

# GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

## MINUTES 1/8/04

Absent: Kasuganti, Munro, Sarro

The committee met to review the LO proposals from departments for their general education courses. It discussed the following issues -

Use of wording - the committee agreed that it did not approve of the word, "appreciate", because of the difficulty in measurement. It also decided that usage of the words, "learn" or "understand", was permissible. Some argued that such words were not regarded as appropriate for measurement in many assessment schemes, but others felt that elimination of those words as appropriate would simply aggravate faculty unnecessarily. Nancy White offered to provide a copy of words used in Bloom's Taxonomy, which could be used as suggested words for departments to use in drafting learning outcomes. Jenkins indicated that he would send a copy of these words to the committee for approval.

Number of goals - Nancy Sweeney asked if the committee wanted to limit the LO statements to 3-5. She thought that the number was more manageable. Sherri Lovelace-Cameron argued that the departments should be able to decide, and that Biology in particular could measure the number of goals it had submitted. The consensus of the committee was to permit departments to decide, and to allow them the leeway to reduce the number of goals upon further assessment.

The following is a list of all general education courses by domain with the original goals listed afterward and the decision of the committee regarding the learning outcomes submitted.

990027- *MATH 2623* Title: Survey of Mathematics

**Goal: 5 December 4 meeting – sent back to examine the criteria of the Senate. Received changes from Kent and Chang, which are under review.**

990378 -- MATH 2625 **Title:** Mathematical Literacy and Critical Reasoning

Goal 5 **December** 4, meeting – sent back to examine the criteria of the Senate.  
Received changes from Kent and Chang, which are under review.

The following courses are substitutes for the Math 2623 or Math 2625:  
1549 (College Business Mathematics 2); 1570 (Applied Calculus II); 1571  
(Calculus ■ ~~1572~~/H (Calculus II); 1581H (Biomathematics 2); 1585H  
(Calculus Honors); 2652 (Mathematics for Early Childhood Teachers 2);  
2665 (Foundations of Middle School Mathematics 2); 2670 (Applied Calculus  
2). Goal 5 no submission

### **-Oral Communication-**

990001- *COMST 1545H* **Title:** Honors Communication Theory and Practice  
Goal 1

990002- *COMST 1545* **Title:** Communication Theory and Practice Goal 1

December 4 meeting – sent back both courses to Carey Horvath to examine Senate  
criteria. Demonstration of effective speaking does not **indicate** that learning has  
occurred.

### **-Writing I, II-**

990040- *ENGL 1550* **Title:** Writing / Goal 1

990042- *ENGL 1551* **Title:** Writing 2 Goal 1

990041- *ENGL 1550H* **Title:** Honors Writing 1 Goal 1

990043- *ENGL 1551H* **Title:** Honors Writing 2 Goal 1

Passed by GEC, 1/8/04

## **DOMAINS**

### **- NATURAL SCIENCE-**

990017 - A&S 2600 **Title:** Exploration in the Sciences. Goal 6

December 4 meeting – **agreed** to contact Jim Mike about pulling chairs together.

**990074- ASTRO 1504 Title: Descriptive Astronomy** Goals 7, 13

Not submitted. Greg Sturru has been contacted.

**990068- BIOL 1505/H Title: Biology and the Modern World**

Goals 6, 7, 13 The scientific method, is not there, and is not needed because of A&S 2600. Department needs to reconsider whether it wishes to include Goal 6.

**990070- CHEM 1500 Title: Chemistry in Modern Living** Goals 6, 7, 13 GEC decided that the elimination of goal 7 is ok, but the rest of the courses lack LO statements. **Some** of the goals are simply **repeated** from the **general** education list.

**990443 -- ENST 1500 Title: Introduction to Environmental Science** Goals 6, 13 Not submitted

**990058- GEOG 1503/H Title: Physical Geography** Goals 6, 7, 13 Goal 12 was not intended to be interpreted loosely to **mean** differences in the world's landscapes; it was also not identified as one of Geography's goals in the original proposal. Goals 7 and 13 are covered, but there is no learning outcome that relates directly to Goal 6, the scientific method. Either it **needs** to be more clearly stated, or dropped as a goal of the course.

**990057- GEOG 2630/H Title: Weather** Goals 6, 7, 13 Goals 7 and 13 are covered, but, just as with 1503, there is no learning outcome that relates directly to Goal 6, the scientific method. Either it needs to be more clearly stated, or dropped as a goal of the course.

