

GEACC Minutes

Thursday, February 8, 2018

Chairperson: Jason Seabury Vice Chairperson: Jeff Damiano

Attendees: Ed Clancy, Jeff Damiano, Sandra Eddy, Jaime Hammond, Karla Ekquist-Lechner, Beth-Ann Scott, Jason Seabury, Erin Strauts, Amy Lenoce, Yvette Tucker, Lisa Anderson, Gil Harel, and Larry Venuk

Guests: Patti Pallis and Carlos Plaza

The meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by Jason Seabury.

1. Review of last meeting minutes.

Jaime Hammond's name was spelled wrong on the attendees list.

Jaime moved to approve minutes as amended. Karla seconded. All in favor. Amy abstained because she was not at the last meeting.

2. New courses for General Education

- A. PSY 203 Psychology of Child Development

Larry asked why we need to approve another psychology course when PSY 111 is pre-req. for every psychology course. Discussion followed.

Beth Ann has made a motion to return for rationale as to why this course should be included in Gen Ed framework. Second from Pete. All in favor.

- B. ENG 231 and ENG 232 proposed for Historical Knowledge/Understanding by Patti Pallis

Patti said both of these courses will be going through CEAC to be removed from Written Communication.

Discussion followed. Jaime had questions on primary source documentation. Jason asked about how many different competencies are allowed for one course.

Sandra made a motion to do as a bucket. Jason seconded. All were in favor.

Motion to approve as a group by Amy. Beth Ann seconded. All were in favor.

3. Written Communication Assessment Report by Patti Pallis

ENG 101, 102, 200, and 202 were assessed. Common assignment format was proposed. All courses had the same requirement for assessment.

All English survey courses are now being mapped together. A problem was that submitted artifacts were not necessarily blind. Instructors could have submitted the best work from the best students, not that it necessarily happened.

208 artifacts were used. Two teams of three readers after a norming session. There was no statistical difference from semester to semester. The same exact students (within subjects design for small N) could be used in the future. Different assignments were used which was a problem with the assessment itself.

A careful syllabus review is planned in the schedule of courses. There was not enough evidence of revision processes in ENG 101.

Jaime asked if the methodology was similar to the multi-state collaborative. No one was sure. Vigorous discussion followed. Jason recommended that GEACC collect artifacts throughout the year.

Three outcomes of seven were assessed. Is it OK to leave off areas in future assessments? TaskStream should be coming soon to make this process easier. Ron Picard's office was suggested to help accomplish the data collection and review.

In conclusion, Jason thought the report was excellently done even though there could be some improvements for future assessment.

Motion to accept report made by Jeff. Seconded by Sandra. All were in favor of approval of the Written Communication Assessment Report.

4. Jason would like to review where Modern Languages fit in General Education categories. Brief discussion followed.
5. Meeting adjourned by Jason at 3:50 p.m.