

GEEC meeting minutes

Meeting of February 13, 2024

In attendance: Travis, Asvathangui, Shin, Wallace, Hartzell, Sayegh, Johnson, Pitiporn, Sheridan, Scepanski, Quam-Wickham

Meeting begins at 11:03 AM

Call to order by Chair Travis

M/S/A - Minutes for November 28, 2023 with the change of spelling for Nuventive

Chair Travis and Vice Chair Washburn provided a recap of a recent AS executive board meeting at which they discussed the work of GEEC. They report that things went well with Academic Senate executive board, although executive board members had questions about the possibility of course decertifications, especially what would happen if a course is close to decertification or becomes decertified. Discussion ensued about how the intent of recertification is compliance, not punishment.

Course Recertifications. Next, Travis noted that we will need to create an expedited way to re-certify courses. In particular, how do we make a decision about recertification if a course is completely out of alignment with the GELOs — what do we do? Johnson and others noted that departments should have early notification and thus ample time to address any issues, primarily with alignment between GELOs and course SLOs. It may be that some instructors or departments may elect to let a GE course be decertified.

The committee was reminded that we may be doing 40 recertification of courses per semester.

Discussion of Nuventive. Sayegh noted that her office has a follow up with Nuventive representatives on March 4, from 10-11:30 am, in Library 201. There is also a meeting planned for Thursday, February 29, and there may be another on Friday, March 1 at a Data Fellows regular meeting.

The big issue with Nuventive seems to be integration with Canvas and limitations on pulling student artifacts automatically, Sayegh notes. The Nuventive meetings will be geared for IPAC members, but it may be possible for GEEC members to attend. Sayegh called on committee members to serve as volunteers to be pilots in this new software rollout.

COMM 130: Essentials of Public Speaking. Discussion of the recertification of COMM 130 was held. Suggestions and notes:

- As a committee, we need to ensure that instructors' syllabi, not those of TAs, are examined for recertification.
- Committee members noted that the GE form is currently incomplete. It needs updated assessments, an outline of schedule, and links to appropriate GELOs.
- Committee members took a few moments to examine several syllabi, including those of senior professors.
- Members posed question about the percentage of syllabi we must look at for the purposes of recertification, especially given this is a high enrollment, multi-section course.
- Committee agreed that we had looked at several syllabi.

- Long discussion of what syllabi should contain, including GELOS, SLOS, assessments and alignment. Sayegh notes importance of alignment of LOs; others agree.
- Hartzell notes that the course SLO 6 and GELO seem to be aligned. She looked at fall and spring 2023 syllabi.
- A question concerned what percentage of syllabi are missing GELO 4. Another question concerned whether GELO 4 was assessable.
- The committee agreed that we sufficiently looked over course syllabi. Committee members noted the repeat of the same names in the syllabi, and had a question about the percentage those who teach the course are adjunct faculty members. This has an impact on Fidelity of syllabi to the SCOs.

COMM 110: Discussion of COMM 110 followed with their revised SCO. Notes:

- A long discussion about the need to expedite the process.
- We needed to have a point person in the department, perhaps a course coordinator but not the chair, because she has too much on her plate.
- Motion to table our discussion of COMM 110.

Assessment of Oral Communication. Travis led a discussion Travis about developing guidelines for assessment and recertification. Individual GEEC committee members will need to take the lead on this with reviewing 2 to 3 syllabi each.

Sayegh lead discussion of assessment updates. She suggested that we begin to pull student artifacts for practice norming scores using the rubric.

- Discussion about the current rubric she had supplied from IPAC.
- Suggestion was made to change the category of developing to adequate, especially since so many enrolled students are first year college students.

Chair Travis called for us to take a look at the rubric supplied from the department as well as that one supplied. Her suggestion was that we need to offer ideas about what each level of achievement means. How do we operationalize these various levels. A number of faculty expressed interest in receiving guidelines for assessment, but also acknowledging the need for departmental input.

Discussion of artifacts available for us to begin norming practice. Travis has uncovered many videotaped student speeches and presentations for us to use.

Travis suggested that committee members should bring questions and ideas about levels of achievement on the rubric to our next meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 12:54 PM.