**990055- GEOL 1504 Title: The Dynamic Earth** Goals 6, 7, 13 Not submitted

**990076 - GEOL 1510 Title: Geology of National Parks.** Goals 6, 7, 13 Not submitted

**990056- GEOL 2602 Title: Introduction to Oceanography** Goals 6, 7, 13 Not submitted

**990073 - PHYS 1500 Title: Conceptual Physics.** Goals 6, 13 Not submitted

**990136 - PHYS 2608 Title: Sound.** Goals 6, 7, 13 Not submitted

**A student must take A&S 2600 to satisfy the laboratory requirement if he or she is taking a regular natural science course listed above.**

## Substitute Courses for the Science Domain

990172 - BIOL 1545 Title: Allied Health **Anatomy/Physiology**. Goals **6, 7, 13** Goal 7, relating science to society, is not there. Department needs either to keep and add LO, or drop by letter requesting **change**. **LO10 appears** to combine several learning outcomes (small group work, investigational skills and **understanding** basic principles), which needs to be simplified or broken into three **LO's**.

990155 - BIOL 1551 Title **Anatomy & Physiology ■** - Goals **6, 7, 13** Goal 7, relating science to society, is not there. There is only one LO that talks directly about laboratory work, but it emphasizes "working smoothly with laboratory partners" and "**establish** a professional attitude towards interpersonal relationships" rather than the student's knowledge or employment of the scientific method (Goal 6).

990156 - BIOL 1552 Title: **Anatomy & Physiology II**. Goals **6, 7, 13** Goal 7, relating **science** to society, is not there. **Department needs** to consider whether to adopt some **LO's** reflecting that goal, or request a change of goals. **LO-8** wants students to "learn to work in a small group setting in the laboratory," but also to "develop investigational skills" and to "**understand** the basic physiological principles..." There are three **LO's** in one; perhaps they should be made into 3 **LO's**.

990157 - BIOL 2601/H Title: General Biology: Molecules and Cells Goals 6, 7, 13 Ok as submitted except for one typo.

990158 - BIOL 2602/H Title: General Biology: Organisms and Ecology Goals **6, 7, 13** LO1 has **two** outcomes stated, and **LO2** has three outcomes stated. The last sentence of **LO1** and **the first sentence** of **LO2** uses "will be introduced," a verb phrase that does not **reflect** a student learning outcome; **rather** it represents the action of the instructor. LO3 is unnecessary since the other **LO's** indicate what the student needs to know or to do in order to be prepared for upper division courses.

990170 - CHEM 1505/1506 Title: Allied Health Chemistry ■ **II**. Goals 6, 7, 13 The elimination of goal 7 is ok, but the rest of the courses lack LO statements. Some of the goals are simply repeated from the general education list.

990169 - CHEM 1515/1516 Title: General Chemistry ■ **II**. Goals **6, 7, 13** the elimination of goal 7 is ok, but the rest of the courses lack LO statements. Some of the goals are simply **repeated** from **the general education** list.

990165 - *GEOL 1505/H* Title: Physical Geology. Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted

990159 - *GEOL 1513* Title: Physical Evolution of North America. Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted

990161 - *GEOL 1514* Title: Life of the Geologic Past. Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted

990163 - *GEOL 2611* Title: Geology for Engineers. Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted.

990167 - *PHYS 1501 + 1501L / 1502 + 1502L* Title: Fundamentals of Physics ■ **II** Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted

990166 - *PHYS 2601, 2610L / 2602, 2611L* Title: General Physics for Applied Medical Studies **I, II**. Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted

990360 - *PHYS 2607* Title: Physical Science for Early & Middle Childhood Education Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted

990162 - *PHYS 2610+2610L / 2611+ 2611L* Title: General Physics ■ **II**. Goals **6, 7, 13** Not submitted

#### - SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS-

990153 - *AFRST 2600* Title: Introduction to **Africana Studies** ■ **I** Goals **11, 12** Submitted 10 and 12, but original proposal was for 11 and 12. Need to clarify goals. **LO6** – use of verb phrase, "will familiarize herself," is not a student-centered learning outcome. Check Bloom's Taxonomy for appropriate verb forms.

990026- *AMER 2601/H* Title: American Identity Goals **11, 12** OK, but would like a link to the goals.

990049- *ANTHR 2602/H* Title: Introduction to Anthropology Goals **10, 11, 12** OK except for **LO2's** usage of "come to." Need to rephrase. Also **LO3** has two different **LO's**; should be separated into two.

990110 - *CRJUS 1500/H* Title: Introduction to Criminal Justice Goals **10, 11, 12** **LO1**, are you intending to pre-test and post-test to demonstrate an increase in knowledge? The second part of the LO is perhaps another **LO**. **LO6** does not

have to be stated as it is measured in other ways. The course, as originally proposed, should fulfill **goals 10, 11, and 12**, but it is not clear from the learning outcomes that either 10 or 12 is covered in the course.

