

GEEC Meeting Minutes — Meeting of March 26, 2024

In attendance: Washburn, Rendon, Travis, Sheridan, A. Johnson, K. Johnson, Wallis, Scepanski, Gerard, Tchen, Hedayatipour, Asvapathanagui, Quam-Wickham

Chair Travis called meeting to order at 11:02a

M/S/A approval of meeting minutes from March 13 meeting with changes as noted: addition of name, correction to COMM 130 (approved conditionally)

Travis notes that COMM110 discussion will be tabled until the next meeting because the Department has not yet uploaded documents to Canvas

Long discussion of the rubric for A1 evaluation, covering various points and comparing the rubric used by IPAC with that we created. Consensus among committee members was that we adopt the former. Questions and clarifications followed:

1. How we are to look at it accept changes evaluate and edit? Answer: The rubric is available in Sharepoint, access through the Canvas GEEC site, Module “Pilot A1 Assessment,” under “GEEC A1 Oral Communication Rubric (group edit).” This version is open to comments and may be edited with track changes.
2. What is the COMM department’s viewpoint? Answer: Unclear if the department has weighed in on the rubric, at least formally. Hartzell (COMM) states that it is a useful rubric.
3. Can we evaluate preparedness, and if so, under what criterion? Answer: Hartzell and Wallis suggest that preparedness (practice?) might be folded into the organization descriptors (Criterion C).
4. How would we measure “listening skills” (Criterion E)? Answer: Podcasts are an assignment for COMM 132: Small Group Discussion and would likely provide good artifacts for assessing this criterion; would be difficult in other recorded speeches.
5. How would we evaluate verbal versus nonverbal communication skills (Criterion A)? Answer: Norming practice will help us understand non-verbal communication practices: eye contact, body language, voice modulation, facial expressions, proximity to audience (if evident).

After quite a bit of discussion and clarification, committees broke into several groups to norm the rubric using recorded speeches, mostly from the Hauth Center that were recorded during COVID times.

Upon returning to the group after 40 minutes of norming practice, most people agreed subgroup members were pretty much in reasonable agreement on levels of achievement for speeches evaluated.

Travis asked us to examine the rubric in Canvas before the next meeting. She also suggested that we look at the one Quam-Wickham shared from the office of assessment at the University of Hawaii, Manoa (Canvas) We may discuss some clarification of levels of achievement and descriptors, as provided by AI.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50p.

These minutes have not been approved.

Respectfully submitted,

N. Quam-Wickham