

Dates of Minutes in Document

11.30.16

2.8.17

3.8.17

5.17.17

6.7.17

6.26.17

7.17.17

7.31.17

9.13.17

10.11.17

11.8.17

2.7.18

3.21.18

4.11.18

4.25.18

5.23.18

7.11.18

8.8.18

General Education Committee

Meeting Minutes

October 12, 2015

Members in attendance: Lisa Broussard, Pearson Cross, Emily Deal, Sally Donlon, Jonathan Goodwin, Jenny Faust, Alise Hagan, Rob Hermann, Jordan Kellman, Jimmy Kimball, Michael McClure, Sue Ann Ozbirn, Kay Riedel, Michael Totaro

Members excused: Dean Bergeron, Ross Chiquet, Irvin Esters, Lindsay Hobbs, Fabrice Leroy, Carol Polito

I. Welcome / Member introductions

Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by M. Totaro

Member introductions

II. Minutes from 09-21-15 meeting

Motion to accept Minutes was made by S. Donlon and was seconded by R. Hermann; no discussion; motion to accept Minutes passed

III. Old Business

SACS Report: Gen Ed

- M. Totaro spoke briefly about brief synopsis about the history of Gen Ed IT Learning Goals, which would be incorporated into the report
- J. Kellman addressed the following:
 - CEA Component (with help from A. Hagan)
 - How much has been done
 - What we have now
 - Roughly ½ of what has been done is in our possession
- P. Cross summarized history of Gen Ed Global Competencies component
- A. Hagan offered overview of institution-wide NSSE
- J. Kellman articulated the point that we may expect further requests, in order to help finalize the report
 - Global Awareness RAT (Rapid Action Team): P. Cross
- This group continues to explore “pathways,” plans, etc.
- Recent meeting of the group was very productive, with NSSE data available on Global Learning, which is perceived as important to overall student learning
- A. Hagan stated that we may customize the NSSE, if necessary

IV. New Business

- **K. Riedel’s Task Force: Report deferred for now**
- **J. Faust’s Task Force Update**

- J. Faust disseminated copies of a “Comparison of La. Board of Regents Policy and UL Lafayette Requirements” document
- “20,000 foot view”
 - Concerns about time-to-graduation
 - We are not helping students to understand specifically what Gen Ed really is all about
 - Bottlenecks (Gen Ed courses)
 - Make certain that our Gen Ed meets BoR requirements
 - We may have unnecessarily restricted ourselves
- Cited (as an example) UL Monroe’s DegreeWorks with 3 dashboards (Major, Gen Ed, 120-credit curriculum)
- R. Hermann amplified the point that the real “buy-in” must come from advisers and/or Gen Ed
- J. Faust indicated the professional advisors per college are anticipated; M. McClure suggested that the idea of having professional advisors may be viewed with some skepticism
- J. Kellman: Gen Ed Matrix may indeed need to be redone
- All agreed that both J. Faust’s task force and K. Riedel’s task force should be combined, in order to work toward a Gen Ed framework and structure

V. Next meeting: November 19, 2015.

VI. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn was made by R. Hermann and was seconded by S. Ozbirn; no discussion; motion to adjourn passed; meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

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

Minutes of the Meeting of the UL Lafayette General Education Committee

3/8/17

Present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Lisa Broussard, Carolyn Dural, Burke Huner, Jordan Kellman, James Kimball, Michael McClure, Sue Ann Ozbirn,

Absent: Charles Duncan, Robin Hermann, Robert McKinney, Lana Rodriguez, Lise Anne Slatten, Emily Deal, Jonathan Goodwin.

1. (1 pm) Greeting

2. Minutes of meeting from previous session approved by committee.

3.

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

General Education Committee Minutes from May 17, 2017

Members present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Robert McKinney, Alise Hagan, Emily Deal, Carolyn Dural, Jonathan Goodwin, Burke Huner, Jordan Kellman, James Kimball, Ashok Kumar, Michael McClure, Lana Rodriguez

The meeting opened with a quick discussion of the tasks facing the committee over the summer and the urgency of the charge. These included the following items from the Agenda:

Which classes are Gen Ed? Who decides?