.....  
990028 - ECON 1501 Title: Economics in Action. Goals **11, 12** OK

90118 - ECON 1502 Title: Panic and Prosperity: U.S. Economic Policy Since the Great Depression. Goals **11, 12** Covers goals 11 and 12, but needs to make a broader **statement** in LO6 to cover goal 12.

990078 - ECON 1503/H Title: Rich and Poor: Diversity and Disparity in the U.S. Workplace. Goal **11, 12** Covers goals 11 and 12, but needs to make a broader statement in **LO6** to cover goal 12.

990149 - ECON 2610/H Title: Principles of Microeconomics. Goals **11, 12** OK

990119 - ECON 2630 Title: Principles of Macroeconomics. Goals **11, 12** OK

The General Education Committee has determined that a student must choose only one of the courses, ECON 1501, 1502, 1503. The student may choose to take one or both of the Principles courses, but may not combine either one of them with ECON 1501, 1502, 1503.

-----  
-----  
990037- *GEOG 2626/H* Title: World Geography Goals **10, 11, 12** Original proposal covered goals **10, 11, 12**, but does not do 12. **Need either** to include LO to **cover**, or request removal. Goal 11 appears weak to committee. **LO3** appears to be a skill LO, in which the "appreciation of world geography" is not the prime outcome; may want to have multiple skill outcomes. **LO2** needs rewording – "**locate** an ability to locate."

990016- *GEOG 2640* Title: Human Geography Goals **10, 11, 12** **LO1** should refer to geographer's theories only. Also theories are not usually applied in the general sense; hence, coverage of goal 10 in this particular LO is not clear. Need to provide department with Bloom's Taxonomy.

990018- *HIST 1511* Title: World Civilizations to 1500 Goals **10, 11** Not submitted

990020- *HIST 1512* Title: World Civilizations since 1500 Goals **10, 11** Not submitted

990022- *HIST 1511H* Title: World Civilizations to 1500 Honors Goals 10, 11 Not submitted

990024- *HIST 1512H* Title: World Civilizations since 1500 Honors Goals 10, 11 Not submitted

990030- *HIST 2605* Title: Turning points in U.S. History 1 Goals 11, 12 Not submitted

990031- *HIST 2606* Title: Turning Points in U.S. History II Goals 11, 12 Not submitted

990029- *POLIT 1550/H* Title: Politics and Globalization. Goals 10, 11, 12 Original proposal had goals 10, 11, 12, but course only covers 11 and 12 here. Should add LO, or request removal of goal.

990117 - *POLIT 1560* Title: American Government. Goals 11, 12 OK

990139 - *POLIT 2640* Title: Comparative World Governments. Goals 10, 11, 12 Original proposal had goals 10, 11, 12, but only covers 11 and 12 here. Should add LO, or request removal of goal.

990098- *RELIG 2601* Title: Introduction to World Religions Goals 10, 11 Not reviewed yet.

990100- *RELIG 2617* Title: Introduction to Eastern Religions Goals 10, 11 Not reviewed yet.

990050- *SOCIO 1500/H* Title: Introduction to Sociology Coals 10, 11, 12 OK except for use of word "appreciate" in LO2 (goal 11) and LO2 (goal 10).

990011 - *TCOM 1595* Title: Survey of American Mass Communication. Goals 11, 12 Not submitted

990103 - *WMST 2601* Title: Introduction to Women's Studies Goals 11, 12 Not submitted

- ARTISTIC AND LITERARY PERSPECTIVES-

990152 - *AFRST 2601* Title: Introduction to *Africana Studies II*. Goals 8, 12 Originally proposed goals 8 and 12, but now adds 10. How is goal 10 met in these **LO's**? In **LO5** use some word other than appreciate, which the committee considers difficult to **measure**. In **LO6** consider changing "will be conversant" for a stronger word from Bloom's Taxonomy.

990131 - *ART 1541/H* Title: Survey of Art History 1 Goals **8, 10** OK on goals 8, 10. Some of the **LO's** under Goal 8 appear to fulfill goal 10. In **LO3** reading is not a knowledge or skill outcome; rather it is a means.

990130 - *ART 1542/H* Title: Survey of Art History 2 Goals **8, 10** OK on goals **8, 10**. Some of the **LO's** under Goal 8 appear to fulfill goal 10. In **LO3** reading is not a knowledge or skill outcome; rather it is a means.

