

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

General Education Committee

Meeting notes: August 8, 2018

Present: Pearson Cross, Jordan Kellman, Ashok Kumar, Jimmy Kimball, Alise Hagan, Beth Giroir, Andrea Flockton, Jonathan Goodman, Carolyn Dural.

Guests: Mickey Dietz, Amanda Payne, Elizabeth Daigle.

The meeting opened with greetings and introductions.

Opening the discussion, Jordan discussed changes to the Humanities which aligned the core with the Regents requirements while opening up areas that had not been available to GenEd students (MODL, PHIL), and providing necessary flexibility for transfer students and students who change majors. Mickey, Amanda and Elizabeth were brought into the discussion to provide insight on the technical aspects of the changes for the catalogue, the software, and for advisors. Elizabeth noted that DegreeWorks could be programmed to allow any history, for example, to be used for GenEd, while hiding (to some extent) all the options available to students.

This accommodation would allow the system to get around the continual necessity of paper overrides. Approval for more options for students would be covered under the phrase “Dean approved,” which would permit (for example) all social and behavioral science classes to be used for the social/behavioral science requirement, while steering students towards the options preferred by the discipline’s steering group. The language to use was discussed, words included requirement and recommended were seen as less useable than “approved.”

Elizabeth and Mickey discussed how DegreeWorks views double counting, and the conditions under which that is allowed (or not). Double counting of courses for two requirements can never be allowed for credits. There was a discussion of how courses counted in Degree Works and if the “path” could be altered to place certain courses in certain categories, i.e. count a French course as a MODL requirement for a Liberal Arts language requirement rather than a general humanities GenEd requirement.

The question of GenEd “carve outs” for various majors, (e.g. Business and Psychology 110 for Soc/Beh requirement), was discussed. It was noted that limiting students to 120 hours posed obstacles, but that often the “accreditation” excuse offered by colleges to justify their desired course choices was not substantiated.

Next the question of where and how GenEd proposed changes were passed on was considered. It was noted that the Faculty Handbook said that proposals went to CAAS. The question was posed, is the GenEd committee a policy group or a recommending group? The question of faculty governance was raised. Other schools refer to CAAS or to the faculty senate for approval. The question of student participation in CAAS was raised. Carolyn noted that GenEd affects every undergraduate program at UL, and as such, should be widely vetted. The example of MUSC 130 was used as how changes

ought to emerge from the discipline groups, pass through the GenEd committee, and then be forwarded to CAAS and Academic Affairs for final approval and inclusion in the catalogue.

It was recommended that GenEd create a memo that provides instructions about how changes to the GenEd core are made and the time-table for such changes. This would need to be distributed along with guidance for advisors. The need for publicizing what we do and developing a plan for letting advisors know was discussed.

Ashok suggested that some measure might be taken of the number of students in each GenEd course and then compare it to the number of students and courses that were assessed.

The discussion turned to a time-table for GenEd revision such that changes to the GenEd curriculum could be included in the catalogue and promulgated in a timely fashion. Beth suggested that changes once a year rather than twice was better for planning, stability, and communication. It was suggested that the proper time for proposing changes to GenEd would be in the fall semester (by November). These changes would then be submitted to CAAS, Academic Affairs for approval and inclusion in the catalogue no later than February. The cycle would then be closed until the next fall.

The next general meeting was not scheduled at this meeting. Although the third Wednesday at 4 pm had worked previously, it was thought that awaiting a Doodle or survey to find the most convenient time this semester for the largest number of people would be prudent. Pearson said he would circulate the survey ASAP.

The meeting adjourned.