Should GenEd classes make adoption of goals and outcomes explicit?

What is an appropriate assessment strategy for GenEd classes?

And finally, what to do about the humanities requirement?

The Committee then turned to Jimmy Kimball to discuss the GenEd Math requirements of the University's departments. A spread sheet showing which math classes were required by which departments and degree programs was distributed and led to a discussion.

Differences between programs and the rationale for various requirements were discussed. This discussion focused principally on whether programs could allow any 6 credits of math as their GenEd requirement, or were compelled by accreditation or some other reason to require higher-level courses. In the case of Architecture it was noted that the requirement was 109 and 110 for example. The reasons for this and other different requirements were debated, and the option of allowing for a waiver was weighed. It was stated that 10,000 of 16,000 UL undergraduates were in programs with accreditation requirements and that the trouble of unlocking the GenEd electives might not be worth the bother. Others pointed out that anything that opened up electives and hastened the path to graduation for undergrads was worth pursuing.

Math Assessment program was discussed. Jimmy K discussed the current procedure, the number of classes assessed, and the expectations for student success. He noted that while assessment had been limited to 103, 105, it was now being expanded in the fall to include STAT 214. The discussion broadened to talk about what might be desirable in terms of assessment, how many classes, how many sections, what standards and so on. It was speculated that there may be national standards for GenEd assessment that could be of help. At this point, it was noted that the various departments and majors at UL had formulated the Goals and Objectives

which guide assessment and hence were in the best position to decide the implementation of assessment.

In terms of immediate action it was suggested that the working groups that originally put together or currently oversee the Goals and Outcomes that guide GenEd Assessment meet (potentially with Alise Hagan and/or Pearson Cross) to decide which courses will retain GenEd status in their fields and also which courses they plan to assess for GenEd. Pearson and Alise are going to contact the various workgroups and request that they begin this task, with a deadline, if possible, of the **next GenEd meeting which was set for June 7 at 1 pm.**

The meeting was adjourned.

General Education Committee Minutes from June 7, 2017

Members present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Carolyn Dural, Jonathan Goodwin, Jordan Kellman, James Kimball, Ashok Kumar, Michael McClure, Lise Anne Slatten, and Sue Ann Ozbirn.

The roll was taken, the Agenda was passed out and the meeting began with a review of the progress made in the different disciplines beginning with Social and Behavioral Sciences, followed by Math, Natural Sciences, FYE, Fine Arts, and Humanities. English was deferred until the next meeting. Most of the disciplines had made good progress towards identifying courses that would be designated GenEd and were moving on towards creating rubrics for assessment.

During the discussion of GenEd requirements in Fine Arts, it came to the committee's attention that some disciplines were allowing their students to use courses in their major field to fulfill GenEd requirements, while others were not. For example, Visual Arts students may use VIAR courses to meet the GenEd Fine Arts requirement, but Anthropology majors are prevented from using ANTH courses to fulfill the Social and Behavioral Science GenEd requirement. This disparity was debated and the merits of both approaches were weighed. Any decision addressing this incongruity was postponed for a later meeting to attend more closely to the assessment progress.

Fine Arts discussed their "GenEd Council" and its operation which most thought a good practice that might be copied elsewhere where relevant and useful. Then the discussion turned to the storage of GenEd documents, rubrics and data. Different methods of storage were discussed including Moodle, LiveText, and others. The question of what should be saved and what could safely be recycled was discussed as well, without final resolution.

Following the Fine Arts discussion, Humanities presented some possibilities for the 9-hour requirement imposed by the Regents for Humanities GenEd classes. Two options were introduced: leaving the fulfillment of the 9-hour requirement entirely up to the student; or locking this requirement down in some specified way, as it the current practice. It was noted that the original intent of the Regents appeared to assume that different institutions would formalize some requirement with regard to this question.

The discussion of the different possibilities and ramifications of changing the current policy with regard to Humanities' 9-hours focused on the majors that might be impacted by a change (English, History, CMCN, and MODL). It was also noted that changes to the Humanities GenEd core could have sweeping ramifications on staffing in the impacted departments, and curricular requirements across the university. The question is one that will be the subject of further meetings within the Humanities group headed by Jordan Kellman, leading to a recommendation by that group to the general committee.

