

General Education Committee Minutes: 2/24/2022

Present: Victor Piercey (Director), Kathryn Wolfer (Senate Liaison), Monica Frees (RSS), Rachel Foulk (CASE), Sheila MacEachron (CHP), Angela Ryan (Academic Counselors), Paul Zube (FNTFO), Peter Bradley (Interim Assessment Coordinator), and Michele Harvey (CET).

Absent: Katie Kalata (COB), Andrew Peterson (EIO), Mari Kermit-Canfield (FLITE), and Leonard Johnson (Academic Affairs).

11 am – 12 noon, Zoom

1. Approval of Agenda

Approved unanimously

2. Consent Agenda

- Minutes from 27 January 2022

Approved unanimously

3. Discussion: Assessment Data Collection

P. Bradley presented progress toward a revised data collection system. The goal is to have a **minimally viable product**, and then we can add to the process as faculty decide what they are interested in.

While distinguishing between course-level and program-level assessment as well as direct and indirect assessment, P. Bradley focused on course-level direct assessment. He laid out three options. Regardless of option, instructors will be able to import learning outcomes and rubrics into their Canvas shells. The options distinguish who receives the assignments to input data into Nuventive/Improve. The question is the level at which data will be collected and aggregated.

Option 1: Units determine for themselves whether they want to have data aggregated by section or course as well as who will be responsible for inputting the data. The General Education Assessment Coordinator will send each responsible party a Nuventive/Improve assignment and track what is submitted and unsubmitted. The assignment requires entering the total number of students assessed as well as the total number of students assessed at each of levels 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.

This option will require a heavy load for the General Education Assessment Coordinator in sending the emails and tracking compliance but is otherwise the simplest.

Option 2: Each instructor is sent an assignment to enter aggregated data for their section. Instructor lists are uploaded into Nuventive/Improve through Banner and the emails are sent automatically. The assignment requires entering the name and section of the course, the total number of students assessed, and the total number of students assessed at each of levels 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.

This option is simplest in terms of workload but raises the possibility of instructor exposure should assessment data be used to evaluate performance.

Option 3: Each instructor is sent an assignment to enter individual data for their section. Each assignment includes a section roster uploaded from Banner and requires instructors to enter an assessment level for each student.

This option has the heaviest workload for instructors, and the UGEC discouraged the use of option 3.

The following points were discussed:

- Option 3 is the only option that would allow us to assess things like equity, but that might be something we can do later, possibly through program-level direct assessment.
- The difference between Options 1 and 2 has to do with how identifiable an instructor might be, and a tension between better data and easier compliance tracking on the one hand and instructor exposure should assessment data be used to evaluate performance.
- Several features of the previous system, such as registering courses and listing the type of assessment will no longer be present, nor will it be necessary for instructors to generate a separate spreadsheet.
- Inter-rater reliability (particularly with assignments and rubrics) can be addressed as we refine the system.
- Reducing technical snags will enable instructors to have more meaningful conversations about interpreting the rubric and assessment levels.
- Once the new system is running, the UGEC does not think it is a good idea to ask for retroactive data submission (but will take it should someone want to submit it).