

GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 1-14-05

ABSENT: Sarro, Sracic

Castronovo and yearly rotation – Jenkins explained that Frank Castronovo of the Theater program had asked about the possibility of creating an assessment plan that allows his department to assess one course each year – they have five. According to Jenkins, he had encouraged departments to spread the assessment over a number of years because of the work required in assessing every year. The committee expressed concern, however, that five years was too long to wait to see if assessment was leading to improvement in delivery of the course. White noted that GEC had not approved an assessment plan that ran beyond three years. A consensus was reached that the committee would allow assessment plans spread over time, but for no more than three years.

Assessment Plans

ENGL 1590; ENGL 2610; ENGL 2617; ENGL 2618; ENGL 2631; ENGL 2665. Since the assessment plans were similar for these courses, the committee considered them as a whole. The only area of concern was random sampling; there was no indication of how many sections or what percentage of students would be sampled. Some discussion ensued over what was an appropriate percentage or number. Ten percent was acceptable, but Jenkins raised a question about the minimum number needed if there was only one section. It was agreed that a minimum of 30 students should be sampled. Crist moved, White seconded, a motion to approve pending inclusion of a statement about the sampling percentage in the proposals.

PHIL 2625 -- the committee noted the following areas of concern: 1) that there were potentially too many goals and the department should consider whether it wanted to reduce the number; 2) that the alumni survey did not seem feasible given the propensity of students not to follow through on such surveys and the number of years that might elapse before they were working; and 3) the dates given for assessment did not match

Jenkins announced that the Committee would meet on Mondays at 2 PM in the President's Conference Room. Next meeting will be Monday, January 24th.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 1/24/05

Absent: Kasuganti

Assessment Plans

PSYCH 3707 – the committee thought the rubrics were ok, but wanted clarification about the random sampling, the use of a free writing exercise as a pre-test, and the classification of assessment tool **3** as an essay question, when it appears to be an attitude survey. On the last item, there were questions raised about the learning outcome – a cognitive goal – and a survey that measured attitude change. They did not seem to be compatible. There was also some discussion about the appropriateness of grading on a basis of attitude change. Some felt that such grading was inappropriate. Others argued that it was appropriate to measure attitude change, but the instructor did not have to assign a grade. It was decided to return the course for further review.

Intensives

AHLTH 4805, WI – Bill Jenkins had not been able to get the paper to Jay Gordon in a timely manner, but asked the committee to examine the proposal. After some discussion, the committee agreed that there was a need to have more than the one paper, which is only 500 words long, as part of the drafting process. The syllabus also lacked a statement about meeting gened requirements, a statement about writing skills under the selected goals, an explanation of writing assignments on the schedule, and some commentary on the drafting process. Kathylynn Feld agreed to take these concerns to Sal Sanders.

AHLTH 4810, CT – Overall, Tom Shipka had approved the proposal. The syllabus, however lacked a statement about meeting gened requirements, and did not list critical thinking under its course goals. Gergits moved, and Crist seconded, a motion to approve pending the changes on the syllabus. Motion passed.

Capstone

AHLTH 4820, CA – there were no concerns about this proposal. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Jenkins brought up for discussion the question of whether students were finishing the intensive requirements, particularly the oral intensive. He explained that the requirement for oral intensive had been reduced from 2 to 1 courses, but some departments had no such course. Others, such as English and History, had adopted a one-credit course which the student could attach to an upper division course in the major. It was decided that there should be a survey of advisors in the various colleges about what they had experienced.

Next meeting will be on Monday, January 31, at 2 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 1/31/05

ABSENT: Feld, Kasuganti, Riley, Sarro

Assessment Plans – Jenkins explained that the previous Geography submission was totally not synchronized with the Committee's criteria.

GEOG 2626, World Geography
GEOG 2640, Human Geography
GEOG 1503, Physical Geography
GEOG 2630, Weather

Since all four geography courses used a uniform approach to assessment, it was decided to examine them as a whole. Committee members thought that the proposals were improved, but that there was no designation about who collected the data, and lack of clarity regarding departmental involvement. The committee also wanted to know if there were multiple sections of each course. The committee decided to return the proposals for further review.

Jenkins explained the changes made by Frank Castronovo. He was reluctant to require that a department explain its random sampling on the form. The committee had at an earlier meeting decided to require either a sampling of 10% of the available students or a minimum of 30 students. The committee agreed to place this information on the Assessment Report form to be handed in next September.

THTR 1560, Understanding Theater – Gergits moved, White seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

THTR 1590, History of Motion Pictures -- Crist moved, White seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

THTR 4891, Theater History and Texts to 1700

THTR 4860, Theater History and Texts After 1700 -- White moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve both 4860 and 4891. Motion passed.

SOCIO 1500 – Jenkins explained that Bob Weaver had dropped the passage about the improvement of the instructors and had reworded the sentence regarding the aggregation of data. Nancy White pointed out several grammatical errors. Sweeney moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve subject to correction of the errors. Motion passed.