The focus of the discussion then turned to the importance of alerting and educating advisers across the university of any changes in the GenEd core and also of aligning proposed changes with the University Strategic Plan.

The meeting was adjourned after setting the next meeting date and time:
Monday June 26 at 1 pm.

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 July 17, 2017

Present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Alise Hagan, Lisa Broussard, Jordan Kellman, Carolyn Dural, Christie Maloyed, Jonathan Goodwin, Burke Huner, James Kimball, Michael McClure, 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 starting with Humanities.

Jordan Kellman introduced the work underway in the Humanities GenEd requirement (9 hours). A chart was distributed. He discussed the separation, as much as possible, of structural issues in the humanities requirement with assessment issues. He discussed the creation of the learning outcomes in the workgroup and how they lent themselves to the scheme already in place, to some extent, with regard to Humanities requirements. Kellman discussed the grouping of LIT and HUMN, HIST and PHIL, and CMCN and MODL (and creative writing) as being arrived at quickly within the workgroup.

This led to a discussion of the classes that would (likely) be assessed in the various sub-disciplines, they were LIT: 201, 202, 205, and 206; HIST: 101, 102, 221, 222 plus PHIL; and CMCN 100 with MODL to be added. This led to a discussion of which humanities courses would be counted as GenEd and which would not, complicated by the requirements set down by the Regents, which were consulted by the committee. The question was raised about creative writing classes that had, for one reason or another, been excluded from GenEd consideration.

Various stratagems were discussed on this head including practical and philosophical concerns, with the interrelation of SACS versus Regents requirements. The question of “skills” classes was discussed. It was noted that even if a student took what had previously been a skills class for part (3 credits) of the humanities requirement very likely the other (6) hours would be Humanities in the broader sense. The possibility of Banner providing some practical solutions to this vexing problem was discussed, along with the idea of deferring any solution until the fall.

Ashok Kumar then presented the revised Science Rubric. Comments were made on the rubric and suggestions for various revisions. Discussion swirled around the terms in use in the Rubric and also the criterion of success/failure e.g. 50%, 60% etc, with suggestions for a more uniform standard being offered. Kumar talked about a GenEd assessment workshop meeting in sciences in the fall with all those instructors and others who teach GenEd.

The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for **Monday, July 31 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 2:00

Minutes

GenEd Meeting of July 31, 2017

Present: Pearson Cross, Alise Hagan, Lisa Broussard, Jordan Kellman, Carolyn Dural, Jonathan Goodwin, Lise Anne Slatten, Robert McKinney, Sue Ann Ozbirn.

After a brief introduction the meeting began with a discussion of the various Gen Ed Assessment plans in the disciplines starting with Humanities. Jordan Kellman introduced the work underway in the Humanities GenEd requirement (9 hours). A chart was placed on the overhead. Jordan Kellman explained the Humanities workgroup's efforts to edit the list of student learning outcomes and ideally arrive at one shared learning outcome and three more specific ones. A long discussion centered on the various terms listed in the objective for the first 3 credits of Humanities, and in particular the idea of "creativity" was noted. It was not clear that all classes would satisfy this requirement. Various issues with teaching strategies, class size, variability of instructors and others were noted in this regard. Dr. Kellman agreed to take all these issues up with the Humanities work group.

The possibility of Banner providing some practical solutions to this vexing problem was discussed, including some progress made by Kellman's discussion with Elizabeth Daigle, who had suggested the ability of Banner to offer recommended Gen Ed courses to students while still accepting a larger list to fulfill requirements if students such as transfer students took them instead.

There was also a discussion of the kinds of classes that might pose questions for inclusion or exclusion in a humanities core, including VIAR 120 (121, 122). There was also a discussion of technical writing (ENGL 365) and its place in the GenEd structure, with a longer discussion about technical writing as a field and its place in the discipline and also at UL. This built on the previous discussion of "skills" classes.

Pearson Cross gave a brief update on progress in the Social and Behavioral Sciences working group, which included a complete rubric, and setting of criteria for success. Discussion of various points followed.

