirucci plans to speak to MLS faculty, conduct a norming session

with them and clarify what the instructors need to assess. J. Stanley noted that this is their time and opportunity to choose and put courses through GEC for addition to the permanent list. A. Cirucci expressed concern that rubrics will never be able to be met with foreign culture and language courses, since the current rubrics were made with the assumption of native speaker fluency. J. Stanley again suggested that they choose now what to assess and how to assess it. K. Newlander asked where this question was 2-3 years ago when the rubrics were being created. J. Stanley noted that the rubrics were made, then the courses tried to fit into the rubric categories. A. Cirucci said she will schedule a meeting with the department as soon as possible, and has the sense the department chair is in support of assessment and needs to get the faculty on board.

Spring 2019 report: G. Sirkakos reviewed the Spring 2019 GEAC Report with the committee. J. Stanley noted the Math Dept. says that not all courses match the categories accurately. G. Sirkakos shared that some of the strongest quantitative reasoning was from Chemistry courses, not Math. J. Stanley also brought up sample assignments for courses that GEAC can reference later, and said that while it comes with the first proposal to GEC, we need to avoid the “one and done” submission and discuss how to make sure it is passed along to new or different faculty teaching the course. G. Sirkakos said that the sample is used to show what instrument is used to assess the course, and that it is good to discuss a feasible approach to updating sample assessments, which needs more than a paragraph but actual assessment sheet to show how an assignment aligns to the SLO. There was discussion on sampling and how the samples were achieved for the report. J. Stanley asked why there was a large difference in SLO submission rates (between SLO 2A and SLO 2B), and K. Prock noted that the percentage is of sections not faculty, and that there were some faculty who did not comply with the assessment or provided unusable data. K. Newlander asked if data on pg. 13 in table 4 could be broken down by 100 level and 200 level, and G. Sirkakos responded that it may be possible, but the report was looking at 1st course taken and 2nd course taken. K. Newlander commented that it may show a difference if there are more 1 and 2 scores in 100 levels than in 200 levels. A. Cirucci asked if G. Sirkakos could send the raw data to the GEAC members, and G. Sirkakos said yes.

Next meeting is October 30, 2019 at 2 pm in MSU 322.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.

/bf
10/21/2019