990065- *ENGL 1590/H* Title: Introduction to Literature Goals **8, 4, 7, 9** Originally proposed goals 4, 7 and 9, as well as 8, but proposal does not deal with 4, 7, or 9. **LO4** not clear.

990048- *ENGL 2610* Title: World Literature Goals **8, 10** OK

990071- *ENGL 2617* Title: Women in Literature Goals **8, 12** 8 and 12 – OK except for **LO4**, where women's literature, **rather** than **women's** history, appears to be the more appropriate reference.

990047- *ENGL 2618/H* Title: American Literature and Diversity Goals 8, 12 OK

990072- *ENGL 2631/H* Title: Mythology in Literature Goals 8,4 Originally proposed goals 8 and 4, but only 8 covered. In **LO4** might consider rewording to speak to goals 10 or 12.

990046- *ENGL 2665/H* Title: Introduction to Film Study Goals 8,7 – Originally proposed goals 8 and 7, but only 8 covered.

990063- *FNLG 2605* Title: Foreign Drama Goals 8 Dropped as a general education course.

990227 - *HPES 2698* Title: Survey of Dance Goals **8, 10, 12** Originally proposed goals **8, 10, 12**, but has added goal 9. In **LO1** there appear to be **two** different **LO's**. Eliminate "and **appreciate**" in **LO's 4, 5, 9**. In **LO7** department needs to separate different objectives into more **LO's**; it can also limit the information.



990052- *MUSED 2621* **Title:** Musical Literature and Appreciation **Goals 8, 10** Not reviewed.

990105- **MUSHL 2616 /H** **Title:** Survey of Jazz **Goals 8, 10** Not reviewed.

990039 - *MUSHL 2617 /H* **Title:** Film Music **Goals 8, 10** Not reviewed.

990038 - **MUSHL 2618/H** **Title:** Rock 'n Roll to Rock **Goals 8, 7, 12** Not reviewed.

990459 - **THTR 1512** **Title:** Survey of Musical Theater **Goals 8, 3, 10** Not reviewed.

990010 - *THTR 1560* **Title:** Understanding Theater **Goals 8, 12** Not reviewed.

990009 - *THTR 1590* **Title:** History of Motion Pictures **Goals 8, 12** Not reviewed.

990008 - *THTR 2690* **Title:** The Art of Motion Pictures **Goals 8, 12** Not reviewed.

#### **Substitute courses for Music 2621**

990106 - **MUSHL 3771** **Title:** Music History and Literature I **Goals 8, 10** Not reviewed.

990107 - **MUSHL 3772** **Title:** Music History and Literature II **Goals 8, 10** Not reviewed.

990108 - **MUSHL 3773** **Title:** Music History and Literature III **Goals 8, 10** Not reviewed.

990109 - **MUSHL 3774** **Title:** Music History and Literature IV **Goals 8, 10** Not reviewed.

#### **Substitute courses for Theater 1560 and 1590**

990014 - **THTR 4860** **Title:** Theater History and Texts after 1700 **Goals 8, 10, 11** Not reviewed.

990015 - THTR 4891 Title: Theater History and Texts to 1700. Goals 8, 10, 11 Not reviewed.

**- PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY-**

990075 - COUNS 1587 Title: Introduction to Health and Wellness in Contemporary Society. Goals 9,3 Not reviewed

990438 -- COUNS 1588 Title: Exploring Leadership: Theory & Practice 3 SH. Goals 9, 4, 3 Not reviewed

990113 - FNUTR 1551 Title: Normal Nutrition Goals 9, 3 Not reviewed.

990067- *HSC 1568* Title: Healthy Lifestyles Goals 9, 3, 12 Not reviewed

990086 - PHIL 2609/H Title: Technology and Human Values Goals 4,9 Not reviewed.

990064- *PHIL 2625* Title: Introduction to Professional Ethics Goals 4, 7, 9, 11 Not reviewed.

990364 -- PHIL 3711 Title: General Ethics Goals 4, 3, 7, 9 Not reviewed.

990353 -- PHIL 3727 Title: Environmental Ethics Goals 4, 1, 2, 3, 7, 13 Not reviewed.

99006- *PSYCH 1560 /H* Title: General Psychology Goals 9,6 Not reviewed.

990061 - PSYCH 3707 Title: Psychology of Intimate Relationships. Not reviewed.

990445 - PSYCH 3755 Title: Child Development Goals 9, 12 Not reviewed.

990069- *PSYCH 3758* Title: Lifespan Development Goals 9, 12 Not reviewed.

990101 - RELIG 2621/H Title: Religion and Moral Issues Goals 4, 3 Not reviewed.

990097 -- RELIG 2631 Title: Religion and the Earth Goals 4, 3, 9 Not reviewed.