The next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for **Wednesday August 31 at 1 pm in Griffin 109b**. Subsequent meetings were scheduled for the second Wednesday in each month at 1 pm where possible, starting with September 13, and continuing to October 11, November 8 and December 13.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40

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

Minutes

GenEd Meeting of October 11, 2017

Present: Pearson Cross, Alise Hagan, Robert McKinney, Lisa Broussard, Jordan Kellman, Carolyn Dural, Sue Ann Ozbirn, Burke Huner, Clay Weill, Christie Maloyed, Ashok Kumar, Michael McClure, James Kimball.

After greetings and the distribution of the Agenda, the meeting began with Jordan leading a discussion of the GenEd Committee's long consideration of the impact of various departments "locking down" GenEd requirements. Jordan discussed the implications of Banner, the reality that what the University has practiced for some time will longer meet audit requirements, and finally, the unmanageable impact of a flood of course substitutions to make the system work. The committee looked at which departments were locking down which courses on an EXCEL sheet prepared by Alise Hagan.

This discussion culminated with the introduction of a draft recommendation for the Provost that had been prepared by Jordan. The draft was discussed by the committee. Most of the discussion focused on the importance of allowing accredited programs the ability to stay under 120 hours and fulfill the requirements of their accreditation. Ultimately, Jordan's proposed draft was approved with very little change.

The Committee then voted unanimously to send the proposal to the Provost and end, to the extent possible, the practice locking down of GenEd requirements without strong justification.

The Discussion then turned to the December 6 deadline for the seven GenEd disciplines to submit their plans for assessment, particularly with regard to scheduling assessments. This led into a discussion, led by Alise, of the best way to submit GenEd Assessment data and reports. It was recommended by Alise that all disciplines submit their data in summary form to her. She would then upload the reports and data to LiveText. This process would make data collection from the various disciplines more uniform, and make sure that the information collected was uniform and available to support SACS requirements.

Ashok gave a report on assessment in the Sciences.

The committee adjourned at 1:45 pm.

Minutes

GenEd Meeting of November 8, 2017

Present: David Danahar, Pearson Cross, Alise Hagan, Robert McKinney, Jordan Kellman, Carolyn Dural, Sue Ann Ozbirn, Burke Huner, Clay Weill, Michael McClure, Lana Rodriguez.

The meeting began with a discussion with the Provost of the GenEd Committee's long consideration of the impact of various departments "locking down" GenEd requirements. The Provost had previously met with Pearson and been presented the letter summarizing the Committee's recommendations.

This began a wide-ranging discussion of the purpose of GenEd and the impact of the changes proposed by the Committee. The Provost's comments focused on the University's deliverance of a "baccalaureate" degree, and the contribution of the GenEd program to that end. Danahar emphasized that the University was required to provide a general education, no matter what else we might do. He also noted that a discussion of general education had been beneficial and intellectually stimulating at other institutions.

Although Provost Danahar expressed general support for the Committee's proposal and philosophy, he emphasized the importance of vetting it with the relevant committees and administrators, including the Deans, the Department Heads, and the University Senate. Changes that affect many department and programs should be, in his view, extensively vetted before implementation in order to gather support and inform the community. A short discussion of how and when this might happen ensued.

The suggestion was then made that a statement summarizing the philosophy of General Education should be created and circulated. Pearson volunteered to search out and/or create such a document and submit it to the Committee for review.

The committee adjourned at 1:00 pm.

Next meeting scheduled for Wednesday December 6 at 1 pm in Griffin 109b.

Minutes of the Meeting of the UL Lafayette General Education Committee

2/7/18

Present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Lisa Broussard, Carolyn Dural, Jordan Kellman, James Kimball, Lana Rodriguez, Lise Anne Slatten, Sara Birk, Febee Louka, Lee Price, Andrea Flockton, Ryan Teten, Beth Giroir, Ahmed Khattab,

The meeting was opened at one pm with a greeting to new members. This proceeded into a short discussion of membership on the GenEd committee that was tabled awaiting arrival of Robert McKinney.

