

Minutes

GenEd Meeting of June 26, 2017

Present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Robert McKinney, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Emily Deal, Jonathan Goodwin, Burke Huner, James Kimball, Sue Ann Ozbirn, Ashok Kumar, Lana Rodriguez, Lise Anne Slatten

After a brief introduction the meeting began with a discussion of the various Gen Ed Assessment plans in the disciplines. The draft plan for Social and Behavioral sciences was distributed and discussed. Comments focused on the insufficient attention to critical thinking, problems with the rubric, and with the outcomes themselves. The question was raised about the rationale for assessing 3xx level classes for GenEd. A further question concerned whether majors in a field should be excluded from GenEd evaluation. It was the will of the committee that once efforts had been made to select classes taken by students for GenEd credit that the question of major/not-major was of lesser importance.

The second area taken up was Math assessment. The Math plan was explained. There was some focus on the rubric and the question of whether the objectives contained more than one thrust, leading to confusion in the assessment portion. Somewhat detailed discussion of the artifact used to assess Math classes for GenEd. Discussion of Math 109/110 and whether they should be assessed. It was pointed out that two colleges (Engineering, Sciences) were likely not assessed for Math in terms of GenEd.

A discussion of the Sciences GenEd assessment followed. The Sciences GenEd structure was noted for praise. However, the question of whether or not the Sciences should have or employ a formal rubric was discussed at some length. It was felt that the creation of a formal rubric might allow some nuance in the evaluation of results with a consequent improvement in efforts to “close the loop.”

Following Sciences, First Year Experience presented a rubric and also a multiple choice exam containing questions solicited from various instructors. The rubric and questions were examined in some detail, with regard to areas covered.

Finally, English presented a First-Year Writing Assessment Report, which detailed the current GenEd Assessment process in English. Results from assessment in six sections were detailed (5 Engl: 102; 1 English 115). It was suggested that future assessments would be conducted in random rather than utilizing entire sections of a class. It was noted that English assess 5% of the students in its sections, which constitutes a significant time commitment from department members.

Questions about Humanities and Arts were deferred until the next meeting of the Committee, which was scheduled for **Monday, July 17 at 1 pm in Griffin 109b**. Work groups were encouraged to continue their good progress with an eye towards instituting the assessment beginning in fall 2017.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35

Minutes

GenEd Meeting of September 13, 2017

Present: Pearson Cross, Alise Hagan, Lisa Broussard, Jordan Kellman, Carolyn Dural, Jonathan Goodwin, Lise Anne Slatten, Sue Ann Ozbirn, Fabrice Leroy, Burke Huner, Lana Rodriguez, Clay Weill, Christy Maloyed.

After greetings and the distribution of the Agenda, the meeting began with a introduction of the QEP nomination and selection process by Jordan. This introduction included the context within which the QEP will be crafted, i.e. SACS-COC and the University's Strategic Plan. A number of the current suggestions for QEP were mentioned as well as the deadline for online submission (Friday September 15).

Ashok presented the current state of GenEd Assessment in Sciences, with a guided tour through the document summarizing the program. Using Bloom's taxonomy, Sciences will attempt to use GenEd assessment as a tool to help them orient their introduction courses beyond just knowledge to evaluation and other higher order skills. Sciences' innovative approach to increasing student learning was met with approval by GenEd committee members.

Alise presented some recently completed Excel documents summarizing the way that majors across the University select specific GenEd electives for their students, reducing the generality of the GenEd curriculum. A detailed discussion of the tables and their meaning and import was postponed until the next meeting so that members would have a chance to examine the tables more closely.

Jordan then broached some possible problems relating to the Excel sheets presented by Alise and involving Degree Works. One problem involved the programming issues created by such a complex and exception-filled GenEd reality. He argued that allowing programs to carve out GenEd exceptions or preferences made changes much more work for IT, as well as limiting transferability for students. From a programming point of view, absolute freedom of GenEd choices for all students in all majors offered the easiest system to administer, as well as the greatest flexibility for students. This led to a discussion of how computer scientists accomplish their tasks, led by Jonathan and Ashok, and what could be accomplished.

The next point Jordan raised had to do with raising the profile of GenEd assessment and distinguishing it from or major assessment. He argued that many outside of the GenEd committee had only a vague understanding of the differences between assessing for degree program purposes and assessing for GenEd purposes. This led into a discussion of how and when GenEd Assessment would be made and what their relation to the timetable imposed by SACS-COC would be. The "twice in five years" standard was raised and defended. The importance of maintaining a clear distinction between the two types of assessment was made clear to all.

Following this discussion, the question of schedules and time-tables for assessment was broached. The group considered several dates before settling on a clear setting of assessment timetables for all disciplines by the last meeting of the year, which was moved to December 6, at 1 pm. This would allow time for the various working groups to meet and decide the best program of assessment for their individual part of the GenEd curriculum and how any rotation of assessment, if such were part of their plan, would work in practice.

Lise Anne raised a general question about various Math courses required by different departments. Some discussion of changes in Math offerings, but a general agreement that Departments need to update their curriculum sheets to account for different courses being used by students to satisfy requirements.

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for **October 11 in Griffin 109b**, followed by meetings scheduled for November 8 and December 16.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15