**-SELECTED TOPICS AND ELECTIVES-**

**990440 -- A&S 2690 Title: Identities and Differences Goals 3, 4, 10, 12  
Not reviewed.**

**990054 - BIOL 3718 Title: Women, Science and Technology. Coals 4, 6, 7,  
12, 13 Not reviewed.**

**990114 -- HMEC 3780 Title: Consumer Economics Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11,  
12, 13 Not reviewed.**

**990082 - PHIL 2600 Title: Introduction to Philosophy. Goals 3, 4, 8, 9, 10,  
11, 12 Not reviewed.**

**990083 - PHIL 2619 Title: Introduction to Logic. Goals 3, 4, 5, 6 Not  
reviewed.**

**990120 - PHIL 2630 Title: Critical Thinking Goals 1, 2, 3, 4 Not reviewed.**

**990099 - RELIG 2605 Title: Myth, Symbol, and Ritual. Goals 1, 4, 8, 10,  
11, 12 Not reviewed**

**990077 - SOCIO 3745, Title: Sociology of Health, Illness, and Health Care  
Goals 7, 9, 11 Not reviewed.**

**990051 - SPED 2630 Title: Individuals with Exceptionalities in Society.  
Goals 9, 11 12 Not reviewed.**

# GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING

## MINUTES 1/26/04

ABSENT: Awad, Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron, Mosca, Riley, Sracic, Sweeney (absent because of knee operation)

Jenkins began the meeting with consideration of the math and economics proposals, which had been resubmitted. The math department had considered the Criteria for the math course, and submitted changes that covered the Criteria. Nancy White moved, and Michael Crist seconded a motion to approve the list of learning outcomes for the MATH 2623 and 2625 courses, which were the same course except for one additional hour covering statistics in the 2625 Course for the nursing program. Motion passed.

Economics - Teri Riley resubmitted the *LO's* for the economics courses. She had made language changes that clarified the coverage of various socioeconomic groups as required by Goal 12. White moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Philosophy and Religious Studies - Jenkins pointed out that all of these course proposals deviated from the goals listed in the original proposals. There was also a problem in most courses because the learning outcomes did not cover the goals listed in the new proposals. It was decided to return these courses and request PRS to work out the discrepancy in the goals and to list goals covered next to each LO.

Music - the committee examined each course separately and agreed to return these courses for further work. Most of the courses need to have more descriptive *LO's* that clearly relate to Goal 10 and worldwide coverage.

*990052- MUSED 2621* Title: Musical Literature and Appreciation **Goals 8, 10.** Question whether LO1 ("attend") was a measure of learning; suggestion was made about possible combination with LO4.

*990105- MUSHL 2616 /H* Title: Survey of Jazz **Goals 8, 10.** No LO relates to Goal 10.

990039 - *MUSHL 2617 /H* Title: Film Music **Goals 8, 10.** No LO relates to goal 10.

990038 - *MUSHL 2618/H* Title: Rock 'n Roll to Rock **Goals 8, 7, 12 .** LO's do not have any mention of material related to Goal 7, nor Goal 12. Department has mistakenly listed Goal 10 as the second goal.

**Substitute courses for Music 2621.** All of the four Music History and Literature have the same LO's. There is a need to indicate that the various historical periods deal with world cultures in order to fulfill Goal 10.

990106 - *MUSHL 3771* Title: Music History and Literature **I Goals 8, 10**

990107 - *MUSHL 3772* Title: Music History and Literature **II Goals 8, 10**

990108 - *MUSHL 3773* Title: Music History and Literature **III Goals 8, 10**

990109 - *MUSHL 3774* Title: Music History and Literature **IV Goals 8, 10**

**Theater** – all of the theater courses need numbering of the LO's.

990459 - *THTR 1512* Title: Survey of Musical Theater **Goals 8, 3, 10.** LO's do not cover Goal 3.

990010 - *THTR 1560* **Title:** Understanding Theater **Goals 8, 12.** The department has listed Goal 10 as its second goal; need to re-examine original proposal for Goal 12.

990009 - *THTR 1590* **Title:** History of Motion Pictures **Goals 8, 12.** The department has listed Goal 10 as its second goal; need to re-examine original proposal

990008 - *THTR 2690* **Title:** The Art of Motion Pictures **Goals 8, 12.** The department has listed Goal 10 as its second goal; need to re-examine original proposal for Goal 12.