The next item on the Agenda was GenEd Assessment. Jordan told the committee about developments in the area of Humanities assessment, using the projector to show the changed pattern of classes and the objectives relating to them. Jordan discussed the various difficulties encountered in shaping current classes to requirements shaped by Regent's rules. A discussion of how changing GenEd requirements might change attendance and enrollment in various classes focused on classes in communication and other likely effects. The humanities assessment group's work was approved by the committee. Pearson briefly presented an update on progress in the area of social and behavioral sciences assessment.

A brief discussion of the inclusion of Music 306 as an approved GenEd course ensued. It was suggested that the pattern of this approval (from Department to Arts GenEd assessment Committee, to GenEd Committee) was the appropriate path for new GenEd courses to take.

Pearson gave a progress report on the continuing effort to win support for the uncoupling of GenEd electives from major requirements, describing a trip to the Dean's meeting and near future visit with the Faculty Senate.

This led to a discussion of the membership of the committee. The different members of the committee discussed how they learned that they had been placed on the committee or removed from it. The role of voting and non-voting members was questioned. The role of the departed Ellen Cook in updating committee membership was discussed. A general discussion ensued in which it was stated that the GenEd committee should have control over its own members, and that membership should be in part

determined by the courses that qualified for GenEd status. Pearson suggested that (in principle) the GenEd committee should be made up of representatives from each area offering GenEd courses, e.g. Freshman Writing (6 hours), Humanities (9) Social and Behavioral sciences (6), Math (6), Sciences (9), First Year Experience (3), and the Arts (3). These should be supplemented by representatives from each College and then by appropriate administrators, as well as the University director of assessment. There was general agreement that these were the pertinent areas for representation on the Committee. Proceeding any further on this issue was curtailed until Robert could attend given the importance of his office with regard to committees.

Future dates of the committee for spring 2018 were set for **March 14**, **April 11**, and **May 9** (as needed).

The meeting adjourned.

General Education Committee

Meeting notes: March 21, 2018

Present: Pearson Cross, Fabrice Leroy, Jordan Kellman, Lee Price, Louka Feebee, Ashok Kumar, Jimmy Kimball, Andrea Flockton, Lana Rodriguez, Sara Birk, Pam Meyer, Lise Anne Slatten, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Beth Giroir, Michael McClure.

Assessment Schedule:

The meeting started with greetings and introductions. First item of discussion was the schedule for GenEd Assessment. Alise noted that current assessments (spring 2018) will need to be completed and to her by a **target date of June 1**. Although there was some back and forth about this date it appeared that this date would allow Alise and the Departments enough time to crunch the numbers, and then allow some time for consideration of action plans where needed.

GenEd Membership

The conversation turned to the problems with GenEd committee membership. Fabrice stated that he had talked with the Provost Danahar about this issue and had settled on some principles for GenEd membership: 1) there was no intrinsic reason to limit GenEd membership, which needed willingness to serve and also institutional memory; there should be a balance between stability and new members; 2) An asymmetrical balance favoring certain colleges was not, in itself, an issue, given that some colleges contributed far more to the GenEd curriculum than others; 3) If members are attending then they should be able to vote, which addressed the issue of non-voting versus voting members. The conversation turned to the description of GenEd membership in the Faculty Senate Constitution (Section 9, A. B.) and some draft changes which expressed the will of the Committee as expressed in the GenEd meeting of February 7. Fabrice stated that he would confer with the Chair and produce a memo regarding changes to be submitted at the next GenEd meeting, which closed the discussion.

SACS

Jordan brought the Committee up to date on SACS. Jordan noted that there were two big sections, the first laying out the education program at the University which included a detailed account of what the University is doing and why, along with a plethora of supporting documents. The second section would be a document describing GenEd at UL. This would include the how's and why's of each assessment unit. Jordan recommended that the chair of each unit (FYE, Freshman Writing, Humanities, Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Math) begin to think about writing the report from their section, which would include the history of the assessment, the various measures and changes, the results and each unit's place in the whole. This **report would be due** at the end of the summer and by no means later than **September 15**, which means in practice that the sections should have a draft of their unit completed well before then to allow for incorporation and rewriting. Jordan and Alise noted the availability of drafts of previous reports (2010, 2015) to guide in preparing the document.