Next meeting will be Monday, February 7th, at 2 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 2/7/05

ABSENT: Crist, Lovelace-Cameron

Search Process – Jenkins talked about his conversation with Bege Bowers regarding the search for a new Coordinator of General Education. She wanted the committee to discuss how it might be involved in the process. Jenkins reminded committee members that Dr. Bowers as Interim Provost would make the final selection, but that she was interested in having the Gened Committee conduct the interviews with some addition of personnel that works with the general education coordinator, like Marie Cullen or Sharon Stringer. Committee members indicated that they would be willing to conduct the interviews and to include the additional personnel.

Learning Outcomes –

BIOL 1545, Anatomy and Physiology for Allied Health – this new proposal includes goal 7, and also made changes in LO10. White moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

BIOL 1552, Anatomy and Physiology II – This new proposal includes goal 7, and also made changes in L08, which had three learning outcomes. Sweeney moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

BIOL 2601, General Biology: Molecules and Cells – This one had been approved earlier, and needed no action.

BIOL 2602, General Biology: Organisms and Ecology – the new proposal eliminated learning outcomes that had too many outcomes, and also dropped the LO that talked about the student being ready for upper division course – not a general education goal. Sweeney moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

BIOL 3718, Women, Science and Technology – the original proposal displayed some confusion over learning outcomes and original goals of course (4,6,7,12,13). Goals 4, 12, 13 were not represented, but 2, 3 were. The later version included actual goal statements, but there were only four learning outcomes and five goals. Committee members also questioned LO2 and its statement that makes a debate the central activity rather than gaining understanding of the ethical issues involved. The committee decided to return the proposal for further review.

Assessment Plans –

POLSC 1560 –the feedback loop is a problem because it does not mention the department as part of the loop. A discussion ensued over the sampling under Assessment Tool 2 – only one class of six sections. It was suggested that there be a random of at least two sections and further random sampling of at least 30 students. Sracic decided to take the proposal back for review.

THTR 2690 – Jenkins noted that the committee had endorsed the other Theater courses last week. This new proposal represented a correction of an earlier submission, and was similar to the proposals recently accepted. White moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

BIOL 1545, Anatomy and Physiology for Allied Health – Questions were raised about the following: the apparent intent to do full assessment every year, and the lack of a report to the department. It appears that page 2 was from BIOL 1551 unless, as the result of cutting and pasting, the wrong course had been indicated. Jenkins was to check with Diana Fagan.

BIOL 1551, Anatomy and Physiology 1 –
BIOL 1552, Anatomy and Physiology 2 --
Both courses need to fill form regarding years of assessment, and include a feedback loop to the department.

BIOL 2601, General Biology: Molecules and Cells – well done except for six embedded questions. Great on feedback loop. Assessment tools do not indicate sampling at all for tools 2 and 3. Faculty meeting every two years.

BIOL 2602, General Biology: Organisms and Ecology – same problems as 2602.
Faculty meeting every two years

BIOL 3718, Women, Science and Technology -- Faculty meeting every two years.
Wonder about tool3 and learning outcome selected.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 2/14/05

ABSENT: Sarro

Learning Outcomes –

TCOM 1595, Survey of American Mass Communications. The instructor of this course, Walter Mathews, does not wish to participate in the assessment process, and has no objection if the course is dropped as a general education course in the Societies and Institutions Domain. Jenkins indicated that he had talked with Dan O'Neill, chair of the Communication and Theater Department, and Dean Joseph Edwards of FPA prior to Christmas and that, so far, no further movement had occurred. Sracic and Gergits recommended that we obtain a letter from the department indicating a desire to decertify the course. Munro and Riley suggested that it would be good if we circulated the letter to departments as a way of indicating that there could be the loss of a course that other departments used or recommended. The committee reached a consensus to use both suggestions prior to considering decertification.

Assessment Plans –

POLSC 1560, a revised proposal from Paul Sracic. The committee agreed that the revisions were appropriate. Sweeney moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Intensive proposals –

ALTH 4805, Health Education for Allied Health, WI. Jenkins explained that the revisions included a statement on the syllabus about meeting the writing intensive requirement, and descriptions of the written assignments that included the drafting process. However, under the sections, Selected Goals and Objectives, there is no direct statement about learning to write. Crist moved, White seconded, a motion to approve pending submission of a more direct statement about writing under the Objective section. Motion passed.

ALTH 4810, Management Skills for Health Professionals, CT. Jenkins noted the inclusion of revisions within the syllabus that addressed committee concerns about a statement concerning meeting the critical thinking requirement, a goal statement about critical thinking, and a description of the critical thinking assignments. Crist moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Next meeting is Monday, February 21, at 2 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 2/28/05

ABSENT: Crist, White

Learning Outcomes

WMST 2601, Introduction to Women's Studies – Previously the submission had many problems, so this submission from Sandy Stephan should be looked at as new. Committee members wondered where goal 12 was in L02. Kasuganti moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve, pending the elimination of goal 12 from L02. Motion passed.

A&S 2690, Identities and Differences (Will become SOCIO 2690) -- the committee expressed concern about the inclusion of goal 10 in LO1. It was felt that the language provided did not explicitly relate how diversity in the world was covered in the course. The committee agreed that LO2 covered goal 10, and that there should be a consideration of moving goal 10 from LO1 to L02. Gergits moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve, pending the suggested change. Motion passed.