990014 - *THTR 4860* Title: Theater History and Texts after 1700 **Goals 8, 10, 11 Not reviewed.**

990015 - *THTR 4891* Title: Theater History and Texts to 1700. **Goals 8, 10, 11 Not reviewed.**

The committee began reviewing COUNS 1587, but did not finish. GEC will continue meeting on Mondays at 2 PM until further notice.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 2/2/04**

Absent: Awad (work schedule), Kasuganti (sabbatical), Mosca (class schedule), Sweeney (operation and recuperation).

The committee reviewed the Learning Outcomes of the following departments:

990011 - TCOM 1595 Title: Survey of American Mass Communication. **Goals 11, 12.** The committee felt that the LO's were too much a duplication of the overall goals for the domain, and not a reflection of what the course did specifically to achieve the goals. The questions came closer to expressing the latter, but needed to be turned into declarative sentences. The form, which is available on the Strategic Planning website, also calls for a linkage of the LO's with the stated goals, in this case goals 11 and 12.

990131 - ART 1541/H Title: Survey of Art History 1 **Goals 8, 10** and 990130 - ART 1542/H Title: Survey of Art History 2 **Goals 8, 10** OK on goals 8, 10. Patricia Sarro resubmitted the edited LO's for both courses. Gergits moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

### **- PERSONAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY-**

990075 - COUNS 1587 Title: Introduction to Health and Wellness in Contemporary Society. **Goals 9, 3.** The department submitted goals 9, 10, and 12 in the proposal, but goals 9 and 3 originally. There is a need for the department either to rephrase its LO's to include goal 3. or to adopt goals 10 and 12 through a letter to the General Education Committee explaining the inclusion of these goals in the course and requesting the elimination of goal 3. LO1 - "investigate" is not a measurable term. In each LO the term, "candidate." is used; it is suggested that the term, "student," should be used. LO6 - the candidate being exposed to something is not a learning outcome, nor is it measurable. LO8 - would be better stated as "The student will communicate as a member of a small group." If the department decides to go with goal 3, then we should discuss the provisions of the Model passed by the Academic Senate for critical thinking.

990438 -- COUNS 1588 Title: Exploring Leadership: Theory & Practice **Goals 9, 4, 3.** Apparently, the department has dropped goal 3. which was listed in the original proposal. Since the Model calls for a minimum of two goals, the department may drop goal 3 by submitting a letter to the committee indicating its withdrawal of the goal. If the department keeps goal 3, then it needs to discuss the provisions from the criteria passed by the Academic Senate so that it develops LO's reflecting those provisions. LO5 - the committee is not sure that this goal is measurable. The statement seems to emphasize the interconnections between the individual, organizations, and society, and not self-knowledge. LO6 - "embrace the belief" has two problems. First, how can one measure how much a student embraces such a belief; and secondly, will the

grade in the course depend on the student's willingness to accept this affective goal? Please note that these are questions about LO6 and not a directive to eliminate this LO.

**990113 - FNUTR 1551 Title: Normal Nutrition Goals 9, 3.** The department needs to examine goal 9, as stated, and relate its goals more directly to the stated goal. It also needs to examine the Criteria passed by the Academic Senate regarding critical thinking and use that language to express the critical thinking skills. LO4 under Goal 3 – appears to be a means of assessment and not a learning outcome.

**990067- HSC 1568 Title: Healthy Lifestyles Goals 9, 3, 12.** The department did not submit learning outcomes that included goals 3 and 12.

**99006- PSYCH 1560 /H Title: General Psychology Goals 9, 6.** LO1 – does not need to include a full description of the scientific method. LO2 – “Understand” is used twice. and we are not sure if the goal, as stated, is measurable. It is also unclear what "the final response" is. Finally. there may be two LO's in this statement. LO3 – the stateincent should emphasize the application of principles by the student. Also it is not clear what a "sufficient" understanding is.

The committee decided not to report back to the Psychology department until the other three courses had been reviewed at next Monday's meeting. Jenkins reminded committee members that we would be meeting every Monday at 2-3 PM.

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES 2/9/04

ABSENT: Awad, Gergits, Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron, Mosca, Sweeney

**99006- PSYCH 1560 /H Title: General Psychology Goals 9, 6** LO1 is ok on scientific method. 1,02 needs some rewording. Are you suggesting that the students will understand the contributions of psychology to the understanding of behavior. or that the students will understand how behavior is affected by social, physiological, and developmental factors? In the second sentence the committee is confused by the term, "final response." LO3 is confusing because it emphasizes the understanding of principles, but then talks about the application of these principles. Which will the department be evaluating?

**990061 - PSYCH 3707 Title: Psychology of Intimate Relationships Goals 9, 12** LO1 – it is not clear to the committee how the larger socio-economic political structure relates to the rest of the list. LO2 – the language implies the use of an assessment tool to gauge student learning rather than the learning outcome itself. LO3 – this LO needs to be stated in a way that indicates its relationship with the material covered in the course.

