

Meeting Minutes — General Education Evaluation Committee — AY 2023-24

Inaugural meeting of this AY begins at 11:06 am, with call to order then discussion of agenda.

In attendance: Asvathanagui, DeWitt, Hartzell, Johnson, Paskin, Quam-Wickham, Sayegh, Scepanski, Shin, Sheridan, Travis, Wallis, Washburn.

Chair Travis asks that the meeting minutes for April 25 be amended to reflect that there are no subcommittees to GEEC during academic year 23–24. M/S/P agenda approved, as amended.

Call for introductions, which ensued. There are no new members of the committee at this time.

Committee discussion as follows:

1. Sayegh has formed a Learning Community (LC) for institutional assessment.
 - Invitations to join were extended.
 - The LC is designed as a 10-week course condensed into a set of modules.
 - The LC meets first and third Wednesdays in the Library 201, and second and fourth Wednesdays via zoom. These are the times of regular IPAC and CEPC meetings.
 - There will be another opportunity to join the LC next semester, as well.
2. Overview of this academic year's activities, including the pilot assessment project (COMM), as well as the creation of a timeline for subsequent assessment activities. Expectations include
 - meeting with COMM faculty, sometime in the middle of the fall semester
 - Rubric creation
 - norming to the rubric
 - assessing GE outcomes
 - and issuing an assessment report by the end of May 2024.
3. Outline of the general education for faculty webpage. Questions arose about how the committee will handle courses with old GE outcomes that are not aligned with the current GELOs.
4. Extensive discussion of the process of assessing GE learning outcomes and courses. Among items of discussion:
 - concerns about disparities in some GE areas: some areas have small numbers of classes, while other GE areas have many classes that satisfy the GELO requirement.
 - likelihood that we will be doing more than one GE area of assessment each AY.
 - we are unlikely to look at every LO every assessment cycle, per Sharlene.
 - we will also add draft rubrics to committee discussion.
 - We may end up having to divide the committee into specific GELO area review groups depending upon the workload.
5. Paskin led a discussion of expectations for general education assessment and recertification processes. We are looking at a 10-year cycle. Among the challenges are that there are over 700 GE courses that will need to be recertified. Another challenge: How will we reach all faculty who teach GE courses?

Question: what happens if a course is denied GED recertification? Can a department fix the issues? Or is it just a straight denial? Sayegh noted that we do not intend GE recertification and assessment activities to be punitive. We would like to encourage departments to comply with university requirements.

We do need to keep records of syllabi and when courses were last approved for GE certification. Paskin notes that OPIE can pull these data.

6. Sayegh presentation: Assessment Basics.

- Principles of alignment
- Direct versus indirect measurements.
- Some of the challenges of assessment, especially given the multitude of different forms of student work that may be used to assess achievement of learning outcomes.
- Importance of creating and norming rubrics carefully. Sharlene notes that next week's LC meeting will focus on creating rubrics. All are invited.

7. Sayegh also discussed issues with NuVentive software. Departments will likely have to pull student work for multiple learning outcomes assessment as the software company denies that its product is able to do so. Discussion about software demonstration dates, the kinds of data that may be pulled from canvas, as well as additional resources for student data, such as the CO's Student Success Dashboard.

- Sayegh noted she may be able to give the committee a demonstration of the software at the end of fall semester 2023.
- David Sheridan has a Canvas course in development that illustrates best practices in learning outcomes alignment and assessment. Data can be pulled by learning outcomes, by course, and so forth.
- Individual faculty will only be able to see their own course data but department chairs should be able to see all courses in their own department. Deans will be able to see results of assessment of all courses in their respective colleges.

Question — Wallis: Regarding defining learning outcomes, alignment, and direct measures: Do faculty have to do this? What if a faculty member refuses? Sayegh: we cannot force anybody to do so, but we can encourage them to use the outcomes feature in Canvas. It will be prudent to reach out to department chairs to prevent potential faculty disengagement and noncompliance. Courses that are not recertified can be still taught, but they will not be GE courses.

Brief discussion of activities for the rest of the semester.

Committee adjourned at 12:59 PM.

Respectfully submitted, NQW.