Assessment Plans

FNUTR 1551, Nutrition – Jenkins noted that Jeannine Mincher had resubmitted with a portfolio section defined as to content, a mention of the development of a rubric, a clear statement of the percentage of students to be sampled and an indication that the faculty, rather than Mincher, would set the standard for passage of assessment tool # 3. However, the final section needed a stronger statement regarding departmental review. Kasuganti moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve, pending inclusion of a statement on the department meeting. Motion passed.

PHIL 2625, Introduction to Professional Ethics -- the committee originally noted the following areas of concern: 1) that there were potentially too many goals and the department should consider whether it wanted to reduce the number; 2) that the alumni survey did not seem feasible given the propensity of students not to follow through on such surveys and the number of years that might elapse before they were working; and 3) the dates given for assessment did not match. Shipka had fixed the problem with the dates, but had not changed the number of goals or dropped the alumni survey, both of which were acceptable to the committee. Sarro moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Intensives

School of Education and Oral Intensive for AYA Math – Howard Pullman had requested our consideration of counting SEDUC 4842, a capstone in the education program toward the oral communication intensive requirement. Math students taking the

Adolescent/Young Adult program were unable to take either of the two math courses that were oral intensive, but they do complete a capstone in the math program. Sarro was concerned that, if we granted an exception, there would be precedent for counting a capstone course as oral intensive, something we had avoided in the past. Kasuganti pointed out the possibility of having education designate some other course taken by education majors as oral intensive., or having the student look elsewhere for an oral intensive course. It was agreed that Nancy Sweeney would report this feedback to Howard Pullman, who could come to the next meeting if he wanted to present his case further.

Reports from Education and Engineering on student completion of general education requirements – in response to the committee request from college advisors, two advisors from Engineering and from Education had submitted reports. Neither of them indicated that there was much of a problem with students completing the general education requirements.

Jenkins passed out the revision of ALTH 4805 from Sal Sanders for consideration at next week's meeting, which will occur Monday, March 7, at 2 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 3/07/05

Absent: Crist, Kasuganti, Sracic, Sweeney

Assessment Plans -

ANTHRO 2602, Introduction to Anthropology – the committee had the following concerns: 1) the department had made changes to address most of the previous issues, except for the mentioning of embedded questions under the feedback loop section; 2) the assessment plan now had only one measure, a pre-test/post-test, instead of multiple measures; and 3) the explanation of the student sample under the pre-test is unclear.

PSYCH 3707, The Psychology of Intimate Relationships -- Jenkins pointed out that the revised proposal included a pre-test/post-test on the diversity goal, thereby comparing the students' own estimation of learning about diversity. He also noted that the free writing exercise had been eliminated under Tool 1. Munto moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve pending clarification of how many students were being sampled. It appeared as if all were. Motion passed.

PHIL 2609, Technology and Human Values – the committee decided that the following items needed attention: 1) clarification of the discrepancy under Tool 2 between having a bank of questions constant across all sections and allowing the individual professor to include certain types of questions; 2) some indication of the process by which CT Portfolios were critiqued.

Decertification – Jenkins began a discussion of Dan O'Neill's letter requesting decertification until such time as the department provides an assessment plan for TCOM 1595. Jenkins suggested that the committee should assume the power to decertify if a department requested it. The committee already had examples of decertification occurring for one foreign language course and one geology course. He raised a question, though, about what would happen when the Committee decided to seek decertification without departmental agreement. Nancy White pointed out that it could occur if the course were never taught, if the department did not engage in assessment at all, or if assessment demonstrated that the course was not meeting the goals of the general education domain from which the course came. Jenkins passed out the Senate-approved policy regarding certification, which was complicated because courses also had to go through the University Curriculum Committee. Jenkins requested that members read the policy and think about what provisions should be used for decertification. Particular attention should be paid to giving the department an opportunity to adapt the course, to providing for a hearing, and to involving the Senate.

Susan Miller expressed concern about the TCOM course and the problem of making sure that all advisors, faculty and students know of the change. Jenkins explained that he

would take care of the administrative side of the change, and, if problems arose, that the course would count through next fall before being decertified.

Next meeting will be on Monday, March 21, at 2 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 3/21/05

Absent: Crist, Kasuganti, Sarro

Assessment Plans –

PHIL 2609, Technology and Human Values – Jenkins reported that Brendan Minogue had clarified the discrepancy under Tool 2 between having a bank of questions constant across all sections and allowing the individual professor to include certain types of questions by removing the section on the individual professor. He had also written a sentence to indicate that the CT Portfolios would be critiqued and that there was a rubric to guide the critique. White moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

POLSC 1550, Introduction to Politics – Jenkins indicated that this was the first time for this proposal. With little discussion, Gergits moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Decertification – Jenkins asked the committee to indicate which sections of the Proposal Flow Form they wished to include in a proposal for decertification. Committee members agreed that the proposal needed to include: 1) a distribution process that allowed those affected by the loss of the course to object; 2) a recognition that there should be one process for departments that wish to decertify and one for the General Education Committee when it determines that a department is not fulfilling the general education requirements for its particular course; 3) and a provision determining the time at which the course becomes officially decertified (spring was suggested by Susan Miller). Miller expressed a major concern about how problematic decertification was for advisors because of the inability to reach all faculty members with the information. Jenkins indicated that he would write a draft proposal and bring it to committee for further discussion.

