

General Education Assessment Committee
Nov. 13, 2019
McFarland Student Union Building, 322

Present: David Beougher (Academic Dean), Angela Cirucci (VPA), Sudarshan Fernando (CLAS), Amy Lu (at large teaching faculty), Khorri 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: Student Representative, and Yongjae Kim (COB).

Guests: Bethany French, Crystal Horninger

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

Announcements:

There will be no meeting on Nov. 27 so everyone can enjoy the Thanksgiving holiday.

The last meeting on the schedule is on Dec. 11, 2019, at 10am in MSU 322.

Rater norming sessions will be held on Nov. 25 at 2pm, Dec. 4 at 11am and Dec. 11 at 1pm, all held in MSU 322.

K. Prock has sent out emails for volunteer raters, and 30 people have signed up so far.

Minutes: The minutes from the October 30, 2019 meeting were presented for review.

R. Ryan had questions on phrasing in January Assessment Day about building courses to the rubric. B. French noted that this can be edited to be clearer that courses are evaluated based on the rubric, and not built to the rubric.

Motion to approve the minutes with edits by S. Fernando, seconded by K. Newlander. Motion passed.

New Business:

SLO 1 Rubrics: A. Cirucci noted that the sections labeled “A” (oral) and “B” (written) on the SLO 1 rubric were switched at some point depending on the version. She wasn’t sure where the second version had come from, or which one was on the website. K. Prock noted that the original version, with A as oral and B as written, was what came up on the Assessment Website, and the committee agreed to keep it that order.

MLS in Category A: A. Cirucci spoke to the department at a recent Modern Language Studies department meeting. She reviewed the rubrics and expectations for assessment, and held a

question and answer session with the department faculty. The Modern Language Studies department wants all courses to be assessed on speaking, but they are split on what the rubric says to do. Some interpret the rubric contextually and are meeting the goals, and other interpret the rubric for native language comprehension and are then not meeting goals. The department is also working on accreditation and wanted to assess based on the accrediting body's requirements; A. Cirucci said that's not an option. It's noted that the department may have to do much of their own assessment because of the languages.

J. Stanley noted that the rubrics need to be interpreted as written only, and asked what the department means by "interpret". A. Cirucci provided an example from the department.

A. Cirucci tried to reassure the department that students speaking in English aren't automatically level 4s, either, and was concerned about the use of supporting materials. She also said that the MLS faculty told her that speaking assignments are not always structured in class. Some are done as conversations with the professor outside of class. J. Stanley argued that the guidelines list "presentations", not just "conversations", and that the students should be coming out with more skill in oral communication. K. Newlander said that they are building competency in the language itself, and not one a topic; he did not see this as a problem, since the skill the students are developing is the language. He also said that the difference is that it is not necessarily a formal presentation, but it is still presentational since they are talking on a topic without asking questions of the professor.

K. Newlander said that this raises questions of if there is a disconnect in expectations. A. Cirucci responded that different professors have different ways of doing this; they pick which student work product to assess, so they could do this after any assignment. This could be contextual in different courses, but does it do what is envisioned in the expectations for oral communication? J. Stanley stated he didn't think oral communication was ever defined for expectations.

J. Stanley was also concerned about a lack of double raters, since Chinese and French language courses only have 1 professor, and the German language professors both teach at the same time.

K. Rauch said she was not sure what the issues are, the she would have had no problem using the rubric for assessing her Spanish classes. The professors are still teaching the students speaking skills, and the assessment is not grading the students but assessing their skills as a speaker.

A. Cirucci said that GEAC should be receiving ratings in these courses from the professors for this semester. Also, there are only two groups of courses that assess speaking: COM 10 courses and MLS courses. K. Rauch stated it would be great to have more speaking courses available in the Gen. Ed. program. D. Beougher said that there are more being proposed, such as courses in science, and that he is interested to see the scores and if there is any difference in the languages being assessed.

Negative Wording of SLO2b Rubric: A. Cirucci brought up the wording of SLO2 in the rubric, noting that the Academic Assessment Committee commented on the negative wording for performance level 2.

J. Stanley stated that everything from level 2 relates to level 3. D. Beougher suggested rephrasing to show improvement, not that students are “less worse”. K. Newlander said an element of gray is missing and asked if 2 is a basic level and the rubric says “failure to achieve”, then what are we saying is our basic level of expectation for students skills? Discussion on rewording the rubric and phrasing of performance levels ensued.

K. Prock brought up find out what has to be done to make changes. J. Stanley said it needs to go to GEC, then be sent to UCC for approval; he also suggested getting feedback on any changes from the departments affected by the change. K. Rauch noted the process for updating needs to be added to the Monitoring Report for Middle States.

A. Cirucci asked for any suggestions on word changes to the rubric be sent to her, and that she will work on editing and bring an update with proposed changes to GEAC for the meeting on 12/11.

Next meeting is December 11, 2019 at 11 am in MSU 322.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.

/bf
12/3/2019