While it was noted that we were in better shape than the last time that we prepared a report (in the last report only Math, Arts and CMCN had a full report, whereas now all units would be able to report results, even if just for one year), it was felt that the committee should schedule two meetings per month in order to prepare for the deadlines quickly approaching. The committee settled on the **second and fourth Wednesday of each month, at 4 pm**. The new time seemed to work better to accommodate a second monthly meeting.

Approving GenEd Courses

The discussion turned to the “list” of GenEd approved courses. It was noted that the changes that Humanities and Social-Behavioral Sciences were making were not yet fully approved and should not acted on as yet. This led to a discussion of where a list of approved GenEd courses was maintained and who was responsible for approving changes and updating the list of courses. This led to a return to the email which Robert McKinney had circulated which articulated a role for CAAS. Specifically, the email asserted that the GenEd committee “exists to review, develop, and recommend policy regarding general education to the CAAS...” Members noted, however, that the GenEd Committee had not (and had never) followed this practice.

This led to the question of how changes to GenEd were made and promulgated. This was unclear however, at the time the meeting ended and remains an item for further consideration.

The next meeting was scheduled for April 11 at 4 pm in Griffin 109b.

General Education Committee

Meeting notes: April 11, 2018

Present: Pearson Cross, Jordan Kellman, Louka Feebee, Ashok Kumar, Jimmy Kimball, Lana Rodriguez, Sara Birk, Pam Meyer, Lise Anne Slatten, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Lisa Broussard, Beth Giroir, Michael McClure.

The meeting opened with greetings and announcements. These included the letter to the Provost regarding membership on GenEd and circulation of the statement of purpose.

Then the discussion moved to the GenEd website, which Pearson reported as out-of-date. A discussion ensued as to who maintained the website which is tied to Academic Affairs. It was decided that a subcommittee be formed to work on the GenEd website. Volunteers to serve on this subcommittee were Alise, Jimmy, Michael, Beth and Pearson. This merged into a discussion of the changes that had been recently made in some areas of GenEd, particularly in Humanities and Soc-Beh sciences, and how these should be not only updated on the website but also recorded in order that the University at large (including advisors) should be informed.

It was noted that changes to GenEd should be in the catalogue, which would then require that they be submitted to Committee on Academic Affairs and Standards (CAAS) for review and then inclusion in the catalogue. The complicated question that was raised was how to record, review and promulgate GenEd changes such that the relevant parties (Academic Affairs, CAAS, and Advisors) were informed. It was stated that the path would be from GenEd to CAAS to the Catalogue (which then informed advisors).

Jimmy noted that the changes that had been made to GenEd program would need to be certified, recorded and communicated before the October advising period for spring 2019. It was suggested that such changes be submitted for the next meeting of CAAs. A question was raised about changes to GenEd courses made by various departments and Colleges and how these changes (if made) could be monitored. Michael suggested that Fabrice might know the best way to do it given his position in Academic Affairs. The idea of a “box” was raised that would flag GenEd interest.

In fact, a “Course Deletion, Addition or Change Request Form” has just such a box which states: “I have searched the Bulletin for this course and discussed the change with departments that require it (for General Education courses, I have consulted the General Education Committee). It has expected that Fabrice’s office would note when the GenEd box was “checked” and would inform the GenEd committee of changes.

Alise passed out a chart showing what GenEd assessment was recorded for the years 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 (current). The chart was a sobering reminder that nearly all GenEd units (excluding Math, Arts) need to do better and in fact must do better by June 1. With this pointed reminder it was suggested that the next GenEd meeting focus entirely on working on assessment. This being the case it was recommended that only those GenEd members who are responsible for assessment come to this meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 25 at 4 pm in Griffin 109b.

General Education Committee

Meeting notes: April 25, 2018

Present: Pearson Cross, Jordan Kellman, Ashok Kumar, Jimmy Kimball, Alise Hagan, Beth Giroir, Michael McClure, Clay Weil, Valanne MacGyver, Cary Heath.

This meeting was focused specifically on GenEd Assessment.

Alise opened the meeting with a handout from the upcoming SACS report: Section 8: Student Achievement (attached). This handout specified reporting expectations for the SACS report. Alise noted that one major difference was the in the past, we were expected to show how changes in our assessment strategy would address problems reported in the overall program. Now we are not expect to “show” how such changes would, in fact, accomplish this, but merely that they were intended to address problems.