Certification of Domain Courses

FNLG 2610, Topics in Foreign Film ALP – the committee was impressed by the course proposal. White moved, Sracic seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

ENGL 2651, Introduction to Language ST– the committee raised the following questions and/or concerns about the proposal: 1) how did a language course teach the scientific method?; 2) what would the actual syllabus look like, especially the critical thinking exercises? The committee decided to invite Terry Benton to the next meeting to discuss this course.

Jenkins passed out the assessment plan proposal from David Porter for POLSC 2640, Comparative World Government. **The committee will meet next Monday, March 28th, at 2 PM.**

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 3/28/05

ABSENT: Crist, Sarro

Selected Topics Courses

ENGL 2651, Introduction to Language – Sal Attardo and Cindy Vigliotti were present to answer any questions regarding this proposal raised at last week's meeting. Jenkins asked about the employment of the scientific method. Attardo responded that they did use hypotheses, the examination of data, and the gathering of supportive evidence for conclusions reached. He noted that other language teachers were more prescriptive in their approach sticking rigidly to grammatical rules. Some, for example, did not recognize "ain't" as a word, and others thought that African American English was bad. He and Cindy were committed, however, to a more scientific approach to the study of language. To a question from Sweeney, Attardo replied that they did not engage in lab experiments, but did use statistical analysis. In regard to whether all instructors used the scientific method, Attardo admitted that there was not universal acceptance by instructors of what was presented in the proposal. There were no further questions.

The committee discussed the English proposal. There was some expression of discomfort with designation of the course as covering the scientific method, but Julia Gergits noted that it was in Selected Topics, which called for an interdisciplinary approach. The committee reached a consensus that the proposal was appropriate for Selected Topics, but wanted a confirmation from the department that all instructors would follow the syllabus as presented to the committee.

Assessment Plans

POLSC 2640, Comparative World Government – questions arose about assessment tool #2, and the number of short answer questions. The proposal was returned.

CHEM 1500, Chemistry in Modern Living – no feedback loop, no sense of entire faculty doing the analysis, lack of rubrics for in-class experiments, need to recognize that the initial baseline will be based on aggregate sample, and identification of how many and what kind of embedded questions will be employed.

CHEM 1505, Allied Health Chemistry I – same problems as above

CHEM 1506, Allied Health Chemistry II – same problems as above

CHEM 1515, General Chemistry I – same problems as above

CHEM 1516, General Chemistry II – same problems as above

Decertification -- Jenkins presented a new policy based on feedback from last week's meeting.

I. Departmental Withdrawal

A. The department submits a letter to the General Education Committee explaining why it wishes to withdraw a course from the general education program

- B. Coordinator sends copies of letter to all department chairs
- C. Department chairs with concerns meet with home department to discuss withdrawal.
- D. General Education Committee votes to decertify

II. Committee Decertification

- A. The General Education Committee may consider decertification of a general education course because of demonstrated failure to assess the course(s) or to fulfill gened goals
- B. The Coordinator will discuss the failures with the department chair and seek changes.
- C. The General Education Committee will hold a hearing with the department, which will follow the rules governing the certification process on objections to course proposals. The Coordinator will notify all departments of the pending hearing and invite concerned departments to the hearing.
- D. The General Education Committee will vote whether to decertify.
- E. If the vote is to decertify, and the department concurs, the Coordinator will present a report to the Senate. If the vote is to decertify and the department does not concur, the Coordinator will present a report to the Senate with a motion to decertify.

After several minor editorial changes, Sweeney moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed. **No meeting until Monday, April 11th.**

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 4/11/05

ABSENT: Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron

MATH REQUIREMENT

John Buoni has submitted a request that Honors Calculus II be submitted for credit as a general education course. The course is comparable to Calculus I and II, for which students can presently receive general education credit. This request results from an oversight on the part of the mathematics department, and unfairly affects honors students who take Honors Calculus II. Sweeney moved, White seconded, a motion to **certify** Honors Calculus II, MATH 2686H, as a general education substitute math course. Motion passed.

CROSS-LISTING

There was also a request from Robert McCoy of Mechanical Engineering that two ISEGR courses (3723 and 3723L), which presently count for oral and writing intensive credit respectively, be permitted to be crosslisted as Mechanical Engineering and Materials Engineering courses – MTEGR 3723 and 3723L, and MECH 3723 and 3723L. Jenkins explained that the courses would be the same. Sarro moved, Munro seconded, a motion to **certify**. Motion passed.

