

**General Education Assessment Committee**  
**Dec. 11, 2019**  
**McFarland Student Union Building, 322**

**Present:** Angela Cirucci (VPA), Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty), George Sirkakos (COE), and John Stanley (GEC).

**Absent:** David Beougher (Academic Dean), Sudarshan Fernando (CLAS), Yongjae Kim (COB), Amy Lu (at large teaching faculty), Khori Newlander (at large teaching faculty), Krista Prock (at-large non-teaching faculty), Karen Rauch, and Student Representative.

**Guests:** Bethany French

A. Cirucci called the meeting to order at 10 am.

**Announcements:**

An email with next semesters meeting schedule will be sent out. It will be built around committee members teaching schedules.

Reminder that the last norming session is being held today (Dec. 11) at 1pm in MSU 322.

There has been some work already done on SLO 1b, and the GAs have been working on coding, but their last day working for the semester is today.

January Assessment Day is scheduled for Jan. 13, 2020. The invitation was sent out by email.

**Minutes:** The minutes from the Nov. 13, 2019 meeting were presented for review.

Since there were not enough members present for a quorum, the minutes will be presented again and voted on in January.

**Old Business:**

**Rubric Update:** A. Cirucci brought new wordings as a handout. The main goal is to have the SLO levels sounds less negative. J. Stanley asked about part of the wording that references prerequisite courses, what if there is no prerequisite for that class? A. Cirucci noted that it can be left off, but this is to address level 2. J. Stanley then said that this is good for level 2. It was noted that better wording is still needed, and that it is not exactly a one-to-one match with the old bullet points. J. Stanley commented the he doesn't want to change too much since classes are being approved to become part of the Gen Ed based on these rubrics as guidelines. G. Sirkakos agreed with A. Cirucci that wording needs improvement and was created noting what students lack in understanding of the subject, and recommended using more positive language. A. Cirucci suggested trying to fit more with the original bullet points. J. Stanley encouraged discussing when

more of the committee is present. A. Cirucci noted she will email it to the committee for feedback. G. Sirkakos also suggested asking for input from professors who did work products for this SLO.

### **New Business:**

**Planning for Spring & Angela's Leave:** A. Cirucci reminded the committee members that she will be going on maternity leave in February. K. Prock will take over as chair in her absence, but will need help. A. Cirucci plans to be back to work on the report in May. The committee will continue this discussion in January.

**PowerPoints as Student Work Products:** J. Stanley stated that a proposal came to GEC for a course that plans to use PowerPoints as student work products from student groups. He felt that if they are only group slides, not individual students, then it is not enough to rate students. He asked how will we know which student does what? A. Cirucci said she liked that it is something different, that it can be done if done well, and that she is open to trying PowerPoints as student work products. J. Stanley suggested professor needs to engage more to get what GEAC needs from the work for ratings. G. Sirkakos said that the students are probably using the PowerPoints to deliver presentations, so if the presentation hits rubric marks then it should be fine. R. Ryan commented that he encourages students in his classes to keep PowerPoints as bare as possible, how can that then convey the necessary information for the rubric? J. Stanley stated they also have a peer review sheet that would be submitted with the PowerPoint, and G. Sirkakos argued that that doesn't align to SLOs, just judges the group work. A. Cirucci suggested requiring notes for each slide in order to have more information. R. Ryan noted that assumes the students make a sparse PowerPoint, but what if they have paragraphs on each slide? A. Cirucci responded that it is not our job to judge their PowerPoint skills, just judge what is on the rubric. A. Cirucci state she is in favor of having work products other than standard papers for reviewing.

G. Sirkakos' big question was if it is ok to assign group ratings, not just individual students. A. Cirucci asked if GEAC would then assign a group rating? She also noted that one section of COM 10 did group presentations and it was difficult to rate. Does GEAC just give the same rating to all the students in the group?

**As May Arise:** G. Sirkakos stated for the Monitoring Report that Middle States noted GEAC focused on process of collection, not on changing or responding to the data collected. It would be good to add edits to SLO 2b rubric to that report to show changes and adjustments.

/bf  
12/23/2019