**990445 - PSYCH 3755 Title: Child Development Goals 9, 12** These LO's do not clearly indicate coverage of goal 12. Although the General Education Committee recognizes and applauds the emphasis of the course on individual differences, it wants to make sure that those differences include race, class. religion, gender. ethnicity, age. disability,. lifestyle and political identity as required by Goal 12

**990069- PSYCH 3758- Title: Lifespan Development Goals 9, 12** The committee discussed and approved the LO's. Crist moved, Sarro seconded. a motion to approve. Motion passed.

### -SELECTED TOPICS AND ELECTIVES-

**990440 -- A&S 2690 Title: Identities and Differences Goals 3, 4, 10, 12** Proposal mixes together Report #1 concerning learning outcomes, and Report #2 concerning the assessment plan. There is a need to separate. and to use the appropriate forms prepared by the General Education Committee. Various learning outcomes do not identify sufficiently both the world components and the American components as required by Goals 10 and 12. The critical thinking learning outcomes are approved.

**990054 - BIOL 3718 Title: Women, Science and Technology. Goals 4, 6, 7, 12, 13.** Learning outcomes do not represent all of the goals originally submitted. In particular, goals 4, 12 and 13 are not discussed. On the other hand, goals 2 and 3 are.



990114 -- HMEC 3780 **Title: Consumer Economics** Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13 The proposal examined only Goals 4, 9, 11, not the entire list above. Need to return and straighten out what is being done in the course.

990077 - SOCIO 3745, **Title: Sociology of Health, Illness, and Health Care** Goals 7, 9, 11 The committee discussed and approved this proposal. Riley moved, Hiznay seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

990051 - SPED 2630 **Title: Individuals with Exceptionalities in Society.** Goals 9, 11, 12 The committee agreed that each of the three goals related more to the goals of the special education program than it did to the goals of general education. Riley commented that there had been quite a bit of debate over this course earlier. Jenkins pointed out that the original proposal had in final form argued that it would be a general education course and not a course designed for majors. but that these learning outcomes did not represent that proposal well.

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 2/16/04

ABSENT: Awad, Kasuganti, Sweeney

The General Education Committee discussed some newly submitted reports on learning outcomes.

990018- *HIST 1511* **Title:** World Civilizations to 1500 Goals **10, 11**

990020- *HIST 1512* **Title:** World Civilizations since 1500 Goals **10, 11**

990022- *HIST 1511H* **Title:** World Civilizations to 1500 Honors Goals 10, 11

990024- *HIST 1512H* **Title:** World Civilizations since 1500 Honors Goals **10, 11**

World courses

- 1) The **LO's** do not give any indication of the differences in **coverage between HIST 1511 and 1512, and between HIST 2605 and 2606.**
- 2) Overall, language should be used that reflects the emphasis of the department in this particular course rather than words taken from **the** original goal statement as passed by the Academic Senate.
- 3) The **LO's** for **HIST 1511 and 1512** should be more specific about coverage of societies throughout the world.
- 4) **LO2 – “will learn”** is not an outcome. **Please see the** attached file with Bloom's Taxonomy for verbs that reflect a learning outcome.
- 5) **LO3 – “will be shown”** is not a student outcome. Each statement should reflect what the students knows or can do as a result taking the course.
- 6) **LO5 –** there appear to be two outcomes in the same statement. One would be the student's understanding of theories, and the other the student's knowledge of how institutions function, interact with each other, and evolve in our society. Perhaps this statement should be made into **two.**
- 7)

990030- *HIST 2605* **Title:** Turning points in **U.S** History 1 Goals **11, 12**

990031- *HIST 2606* **Title:** Turning Points in U.S. History **II** Goals **11, 12**

American courses

- 1) **The LO's** do not **give** any indication of the differences in **coverage** between **HIST 2605 and 2606.**
- 2) Overall, language should be used that reflects the emphasis of the department in this particular course rather than words taken from the original goal statement as passed by the Academic **Senate.**
- 3) **LO5 –** see the statement **above** on **LO5** from **the** World courses.
- 4) **LO3 –** will each of these courses cover all of the listed types of diversity?