ASSESSMENT PLANS

Geography 1503, Physical Geography –
Geography 2630, Weather --
Geography 2626, World Geography –
Geography 2640, Human Geography –

Gergits raised a question about the number of embedded questions asked each year and the number of learning outcomes to be covered (12 in all). The committee decided that the department should either cut the number of learning outcomes, or spread the LO's coverage over a number of years rather than doing all of them in one year. Riley was also concerned about the value of the student survey, and whether it gave any indication of what the student had learned. Jenkins explained that indirect measures of student learning, such as the survey, were appropriate, but that it could be questioned whether the total assessment package sufficiently covered the range of learning outcomes. The committee decided to return the plans.

Political Science 2640, Comparative World Government – on assessment tool #2 the committee continued to have questions about the number of embedded questions and how well they covered the learning outcomes.

INTENSIVES

THTR 2670, Oral Interpretation -- This course proposal was designed to switch the course from COMST 2670 to THTR 2670. There were no other changes, simply a recognition of the location of the course within the theater program. White asked if they were deleting COMST 2670, and Munro said that UCC was checking into that. Sarro moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

MGT 4881, Project Management, WI – Jay Gordon reviewed this proposal, and liked the number of writing assignments of different types, but he did not see any evidence of the revision "cycle." Presumably the multiple "status reports" were meant to help students cultivate their ability to write a good status report. But beyond that, there were no examples of when the professor was going to comment on a draft and return the draft to the student for resubmission. There was also a need to work on the syllabus.

SEDUC 4800M, Reflective Teaching Methods for Adolescent Learning of Mathematics – A number of committee members expressed concern about the inconsistency in the number of hours students would spend in oral communication. Jenkins was to seek some clarification of the actual time spent.

Next meeting will be Monday, April 18th, at 2 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 4/18/05

Absent: Kasuganti, Riley, Sweeney

Decertification – Jenkins reported that our policy on decertification had successfully passed the Academic Senate at its meeting on April 6th.

Intensives

990496 -- SEDUC 4800M – Jenkins reported that Howard Pullman normally had only 9 or 10 students in this class, and that he rarely lectured. Hence, students did engage in classroom reading and group discussion exercises that brought their oral activities to the 10-hour range. Pullman had also placed a direct statement about satisfying the oral intensive gened requirement on page one of the syllabus. Munro moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Capstone

990499 -- ENGL and CICS 4870, Web Communication Capstone – these two courses were to be crosslisted and taught by Bob Hogue for the immediate future. Gergits explained that web communications was presently an ICP, which English and CICS hoped would evolve into a program. White moved, Crist seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

Assessment Plans

SPED 2630, Individuals with Exceptionalities in Societies – the committee raised the following concerns:

- 1) How could there be a pre- and post-test for laboratory work, thereby covering the course goals?
- 2) Under assessment tool #1 there is an undescribed "additional activity."
- 3) How do the simulation activities lead to testable items?
- 4) How does assessment Tool #2 cover both knowledge and attitudes when it is described as an attitude survey?
- 5) Why does an attitude survey cover LO1 and 2?

Personal and Social Responsibility

990498 -- HPES 2600, First Aid – White pointed out that this course should be satisfying goal 9 rather than goal 4. Also the explanation and justification for fulfilling the critical thinking goal was undeveloped. The committee decided to return the course.

990500 – CSIS 2655, Personal Cyber Security. White pointed out that the Personal and Social Responsibility Domain asked for a choice of goal 4 or goal 9, not both. There was a need to choose and also develop a subsidiary goal. Many committee members were not convinced that this course would satisfy either goal 4 or goal 9. Sarro expressed a belief that the course was more for businesses and protection of their computer security than for the individual. The committee decided to return the course.

Next meeting will be on Monday, April 25, at 2 PM.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 4/25/05

ABSENT: Lovelace-Cameron, Sracic

Assessment Plans

POLSC 2640, Comparative World Governments – Jenkins explained that David Porter had provided better language to indicate that he was using more questions directly related to the gened goals throughout the four tests students take in the semester. Sweeney moved, Feld seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GEOG 1503, Physical Geography – Jenkins indicated that Campbell had returned this course with a more specific explanation of the number of multiple choice questions under Assessment Tool 1 and the objectives. He had reduced the number of goals from 12 to 5, and written four questions for each goal. Riley moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve the new learning outcomes. Motion passed. Questions were raised, however, regarding the following: 1) the need for a more specific reference to the aggregation of data; 2) the identification of how many sections were given the assessment tool, and 3) a clarification of the gathering of data in the "collective sense."

GEOG 2630, Weather -- Jenkins explained that Campbell had changed the number of multiple choice questions under Assessment Tool 1 and the objectives. Crist moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GEOG 2626, World Geography – Campbell has reduced the number of goals by one, thereby making 20 multiple choice questions the correct number. The committee noted some problems with the language of LOs 3 and 4. "Gain familiarity" and "Review" should be replaced with a verb phrase from Bloom's Taxonomy. Also the verb "may" should be deleted from goal 4. The committee also observed the same problems as indicated for GEOG 1513.

GEOG 2640, Human Geography – Campbell has changed the number of goals from six to five, thereby making 20 multiple choice questions the total. The committee wanted some **clarifying** language for LOs 3 and 4. It also noted the same problems as indicated earlier for GEOG 1513.

