

GEEC meeting minutes 3/12/24

In attendance: Shin, Gerard, Scepanski, Sayegh, A. Johnson, K. Johnson, Hartzell, Sheridan, Vlad, Wallis, Washburn, Travis, Avapathanagui, Heyaditipour, Quam-Wickham

Meeting begins 11:02 AM

Chair Travis calls for introductions, as there are two new committee members.

No announcements

Sayegh introduces the rubric for oral communication. She differentiates between different levels of achievement; notes that with norming practice we will focus on rater inter-reliability.

Question: Wallis — What was the purpose of this rubric, to evaluate the core competency of oral communication or was it developed for some other reason? Sayegh: it was used at the student research presentation in February.

Another question: How else might this rubric be used to assess oral communication? Answer: Capstone courses and courses that are formally integrative learning GE courses that incorporate oral presentations; oral communications courses.

Question: A question about highest level of achievement on rubric, as well as “meeting expectations” level. Are these levels of achievement appropriate for first-year students in COMM GE courses? Will we have the same rubric for GEEC? Answers: Hartzell notes that this rubric is better than the previous one. Travis agrees. Johnson notes that it has gone through some revisions. Sayegh: Former rubric was developed as a first draft. This one was result of many drafts. Travis: one problem with earlier rubric was in precision. Quam-Wickham suggested that we be careful not to draw too many conclusions between first year and end of program assessments.

Question: Wallis asked about measuring GELOs. Are we expected to touch on all GELOs in each GE course? This rubric may not address all those GELOs. Answer: Sheridan notes that this rubric was built off of a rubric used by IPAC.

Question about the differences between the first rubric for COMM A1 (GEGC work) and this one (IPAC developed). Travis suggested we use the IPAC rubric, though “exceeds” level may not be the correct description for first-year students. Travis has found several examples of student artifacts for the communications courses and she hopes that we will utilize the breakout rooms next meeting, and have committee members test their reliability and fidelity to the rubric.

Travis offers an update on student artifacts: there are many recordings from the Hauth Center. Also notes that for some courses, students must turn in a bibliography. In COMM 110, for example, students must use a minimum number of peer reviewed. journals Articles. Travis reports that she has about 60 speeches from COMM 110 and it is unclear how many speeches from COMM 130 and COMM 132.

Question about using student information and use of student artifacts in assessment. Sayegh explains that this is internal use for assessment, not research. The IRB is concerned with research activities involving student work. We are using student artifacts for internal use and they can be de-identified in many cases (though perhaps not for recorded speeches).

Another question: What do we do about some departments, or perhaps some faculty within departments who do not want to participate? Another case where faculty members want to only pull best work from students. Some discussion about how something to evaluate is better than nothing.

Question about using Nuventive. Discussion about whether or not the software can pull artifacts, and it appears at this point that it cannot pull student artifacts from Canvas.

Discussion about how to pull artifacts from Canvas, and where those artifacts will be housed — in SharePoint folders, invisible to regular faculty members? Or shall we create a separate Canvas page?

Quam-Wickham asked about sampling techniques. Answer: it seems that we will depend upon Departmental members to collaborate with pulling student data. Sayegh has already encountered concerns. Quam-Wickham suggested working with ATS to determine if they can pull artifacts from assignment folders identified by faculty members as aligning with assessed GELOs, using standard random sampling techniques, then de-identify student work.

Discussion about assessment and recertification calendars given that Cal GETC changes will result in revisions to our GE patterns. It is unclear when the state mandate will be determined.. This may provide us with some wiggle room as a committee so that everyone is equally trained.

Some concern voiced about who will determine what artifacts are pulled from a course. Johnson: In most CSU campuses volunteers are those that get assessed.

Discussion of COMM courses: M/S that we take a look at COMM 130 variations for recertification. We looked at the SCO and GE forms, COMM had interested volunteers participate in this activity. There was a question about GELO5 (listening skills) and was it sufficiently incorporated into the course. Not clear if GEEC will assess that GELO. M/S recertification approved conditionally for COMM 130, subject to required updates. Now, two COMM courses have been recertified. COMM 110 needs to be revised and the SCO updated for assessment. Tabling this issue for now. Motion approved.

Travis suggested that we take time to look at the IPAC COMM rubric. Wallace suggested we be incorporated into new IPAC meetings if members desire.

Meeting adjourned 12:55 PM