

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Minutes for Meeting #7 – February 4, 2016**

- 1. The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.** on Thursday, February 4, 2016 in Library Conference Room A, Chairperson Kinnie presiding.

The following members were present: Senators Boudreaux-Bartels, Mead, and Williams; Professors Bide, DeCesare, Echevarria, Irvine, Lloyd, Orr, and Stout; Dean Richmond, and Ms. Boyd-Colvin.

Member absent: Vice Provost Beauvais

Guests in attendance: Professor McGlasson and Assistant Director Kaldor.

- 2. Minutes of GE Committee Meeting #6, January 7, 2016** were approved.

- 3. Announcements and Reports**

- a.** Chairperson Kinnie announced that Professor McGlasson (Theatre), Chair of the Subcommittee on the Assessment of General Education, and Dr. Kaldor, Assistant Director, Faculty Development, Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, would join the meeting to provide the results of the Faculty Survey on General Education Assessment conducted by the Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning.
- b.** Chairperson Kinnie announced that Professor DiCioccio had assumed the role of Chair of the Grand Challenge approval panel.
- c.** Chairperson Kinnie welcomed Professor Lloyd back to the Committee after a long leave.
- d.** Chairperson Kinnie reported that Vice Provost Beauvais had drafted new submission guidelines for Grand Challenge courses.
- e.** Chairperson Kinnie reported that the rubric for the re-named C3 outcome, Diversity and Inclusion, approved by the Faculty Senate on January 28, had been posted on the general education implementation website.

4. New Business

Professor McGlasson, Chair of the Subcommittee on the Assessment of General Education (SAGE), described the outcome assessment process. A two-phase process, phase one would start in fall 2016. Three outcomes would be chosen to be assessed each semester. Complete assessment of the 12-outcome program would require two years. For each outcome, 20 course sections would be selected from a random sample. Ten students would be randomly selected from each course, providing 200 students per outcome. Faculty would score their own students using the relevant learning outcome rubric. Individual faculty would not be asked to assess more than one learning outcome per year. Data would be submitted online; faculty would be asked to upload assignment materials and enter the level of competency of students' work as beginning, approaching, or meeting expectations for competency for each rubric element of the course. Professor McGlasson said that SAGE endorsed the appointment of a Director of General Education but did not have a clear understanding of its future role.

Dr. Kaldor used Power Point slides to present results from the Faculty Survey on General Education Assessment. The Office for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning conducted the survey to determine faculty understanding of the assessment process for general education courses and whether or not the model for assessment were an encouragement to faculty to submit courses in the new program. He outlined the phase two priorities (faculty had been asked to rank them): compare students in different sections of the same course, use faculty panels to score student work using rubrics, continually assess validity of rubrics, ensure representative samples for each outcomes, assess all 12 outcomes within a four year cycle. He said that faculty had expressed concerns about the value of assessment and for faculty support for the work.

Professor McGlasson and Dr. Kaldor left the meeting at 3:45 PM.

5. ONGOING BUSINESS

- a.** Professor Orr presented a revised draft of the elements and the rubric for the Integrative outcome, re-named the Integrate and Apply outcome (to conform with the original legislation). Discussion followed about the application of "ethics" and the difference between "ethical and professional" and "ethical or professional." A motion to approve the rubric was passed.
- b.** The Committee discussed the concern, raised in an email by Senator Boudreaux-Bartels prior to the meeting, about the restriction on pairing Knowledge outcomes with the Integrate and Apply outcome. Discussion followed. The restriction was left intact.
- c.** The Committee discussed its proposal to change the name of the Cultural Competency Student Learning Outcome to "Diversity and Inclusion" that had been presented at the January 28, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting. The motion had

passed but was followed with a motion from the floor to amend the description of the Cultural Competency (Diversity and Inclusion) outcome by striking language referring to the U.S. and America. Concerns were expressed that the phrases *U.S.* and *America* excluded the application of the outcome to courses that focus on other cultures. A recommendation was made in the Senate to return the language issue to the General Education Committee for further consideration but a motion to table the original motion was made before the recommendation was acted upon. The motion to table was approved. The Committee discussed the validity of the concern, expressed in the Senate at the January 28 meeting, that courses that focus on other cultures do not fit the Global outcome. Discussion followed. The Committee summarized its position by reiterating that faculty should submit their proposals [to the Global panel] and engage the feedback process.

- d.** The Committee reviewed the revised the panel approval guidelines and the appeals process. A motion to approve the guidelines was passed. Chairperson Kinnie said that he would forward the documents to the General Education Implementation Steering Team for posting on the implementation website.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Neff