SPED 2630, Individuals with Exceptionalities – committee members discussed this proposal with Nancy Sweeney, who explained that the students answered the questions prior to taking the lab.. She also indicated that she would clear up the confusion about the pre and post test versus the use of embedded questions. For assessment tool 2 it was decided that it was not an attitude survey exclusively, but a self-designed test that covered both attitudes and knowledge. Sweeney agreed to make the change. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve the plan pending resubmission of the changed plan. Motion passed.

Jenkins passed out learning outcomes for COUNS 1588, and a report on the completion of the general education requirements. These will be considered at **next week's meeting on Monday, May 2nd, at 2 PM.**

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES 5/2/05

ABSENT: Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron

Learning Outcomes

COUNS 1588 – the committee expressed the following concerns about this proposal:

- 1) it did not come with the proper form;
- 2) there needed to be an academic source cited for the Whole Person Paradigm, and the Relational Leadership Model.
- 3) Some of the language was unclear.

It was decided to invite Marty Manning to come to the next meeting.

Assessment Plans

CHEM 1515, General Chemistry I – Jenkins noted that the two learning outcomes did not follow the originally approved LOs, so there was a need to justify the change or return to the original. He also cited the need to provide the data to the department at large, and not simply the recommendations. Several committee members remarked on the disparity between the use of assessment tool 1 in all classes and with all students throughout the 12 experiments, and the use of only one embedded question with assessment tool 2 to cover learning outcome 2. Finally, the department should commit to making up a rubric for the teaching assistants to use in grading the laboratory experiment reports.

PHIL 2600, Introduction to Philosophy – the student survey should be renamed pre- and post-test 1, and the other PPT as pre- and post-test 2; both should have a rubric for all those teaching the course. The instructors for the course should provide both data and recommendations to the faculty at large.

PHIL 2630, Critical Thinking – the student survey should be renamed pre- and post-test 1, and should have a rubric for all those teaching the course. The instructors for the course should provide both data and recommendations to the faculty at large. The CT Portfolio is not an assessment tool as described in the plan; it would need to have a grading of the sampled portfolios, an aggregation of the data, and a report presented to the faculty for analysis.

PHIL 3711, General Ethics – the student survey should be renamed pre- and post-test 1, and should have a rubric for all those teaching the course. The instructors for the course should provide both data and recommendations to the faculty at large. The CT Portfolio is not an assessment tool as described in the plan; it would need to have a grading of the sampled portfolios, an aggregation of the data, and a report presented to the faculty for analysis. Although the other philosophy plans appeared to use common embedded test questions, this one allowed individual faculty selection, which would make comparison problematical.

Capstones

Jenkins explained that Nancy Sweeney was presenting a request from the School of Education to have GEC approve certain capstone courses without an official form. Education had already submitted four student teaching capstones, which had received approval, but overlooked other capstones that were similar in content and methodology. Sweeney pointed out that all of these capstones were similar enough to merit a general approval from this committee. Crist moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed for the following courses:

ECE 4811

SEDUC 4827,4837,4838,4843,4844,4845

TEMC 4802

It was agreed that Nancy Sweeney would provide syllabi for each of these capstones for the records in the General Education office.

Jenkins announced there would be a meeting next Monday at 2 PM, and that more than likely there would be a need for meetings during the summer.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 5/9/05

ABSENT: Crist, Gergits, Sarro, White

Learning Outcomes

COUNS 1588 – the committee met with Marty Manning, the instructor of the course, to discuss the committee's concerns. Manning passed out a handout regarding the Whole Body Paradigm (a Steven Covey concept) and a text based on the Relational Leadership Model. Sracic raised a question about whether the student was exposed to a variety of leadership models along with the two mentioned. He believed that the student should have a choice of styles. Manning indicated that he did teach about other models, and about the history of leadership. Feld asked about L06. She was concerned that students be applying the principles they had learned in the course rather than applying their ability. Application of ability would be hard to measure. Manning agreed to change the language. Jenkins pointed out that there was a mention of LO6 relating to Goal 12, the diversity goal, but he did not notice specific language covering that goal. He advised Manning either to write another goal, or to drop goal 12. It was decided that Manning would submit a revised list of learning outcomes.

Assessment Plans

Geography

Craig Campbell had resubmitted assessment plans for GEOG 1503, GEOG 2626, and GEOG 2640 that addressed the need for the following: a specific reference to the aggregation of data; identification of how many sections were given the assessment Tool, and a clarification of the gathering of data "in the collective sense."

Lovelace-Cameron moved, Feld seconded, a motion to approve. The motion passed with one nay. Teri Riley objected to the student survey instrument being used.

Philosophy

Jenkins pointed out that each of the philosophy courses needed a renaming of the student survey (PPT1), the identification of a rubric, and an indication that both data and recommendations would be forwarded to departmental faculty. In addition, 2630 and 3711 should either provide an assessment tool for the CT portfolio project, or drop it as part of assessment. It could still be part of the course.

