

Minutes of the Meeting of the UL Lafayette General Education Committee

11/30/16

Present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Robert McKinney, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Lisa Broussard, Emily Deal, Carolyn Dural, Jonathan Goodwin, Robin Hermann, Burke Huner, Jordan Kellman, James Kimball, Michael McClure, Sue Ann Ozbirn, Lana Rodriguez, Lise Anne Slatten.

Absent: Charles Duncan, Patricia Mire-Watson

1. (1 pm) **Greeting** by Pearson, followed by introductions.
2. **Brief History of GenEd** Committee by PC with additions from members. Discussion of various large projects and concerns.
3. **Setting of future meetings times;** First meeting in spring, February 8, 1 pm; Brief discussion of who the committee reports to (Provost) through the VP for Academic affairs on the committee.
4. **GenEd Goals and Outcomes:** Fabrice recapped progress in the area of setting goals and outcomes for assessment in GenEd, focusing particularly on Humanities, Social Sciences and Science. Discussion about progress and meetings to produce new versions of goals and documents. Discussion moved to principles of general education and the extent to which the current GenEd curriculum satisfies or is aligned with such principles. This discussion led to a discussion of the table that captures the various learning areas and the goals and outcomes. Various critiques of this table were made based on its lack of cohesion with the actual practice at the university and also with the Regent's changing core. The suggestion was made that the GenEd committee consider adding another column to the table that would capture some meta-goals for all general education which would not be broken down by discipline area, or conversely, to begin with the learning goals and outcomes and then work towards classes. This discussion led in many directions, but was tabled with two **recommendations for action:**
 - a. **Further reading** and learning on GenEd as it functions elsewhere;
 - b. **revising the current GenEd Assessment Matrix** to reflect current practice and recent changes. Fabrice offered to begin this revision and bring a revised Assessment Matrix to the next meeting, or share it prior.

5. Discussion of Assessment led by Alise H. Discussion of past system (WEAVE) and new system (LiveText). Discussion of problems in obtaining and/or implementing system of GenEd assessment. It was pointed out that the degree audit system to be implemented will make advisors more aware of GenEd classes.

6. Discussion of need for uniform GenEd requirements to facilitate student movement among majors. Current departmental and college practices were compared including liberal arts, nursing, and business. The will of the committee was that wherever possible, departments and colleges should give up control of GenEd classes. The principle agreed upon by all was that GenEd should be “general” above all.

--It was also noted that some department because of accreditation or because of particular circumstances must continue to require certain GenEd courses and not others. It was felt reasonable to allow these practices to continue, but to discourage other practices where substantial and compelling reasons for their continuance could not be provided.

--As part of this discussion it was noted that it would help if the committee had data on student change of majors, from one college to another and from one department to another. Discussion of various ways to get this data, none entirely satisfactory. It was noted that a clearer understanding of the relation between student major shifting and GenEd requirements might help the committee facilitate rises in retention and graduation.

Recommendation: The committee decided to draft a letter to the Provost asking that departments and colleges be directed to “free” their encumbered GenEd requirements, except in those cases which they were able to present a compelling argument that they should remain as is. Jordan Kellman volunteered to draft the letter.

Recommendation: It was also the Committee’s will that the Provost be invited to the next meeting (Feb. 8, 2017) and that the above request be transmitted to him before that meeting so that he might have time to respond to it. A request has been submitted to the Provost’s office and placed on his schedule for the date.

6. UNIV 100 update: Christie M. updated the Committee on the scope of UNIV100. Extended from a 10 week semester to a 12 week semester; 90 instructors teaching 121 sections with 3,018 students; DFW rate in 2015: 4.85%; in 2016: 5.3%

It was noted that faculty participation in the program (30%) is significantly below the 40% projected by the “Goals for 2016” portion of the

ULL Strategic Plan (page 25); Faculty participation and its correlates were discussed. Strategies for encouraging faculty were discussed including pay, incorporation into load, boosting SCH.

Christie M. pointed out that UNIV 100 was not a formal part of GenEd requirements at UL, and suggested that it should be. The will of the committee concurred and Fabrice agreed to make the case to the Provost.

