

Gen Ed Meeting
2/5/2021

Members: Ryan Korstange, John Sanborn, Rachel Kirk, Virginia Hemby-Grubb, Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand, Janis Brickey, Greg Nagel, Kevin Krahenbuhl, Laura White, Warner Cribb, James Piekarski, Terry Goodin, Mark Frame, Aliou Ly, Samuel Blumer, Tammy Melton

Ex officio Susan Myers-Shirk, Jeff Gibson, Steve Severn

Guests: Andrew Dix

Redesign: Katherine Brackett, Christabel Devadoss, Michelle Boyer-Pennington, Brian Frank, Meredith Funderburk

- Deana is not here today, Ryan Korstange asked if anyone was willing to take notes today
- Kevin Krahenbuhl volunteered to take notes
 - Motion made by Mark Frame to approve this; seconded by someone (I was opening up Word and did not see exactly whom) – all voted in favor
- Minutes from 1/29/2021 reviewed
 - Ryan Korstange asked if there were any corrections or if there was any discussion
 - No motions were made
 - Poll was completed, minutes approved by vote (14 in favor)
- Gen Ed Assessment Report: Communications
 - Andrew Dix presented a brief summary of the competency results, which had been shared with the committee before the committee met
 - Susan asked: “How do you think the pandemic impacted the process?” (this will be something that has to be narrated in forthcoming reporting)
 - Andrew said they were very impactful – impacted sampling procedures, data collection, and even some analyses
 - Sampling shifted from stratified random to purposeful (those available)
 - Speeches were evaluated virtually as opposed to in F2F (as usual)
 - Eye contact competency (#6) harder to gauge meaningful information from it because presentations were online – giving at home, it’s easier to manipulate the environment that you cannot do in an on ground classroom setting
 - In class, only get one shot at the speech – since this was virtual, and recorded, they may have had many chances (potential for multiple takes)
 - Rachel Kirk asked a question (we lost her for a good portion of it because of Zoom connectivity issues) regarding if some results were consistent with past semesters
 - Andrew Dix said yes, mostly
 - He suggested some discrepancies exist because they use different evaluators each year – even though training procedures are in place, it reflects some variation
 - John Sanborn had a question/concern regarding the use of the mean with ordinal data (he affirmed he thinks it was appropriate, but some might think it ought to be median given it is technically ordinal data)
 - Andrew noted that was something they could consider, although it was typical for similar reports to utilize mean-based
 - Ryan Korstange asked about the challenges with regards to finding assessors

- Andrew indicated that he has been consistently asking for additional resources for compensation for this work
 - Andrew indicated that at University of Southern Miss a decade ago, he received more compensation for the same work than our assessors do today at MTSU
 - Additionally, he noted the time commitment is quite substantial
 - Susan asked if the number of speeches had been decreased
 - Andrew confirmed the answer is yes, but clarified that this was a function of the pandemic, not a structural reduction
 - Andrew did affirm that up until around 2017 it had been about 300, it has moved down somewhat since then
- Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand asked about the questions Susan shared: she assumes use of an auditory presentation is a focal point, is this a rational method of assessment – have you had conversations/challenges of including students who have an educational challenge with regards to verbal participation or have anxiety or some other form of accommodation that may lend them to struggle. How is that handled? Are they excluded? How do we make sure all students are included in this assessment and how can we improve with regards to inclusion?
 - Andrew responded noting that this has never been an issue that this format has ever impacted assessment – most accommodations did not need any types of accommodations that influences the speech delivery
- Steve Severn confirmed a few questions regarding who assessed and their workload and then asked: Would it generate greater interest to offer a course reduction?
 - Andrew’s response was that it was closer/more approximate to a one-half course reduction
 - Steve noted that a 4/5 load might be an option that would be well received
 - Andrew agreed
 - Steve suggested perhaps we could consider something like this that honors the time as workload
- Mark Frame commented regarding continuous improvement that an ANOVA might make sense given the variability present in the data
- Mark Frame noted that it appears they’re evaluating a maximal performance – if you wanted to measure the competency in a theoretically more valid manner, you might have observers view multiple presentations (obviously not considering the challenge of assessors) – having multiple times to assess multiple competencies might be a good idea for continuous improvement to track growth and patterns within the year – he asked a question: Is there a reason you cannot use well-trained Graduate Assistants?
 - Andrew concurred observing multiple speeches would be wise but difficult to accomplish
 - Andrew indicated that they do not have a graduate program so they would need to be pulling from elsewhere and he would prefer to keep it “in house” also noting that while the compensation is low, it is something he would like to retain for faculty if desired
- Motion to receive the report made by Mark Frame, seconded by John Sanborn & Aliou Ly
 - 13 voted in favor; 1 abstained
 - Report is approved
- Continue looking at the models for the Gen Ed Redesign
 - Susan introduces the plan including a graphic for the current program for comparison purposes

- Links to files in Google Drive shared in the chat feature of Zoom
- The committee moved into break out rooms for problem finding with regards to Model 2
- The committee came back together
 - Responses collected from each group will go to the design team, coupled with responses on the D2L shell
- Susan shared that she is working on the timeline for Rest of the Semester
 - Shared some questions for feedback from the committee regarding process (regarding D2L feedback, learning outcomes, and plan for public review of models)
 - Greg Nagel asked a question regarding learning outcomes
 - Susan confirmed these are program level outcomes, based upon our values and our strategic plan
 - They are open to comment within the D2L shell, etc.
 - Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand clarified if the outcomes should come out with the models
 - Susan Myers-Shirk confirmed this is so; Ryan Korstange noted that this would make it more official
 - Jenna Gray-Hildenbrand suggested that both the review team and committee look at the raw data
 - Warner Cribb agreed
 - Jenna asked that it be confirmed that she is noted as not having been in favor of either options with regards to item #1
 - Warner Cribb indicated that he would rather not share out models yet because from the breakout rooms there seem to be a lot of problems and they may not be ready
 - Tammy Melton suggested it was primarily about *when we are ready* do we want to give a lot of stuff to choose from or just one thing forward
 - Warner, Susan both indicated they were unsure
 - Samuel Blumer indicated his preference was to share out 2 models, clarified to include the current program as a 3rd option
 - John Sanborn asked if there was sufficient support for the current one
 - Susan pointed out that the current program is what we get if we cannot commit to a new one and so it should be included
 - Outcomes and assessment plans will be changed, either in response to the new model or to the current one upon the final decision
 - John Sanborn noted that raw data could be shared by college
 - Tammy Melton asked to see the results from the straw poll, which were shared and briefly discussed
 - Meeting ended