

General Education Assessment Committee
April 12, 2021
10am, Online via Zoom

Present: David Beougher (Academic Dean), Diana Ebersole (VPA), Sudarshan Fernando (CLAS), Amy Lu (at-large teaching faculty), Christine Núñez (at-large teaching faculty), Amber Pabon (COE), Krista Prock (Office of Assessment), Karen Rauch (Academic Affairs), Robert Ryan (at-large teaching faculty), and Dan Stafford (at-large non-teaching faculty).

Absent: Liaoliao Li (COB), John Stanley (GEC), and Undergraduate Student Representative.

Guests: Bethany French

A. Pabon called the meeting to order at 10:01am.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the March 29, 2021 meeting were presented for review.

Motion to approve the minutes by D. Ebersole, seconded by C. Núñez. Motion passed.

Announcements:

A. Pabon shared that the second professional development program was held last week, and that the recording and the rating materials have been shared with faculty, even to **faculty** and chairs that did not attend the sessions.

Commented [PA1]: Even to faculty and chairs who did not

K. Prock noted that the Office of Assessment has already received some ratings, and she will have the GAs start organizing them.

C. Nunez asked if the revised assessment timeline would be released for her to bring to the next ChairNet on 4/22 for discussion. A. Pabon is working on finalizing it and making it look more like a timeline. The calendar is established, we are just working on clarity and formatting. A. Pabon stated she will have it done before the meeting for C. Nunez to announce at ChairNet.

Old Business:

Drafting Fall 2020 Report: A. Pabon announced that several committee members have been working on this report using the former template, and analyzing the new data to build a draft. Asked the committee to think about what's relevant, and which things are important to note, even if they only represent a little bit of change. She also noted that she did run the Pell Grant variable as suggested at the previous meeting.

S. Fernando suggested adjusting the Y-axis to the full range in some of the graphs, so that readers do not think that a change from 1.42 to 1.62 is a larger change than it really is. R. Ryan asked if the graphs show variability as well as averages, and A. Pabon said yes, this is included.

D. Ebersole stated that there is now enough quantitative analysis in the draft to have a subgroup begin working on recommendations for the report. K. Rauch stated that she can begin adding the historical context, including that the schedule was changed to include FYS this semester and why. Discussion ensued.

Regarding the data analysis in the draft, D. Ebersole noted that SLO 7 consistently outperformed SLO 5 in Fall 2020. D. Stafford added that he tried to address the way the data is displayed in some of his graphs. Discussion on changing the scale in the graphs continued.

K. Rauch stated that this is a formative assessment for SLO 5, and the students in FYS are just beginning to explore the basics of information literacy. There is another chance to assess SLO 5 in the CMP 200 series courses, and that could show improvement in the scores. She also spoke with Karen Wanamaker in the library the other day, and she has ideas about information literacy. K. Rauch suggested she come speak to GEAC next meeting to share those ideas. The committee agreed to invite K. Wanamaker to the next meeting on 4/26.

K. Prock raised the possibility of examining the SLO 5 assignments, and whether the students have the opportunity to score higher. The SLO 5 rubric is very detailed, and the student would need to complete a research assignment with a research log in order to score well. This is also the first time this SLO was assessed, and the professors may not have had time to create an assignment that fits the rubric. K. Rauch added that the recommendation may be that this SLO is not assessed using FYS classes, but in other courses. The committee may be asking too much of the FYS courses, and using too many SLOs. D. Stafford advocates for instructional literacy in FYS courses, even if it is not assessed there. C. Nunez noted that faculty may have altered assignments because of virtual learning, and K. Prock agreed.

A. Pabon concluded the discussion by sharing that she is attending GEC on Thursday, and asked the committee what preliminary findings are good to share at this point. D. Ebersole suggested sharing that SLO 7 scores hover around 2, and that we don't have any problems with SLO 7. The committee needs to have more conversation about how and where information literacy needs to be addressed.

New Business:

Planning for April 22 Open Session on SLO 6: K. Rauch volunteered to take the open session on SLO 6 for faculty feedback. She met with Khori Newlander, who previously revised the rubric and teaches a course assessed under this SLO. He was going to check with GEC for any proposed agenda items. She is planning to have an opportunity for faculty to share sample assignments on what works and doesn't work, score them with the rubric, and ask for suggestions on how to improve the rubric for SLO 6. We are hoping as many GEAC and GEC members as possible are able to attend.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:57am

/bf
04/19/2020