

General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC)
Wednesday, Apr. 6, 2022, 9:00 am
Meeting Minutes

Present: Amber Pabon, Michele Baranczyk, John Stanley, Liaoliao Li, Dannell MacIwraith, Karen Rauch, Dan Stafford, David Beougher, Amy Lynch-Binieck

i. **Approval of minutes from March 2, 2022**

It was moved by J. Stanley to approve the minutes, and seconded by D. Stafford.
MOTION PASSED.

ii. **Old Business**

1. **Drafting the Fall 2020 report**

A. Pabon asked for revisions or comments from the committee. K. Rauch suggested that faculty compliance percentages be included in the report. J. Stanley asked if the recommendation regarding returning to the process of volunteer raters will apply to all SLO assessments going forward, as previous reports have recommended that we stop using volunteers for SLO 2 A & B. K. Rauch observed that part of the challenge in SLO 2 assessment was a lack of alignment; perhaps as we align and revise rubrics with the help of faculty teaching in those categories, the results of using volunteer raters will improve. A. Lynch-Binieck suggested actively recruiting volunteers from the subject areas as a middle ground; A. Pabon reminded us that one goal of the process is that faculty from one discipline should be able to assess work in another. GEAC does not want to privilege any one subject as needing specialists to assess. J. Stanley suggested that the recommendation should stand, but that GEAC should discuss its implementation in the future.

M. Baranczyk moved to support the Fall 2020 report with addition of faculty compliance numbers. J. Stanley seconded. The report was approved.

The updated report will be sent to the Provost, and then it can be posted on the GEAC website.

2. **Fall 2021 Report Update**

M. Baranczyk reported that the data has been compiled into Excel. 24% of students were rated at Level-1, 31% at L-2, 24% at L-3, 21% at L-4. Next, the data was categorized by discipline. Finally, the data was broken down by prerequisite versus no prerequisite. Analysis continues. They are keeping the report reader-friendly.

M. Baranczyk explained that when faculty rate in $\frac{1}{2}$ increments, she collapses them. E.g.: a rating of $1\frac{1}{2}$ is treated as a rating of 1. This works as they are not looking at *means* but at the percentage of students at each category level.

3. Sharing Assessment Results.

K. Rauch reminded the committee that the results must be shared with faculty beyond posting them to the GEAC website, so we need to think about how we will do that. Possibilities: the faculty Professional Development event on June 1-2 from CET; an event at the beginning of the semester; or the September or January Assessment Days. A. Pabon noted the value of making a presentation with a member of GEAC present to answer questions. A. Lynch-Binieck suggested using a Google form to take questions, alongside a recording of the presentation. GEAC can then post the answers on the website. D. Beougher suggested sending a link to the presentation and report in the Daily Brief as a means of further distribution.

A. Pabon recommended that a preview of the upcoming assessments and the assessment cycle is also provided to begin conversations. That can be discussed further at the May meeting.

4. Full Cycle Report Update from Stanley, Rauch, and Stafford.

They have begun looking at recommendations from previous reports, commenting on progress made. They note that data and record retention needs to be improved, as some of the original raw data is missing; we have in some instances only the *reports* on the data. Stafford suggested using the intuitional repository in the library where Senate records are kept; he will discuss this option with Sue Czerny. Data needs to be both safe and accessible. The subcommittee will meet next week, and they hope to have a first draft by the May meeting.

5. Data Collection and Storage

This led to a larger discussion of the need for better data collection and storage generally. Rauch explained that we need a way to collect and warehouse data more seamlessly, keeping workload in mind, so we can collect data every semester instead of every four years. Previous to 2021, actual printed documents were distributed to faculty raters; those materials are not archived centrally. Since 2021, we don't have access to the student documents, as we asked faculty to upload ratings only. We would like to both collect student documents digitally and store them in a centralized manner. Pabon explained that GEAC now collects data in OneDrive. Stanley suggested we look into SharePoint as an option. Labor will be needed to move and save old data.

iii. New Business: Planning for April 22 open session on SLO 6: Role of Values and Ethics

The Fall 2022 Assessment will focus on SLO 2A - Scientific Inquiry, and SLO 2B - Quantitative Reasoning. A. Pabon explained that GEAC needs to make its processes more transparent and streamlined so that faculty understand it and can participate. She is working on some recommendations; send her ideas and she will share a draft of a plan.

K. Rauch offered that because the cycle is beginning for the second time, it's important to have revisions to the rubric; three years ago GEAC made a new one for SLO 2B; it was during a

transitional time for GEAC and the start of the pandemic; the plan to get feedback and use the new quantitative rubric was never implemented. She also has feedback on the scientific rubric SLO 2A from the last time SLO 2A was assessed with suggestions from faculty. K. Rauch asked for feedback from biology and physical sciences, as well as those with approved gen ed courses for these areas not in those sciences. Biology faculty suggested that GEAC provide a rubric *and* sample assignments from a variety of disciplines when we announce upcoming assessments so that instructors can begin thinking about aligning their assignments with the assessment. We can do this more easily with a digital database/archiving system.

J. Stanley suggested GEAC begin recruiting volunteer raters if the process will now use raters in Fall 2022.

Discussion of Fall 2022 will continue in the May meeting.

It was moved by D. Stafford to adjourn, and seconded by D. Macllwraith. MOTION PASSED.

ALB/bf