PHIL 2600, Introduction to Philosophy. Feld moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

PHIL 2630 and 3711 – the committee noted that on both forms there was a problem with permitting the professor to choose the embedded questions rather than having a common selection for comparison, a need to remove "the professor's effort at improvement" from the language under embedded questions, and an indication of sample size under the CT assessment tool. Feld moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve pending submission of these changes. Motion passed.

Jenkins announced that there would be some meetings over the summer, that he would ask each member to submit a schedule, and that he would wait to gather a significant amount of proposals before meeting.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 6/28/05

ABSENT: Crist, Loverlace-Cameron, Sarro, Sracic, Sweeney

Learning Outcomes

COUNS 1587 – Jenkins explained that the committee had earlier expressed concern that L03, as stated, did not detail how the individual would understand the broad range of diversity under goal 12. The committee reviewed a new LO3 as rewritten by Karen Becker. Feld moved, White seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

PHYS 1500 – Conceptual Physics (Goals 6, 7, 13) – the committee originally thought that LO3 should be divided into two learning outcomes, one for goal 13 and one for goal 7. Sturris had revised the outcomes accordingly. Feld moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

PHYS 1501/1502 -- Fundamentals of Physics I, II (Goals 6, 7, 13) – at a previous meeting the committee expressed concern about LO3 and its failure to connect the material regarding the development of technology to its impact on society. The recent submission from Gregg Sturris did not have any changes from the previous L03. Phil Munro expressed satisfaction with the learning outcome because he felt that it would be difficult for physics to do more than indicated. Other committee members, however, felt that the language needed to be strengthened, and eventually suggested the following: "Explain the role of physics in the development of technology and its effect on modern society." Gergits moved, Munro seconded, a motion to approve if the suggested changes were accepted. Motion passed.

PHYS 1501L/1502L/2610L/2611L –(Goal 6) — Jenkins pointed out that these learning outcomes had already been approved.

PHYS 2601/2602 – General Physics for Applied Medical Studies (Goals 6, 7,13) – The committee decided that LO1 does not consider broadly enough the relation of physics to the society at large, both as a science and in term of its technology. The department should be reminded that it does not have to include all three goals if it has trouble with one of them (Goal 13 has to be covered). Kasuganti moved, Munro seconded, a motion to approve the

learning outcomes if the department either dropped goal 7 or wrote wording that connected physics to its impact on modern society.

PHYS 2607 – Physical Science for Early and Middle Childhood (Goals 6, 7,13) – LO1 does not relate sufficiently to goal 7. The department should either drop goal 7 or rewrite it so that the student learns more about the impact of the application of physics on modern society. Gergits moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve pending action on LO1 and goal 7.

PHYS 2608 – Sound (Goals 6,7,13) – The committee had previously approved these learning outcomes if the department eliminated goal 7, which has occurred with the present submission. There was no need for further action.

PHYS 261012611 -- General Physics I, II (Goals 6,7,13) – Gergits moved, Munro seconded, a motion to approve if the suggested changes regarding LO3 and goal 7 were accepted. See the suggested language in the consideration of PHYS 1501/1502. Motion passed

ASTRO 1504, Descriptive Astronomy (Goals 6, 7, 13) – The committee felt that LO2 was confusing, and that LO3 sufficiently covered goal 7. ON the other hand, there now was no learning outcome that dealt with goal 13, which must be a part of any course in the natural science domain. The course was returned for revision.

Assessment Plans

APST 2600 and **AFST 2601** – the committee considered both courses at the same time since the plans were identical. Feld raised a question about the pre and post tests; the pre test was given shortly after the beginning of the semester and after there was accumulation of knowledge that could affect the outcome of the test. The committee had no problem with the instructor providing an overview of the course, but covering material directly from the course would violate the criteria for a pre test. AT 1 labeled the tests as surveys rather than as tests, and there was no indication whether the tests were objective or subjective. If subjective, there should be a rubric developed. AT 4 is not a student evaluation, but another form of test. Also papers will be done, but there is no indication of how sampling and grading will occur. The plans were returned for consideration of the above comments.

HIST 2605 –

HIST 2606 –

HIST 1511 –

HIST 1512 –

The committee considered all the courses together because of the similarity of the plans. Jenkins pointed out that there had been an earlier submission, which he had reviewed. He had pointed out to Martha **Pallante** that: 1) the plans did not refer to the exact number of learning outcome in each case; 2) the essay questions for AT 1 were asked in the **3-5th** week of class, which may be too early for some of the material covered; 3) AT3 used a sample of one A, one B, and one C paper from each instructor. Such sampling did not provide the information needed about how successful students were in achieving the learning outcome. Rather it would measure how instructors graded, a step in assessment, but not the final outcome; 4) finally, individual instructors developed and graded the tests under AT3, which then provides no standard for assessment. The test needs to be cooperatively developed and evaluated.

Jenkins noted the amended plans submitted by **Pallante** in response to his comments. Each concern had been addressed, and there was only one typo in one of the boxes for AT1 that was not changed to reflect a later administration of the test. Kasuganti moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to approve once a corrected form had been submitted. Motion passed.