Recommendation: UNIV 100 should be part of GenEd at UL Lafayette.

The meeting was adjourned (2:35 pm)

Minutes of the Meeting of the UL Lafayette General Education Committee

2/8/17

Present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Robert McKinney, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Lisa Broussard, Emily Deal, Carolyn Dural, Jonathan Goodwin, Robin Hermann, Burke Huner, Jordan Kellman, James Kimball, Michael McClure, Sue Ann Ozbirn, Lana Rodriguez, Lise Anne Slatten.

Absent: Charles Duncan, Patricia Mire-Watson, Robin Hermann

1. (1 pm) Greeting
2. Minutes of meeting from previous session approved by committee.
3. **Proposed Meeting schedule for spring adopted: March 8, April 12**, (fourth meeting date of semester postponed until needs of committee are assessed on April 12).
4. **Robert** led the discussion of a recent Student Success Workshop he attended. The Workshop produced the following statement: “To provide learning experiences that will prepare students to succeed in and contribute to an ever changing global society.” The Committee discussed the statement and talked generally about measures of student success and what we are already doing. It was pointed out that the Matrix that we’ve just reexamined is, in fact, a measure of student success. There is assumed to be a link between general education assessment and student success, (otherwise what are we measuring?). Discussion of different measures of success including post-graduation success and the difficulty of measuring it. It was noted that success is shaped by mission and that the mission of the UL schools varies from school to school. Thus it was recommended that we refer back to the university’s pre-existing definition of success.

--**Moving forward:** It was recommended that emendations to the statement produced by the workshop be directed to Robert for the next (Feb. 22) meeting of his workshop group. He would, in the meantime, canvass the group for suggestions. Thus suggestions are to be forwarded to Robert for inclusion.

5. **Jordan** led next part of discussion on recently created goals and outcomes. He noted problems up to this point, including

- *Gen Ed and assessment misaligned;
- *University courses not aligned with BOR structure;
- *Assessment not aligned with GenEd breakdown;
- *No logic to course selection for GenEd;
- *No ownership of GenEd at Department level;
- *Not much assessment going on, or reported haphazardly;
- Finally, these problems were understood to be interdependent.

He noted that we have started by reformulating our own assessment objectives and goals; we have relied on discipline experts to do this reformulation. Hopefully this will provide some sense of identification and ownership within the departments. There was a discussion of looking at these goals and objectives in the Matrix and approving or disapproving them. Alise noted that we should ask ourselves: do these goals and objectives summarize our expectations for these areas of studies? If they do, then we should move on to a focus on instruments of measurement and criterion of success, (the last two columns on the Matrix).

--General discussion then commenced. It was noted that there are elements that are not contained anywhere in the goals and objectives including civic engagement and service learning. There was some discussion of the effort that had just been made to find workable goals and objectives across several disciplines. A question was raised and discussed about first year writing, and its separation from other English goals and objectives contained in the "humanities" section.

--**Jonathan** was asked to follow up on this (and since has, see attached Matrix with goals and objectives for English and also for First Year Experience)

--The question of whether to accept the Matrix as currently construed (with the exceptions mentioned just above) and to proceed to instruments of measure and criterion of success was posed. This question was answered in the affirmative, and so the Committee looks to begin fleshing out these categories.

6. **Alise** led the discussion on crafting measures and criteria. She volunteered to reach out to the working groups that were responsible for creating the goals and objective and begin to help them craft assessment measures and criteria.

--The question of assessment and the number of years of assessment that would be ready by the next SACs cycle was raised. It was noted that spending the rest of the spring 2017 semester on measurement and then criterion with implementation in fall 2017 would provide two complete cycles under the new Matrix, and partial results from the previous cycle under the old Matrix. This was felt to be acceptable.

--It was determined that Provost David Danahar be invited to the next meeting to talk with the committee about Gen Ed issues given his wide experience in this area.

7. Alise demonstrated the next LiveText system for recording the assessment results.

The committee adjourned, 2:25 pm