Alise stressed that the reports, which are to be created by the discipline heads working with the members of their subcommittees, must be clear to someone who is unfamiliar with the program. Pearson asked about the “voice” of the report and whether or not some effort was made to create a singular voice. The answer was yes, but that relied on Alise and the SACS committee to achieve this.

Ashok presented his results from science. Various questions were raised regarding his particular report, which seemed to be quite complete and well-done. Michael spoke of the “executive summary” which he prepared for his assessment team to provide continuity over years past. There was a general discussion of how this might work in disciplines that had not created reports or reported results in previous years.

The group focused on the June 1 deadline for findings. Jonathan mentioned some problems with the labor-intensive assessment model adopted in Freshman Writing. Discussion ensued about solutions and difficulties. A number of questions were raised and discussed. The meeting ended early.

The next (general) meeting of the GenEd Committee is scheduled for May 9 at 4 pm in Griffin 109b.

General Education Committee

Meeting notes: May 23, 2018

Present: Pearson Cross, Jordan Kellman, Ashok Kumar, Jimmy Kimball, Alise Hagan, Christie Maloyed, Beth Giroir, Michael McClure, Jonathan Goodman, Clay Weill, Carolyn Dural.

The meeting opened with greetings and announcements.

The announcements included the planned trip of Jordan and Pearson to the CAAS meeting on May 31 to discuss GenEd approval procedures and making permanent changes discussed and approved in GenEd.

Pearson spoke of the need for all GenEd units to get preliminary assessment results to Alise by June 1. Alise was asked which units had reported so far. Alise mentioned the units which had submitted results (fine arts, sciences, economics, political science anthropology, math, communication) and those who were in process (the rest). Jordan reported that two of the three units in his group (communication, history, literature, languages) had reported some preliminary results but would probably need a committee structure to focus assessment.

Jimmy then took the floor to discuss assessment in the math GenEd program. He passed out a handout which showed the problems inherent in using “average” achievement as a result. Discussion ensued as the implications of measuring achievement were teased out of the sheet. Ashok talked about his program. Michael suggested adding questions to examine difficulty. Pearson explored the question of a rubric in math. Jonathan talked of the difficulties posed by different disciplines.

The date of the next assessment GenEd meeting was discussed. The date was to be June 20. At that time, Alise would discuss the submissions of all the GenEd assessment results. Timetable: Submission of results (June 1); preliminary discussion (June 20). It was noted that Michael and Pearson were not able to be at the June 20 meeting.

The next general meeting, scheduled for June 6 at 4 pm, has been cancelled. The next assessment meeting is scheduled for June 20.

General Education Committee

GenEd Assessment Meeting notes: July 11, 2018

Present: Pearson Cross, Jordan Kellman, Jimmy Kimball, Alise Hagan, Beth Giroir, Michael McClure, Jonathan Goodman, Shelly Ingram

The meeting opened with greetings and announcements.

Jordan presented the work the Humanities has been doing and updated the committee on the progress made in the three areas covered by GenEd Humanities (Literature, History, and Communication). The literature goals, objectives and testing were discussed in some detail by Shelly. It was noted that there were results from past assessments. The number of total students assessment was mentioned as was the September 15 deadline and the question of assessing diversity. The discussion proceeded to the History requirement and then on to the Communication goal where no common rubric or assessment method could cover all the possibilities. It was noted that these GenEd changes would mean adjustment for a number of majors in terms of students.

The Discussion then turned to Alise and submission methods, before turning to Jonathan and a look at the 1st year writing assessment to date. Jonathan asked how long to keep the raw data (essays, rubrics, etc) and the committee said at least through the next SACSOC cycle. Alise emphasized that everyone should double-check drop box and sends in any bits of information not represented there (rubrics, narratives etc). The first year writing assessment seemed to be in good order as all agreed within the range of possibilities presented by multiple instructors, not all of whom are tenured or even full-time.

The meeting ended at 5 pm

The next general meeting is scheduled for July 25 at 4 pm. Reminders and/or updates will be sent.

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.