PHIL 2619 – **Jenkins** provided the following commentary sent to J.C. Smith -- 1) AT 1 -- we have usually saved the term, survey, for examining student attitudes rather than their knowledge. We suggest labeling Assessment Tool 1 as a **Pretest/Posttest**.
2) AT2 -- The creation of embedded questions by all professors is very good, but, if they select whichever questions or types of questions they want, then it will be difficult to judge student achievement across the whole range of sections. We are also concerned about the sentence "Comparison of the results on these specific questions with the results of students in previous sections of the course will be used by the professor to assess students' performance and the professor's effort at improvement of course instruction on these specific topics." That sentence implies the possible comparison of faculty performance, which

is not the purpose of this assessment. Wording that indicates that the questions will be comparable, and the elimination of the parts of the sentence that imply judgment of individual instructors is recommended.

3) AT 3 -- the creation of a portfolio is a great idea and well worth the time and energy, but there is nothing in the description that talks about evaluation of the portfolios through a rubric, the gathering of data on how well the students performed on these tasks, and a general evaluation of the results.

4) AT 4 and 5 are well laid out.

J.C. Smith had resubmitted plans that reflected positive response to each of the concerns. Feld moved, Gergits, seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Jenkins indicated that he had sent the same commentary regarding the following religion course plans as he had done for PHIL 2619 -- RELIG 2601, RELIG 2617, RELIG 2621.

Jenkins thanked committee members for taking time out of their busy summers to attend. He indicated that there might be one more meeting in the second summer session.

Asst. - 1/2 time secretary
792 - 4096

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES 6-29-06

No summer
6th semester

ABSENT: *Cross, Lyons, Samro, L-C, Ongilt*

Provost? *memo to all faculty - job has changed dramatically - FRD. ditto*
across the board cuts & t.c.a. - hard copy letter
Intensive Proposal Forms sent by email *PS - particularly KLF - now*
KF - how do we support services? gen ed comm - experienced
Learning Outcomes *seeks someone from*

COMST 2610, Intercultural Communication, ST (email)
committee members were concerned that the two goals as stated did not correspond well enough with the general education goals for that course. In particular, the course seemed to deal more with worldwide diversity than American (goal 12). do not meet goal 10 or 12 as stated. Committee members thought that learning outcome 2 was very difficult to assess. Moreover, should students' grade depend upon an attitude? Finally, there were **questions raised about the meaning of the wording, "view diverse values", in L02.**

- 1) seems vague on goals 10 and 12
- 2) very repetitive
- 3) how does goal 11 get covered?

*enumerating
NW 'KF' Motion pictures*

Domain Proposals

990512 - GEOG 2650, Global Economic Landscapes, SI (email)
The committee agreed that the narrative lacked sufficient development of an argument about how basic SI goals were covered in the course. There were also problems with the syllabus, which lacked the usual information regarding how the course fulfilled domain goals. Nancy White noted that the syllabus listed different goals than those identified in the narrative. Michael Crist raised a question about the use of quotation marks on the last line of page two.

990515 - ANTHR 1503, The Rise and Fall of Civilizations, SI (email)
The committee discussed this proposal and raised the following concerns:
1) no title provided on the cover page

- 2) only one of the instructors is full-time, Matt O'Mansky, but on the page providing justification to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, they are all designated as full-time.
- 3) The syllabus lacks a statement about meeting the general education requirements, and does not list the gened goals, or related learning outcomes.

The department has submitted revisions for all areas of concern.

Intensive Proposals

990511 – GEOG 3713, Geography of South America, WI (mail)

The committee determined that the syllabus lacked any statement regarding general education requirements. It also referred to counting writing as only 25% of the course grade (the requirement is 30%), and later stated that it was worth 29% of the grade. There was also only one assignment instead of the two required. Finally, the committee discussed Jay Gordon's concern that the assignment was too descriptive and open to plagiarism. The committee decided to share Gordon's concern with the department, but not to impose on the department's right to define the assignment.

The department has corrected the problems.

NW YR II — Motion Passes



SA**990517 – PSYCH 4804, Conflict and Group Dynamics, CT (email)

- 1) will need signatures
- 2) looks ok otherwise



S990518 – ANTHR 4879, Case Studies in Forensic Anthropology, OCI (delivered)

- 1) Course meets domain of Oral Communication Intensive?
- 2) Should emphasize speaking as a goal

*answer
all
questions*

990520 – CSIS 3720, System Configuration and Maintenance, WI (delivered)

- 1) counts tests as 5% of the grade
- 2) syllabus has nothing on writing

Lab Reports

990521 – CSIS 3722, Development of Databases, WI (delivered)

- 1) syllabus has nothing on writing
- 2) test questions used as writing
- 3) 43% of the grade?

990522 – INFOT 3774, Multimedia Technology, WI (delivered)

- 1) uses emails and quizzes/exams
- 2) syllabus only mentions writing in the goals of the course

990523 – INFOT 3775, Multimedia Authoring, OCI (delivered)

- 1) does not have statement about satisfying oral communication requirement

syllabus

**In process
Capstone**

A**990517 – PSYCH 4895, Senior Psychology Capstone Experience (mail)
needs dean's signature