990103 - WMST 2601 Title: Introduction to Women's Studies Goals 11, 12

The **General** Education Committee has the following comments or questions about the Learning Outcomes submitted for this course:

- 1) LO1 – there will be a problem in measuring this LO because one will have to observe the student participating in consciousness raising. It appears that the emphasis should be more related to the second half of the sentence.
- 2) **LO4** – "examine" is not an outcome; rather it is a student activity. See Bloom's Taxonomy for possible verbs.
- 3) LO6 – first portion of the sentence is ok, but "**study**" is not a learning outcome in the second portion.
- 4) This **course takes** a look at gender issues, but it also should be looking at women as differentiated by age, class, race, ethnicity, lifestyle, etc. **The** course more than likely covers these areas, but a comprehensive LO would indicate a broader coverage than just gender.

990070- *CHEM 1500* Title: Chemistry in Modern Living Goals 6, 7, 13 The resubmitted learning outcomes do cover goal 6 relating to the scientific method, but neither LO2, nor **LO3**, are learning outcomes that reflect specifically enough how chemistry as a particular discipline reaches goal 13 or goal 7 in this course.

990170 - CHEM 1505/1506 Title: Allied Health Chemistry ■ **II**. Goals 6, 13 The elimination of goal 7 is ok, and goal 6 is sufficiently covered. **However, LO2** is not a learning outcome that reflects specifically enough how chemistry as a particular discipline reaches goal 13 in this course. Moreover, the suggested measurement tool relates more to goal 6 and the scientific method than to goal 13.

990169 - CHEM 1515/1516 Title: General Chemistry ■ **II**. Goals 6, 13 The elimination of goal 7 is ok. **However, LO2** is not a learning **outcome** that **reflects** specifically enough how chemistry as a particular discipline reaches goal 13 in this course. The suggested measurement tool relates more to goal 6 and the scientific method than to goal 13.

990227 - HPES 2698 Title: Survey of Dance Goals 8, 10 12 Christine Cobb **resubmitted** changes based on earlier feedback from the committee. White moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

990110 - CRJUS 1500/H Title: Introduction to Criminal Justice Goals 10, 11, 12 GEC considered the resubmission of LO's based on the above commentary, and noted the definite improvement. However, it continues to have some concerns:

- 1) There are no learning outcomes that refer to goals 2 and 3, yet the department continues to list them as goals for this course.

- 2) LO1 talks about dispelling myths. There is a student member on this committee who has taken the course and did not experience any teaching of myths. Is the LO intended to indicate that the student will **learn** about the myths as well?
- 3) LO5 – this LO emphasizes the multiple international influences, but there needs to be a stronger statement that the student will also know about the historical and cultural foundations of the American criminal justice system. Goal 11 calls for a development of institutions over time.
- 4) LO6 – the committee would like to have a stronger statement about the diversity issues and about the breadth of coverage.

**990475 – HIST 4808, Oral Communication in History, OCL.** Sarro raised a question about how this course would function as a one credit course. Jenkins explained that it required the student to take an upper division course in history, and to use material from that course for oral assignments in the 4808 course. Although it was for one credit only, it fulfilled the overall requirements associated with an oral communication intensive course. Mosca moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to certify the course. Motion passed.

**990474 – MUSAC 4804, Applied Composition, CA.** The committee felt that the proposal covered what was required for a capstone course. White moved, Riley seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 2/23/04**

ABSENT: Awad, Crist, Kasuganti, Mosca, Riley, Sracic

990476 – GEOL 3706, Geology of Economic Mineral Deposits, OCI. Jenkins stated that Dan O'Neill had reviewed the course and approved of its certification. The committee agreed that it needed to have a statement on the syllabus about the course fulfilling the oral communication intensive general education requirement. Gergits moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

990477 – GEOL 4804, Ground Water, CT. Jenkins stated that Tom Shipka had reviewed the course and approved of its certification. The committee agreed that it needed to have a statement on the syllabus about the course satisfying the critical thinking intensive general education requirement. Munro moved, White seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

### DISCUSSION OF LEARNING OUTCOMES

AMER 2601 as part of the Societies and Institutions domain – Sherry Linkon had returned the learning outcomes for this course with the domain goals indicated for each one, as the committee had requested. Lovelace-Cameron moved, Hiznay seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Theater courses – Jenkins explained that he and Frank had worked with Alan Viehrneyer to change the original goal of the theater courses from goal 12 to goal 10, but that he had not made the appropriate change on the original form. The only concern that the GEC had regarding the various courses submitted was about the LO that expressed coverage of multiple cultures did not indicate clearly enough that there would be some areas covered beyond the U.S. and Western Europe. The GEC approved the courses, except for THTR 2690 with the proviso that there needed to be a clearer statement about world coverage.

THTR 1512 – White moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

THTR 1560 – Sarro moved, White seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

THTR 1590 – Sweeney moved, Munro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

THTR 4860 – White moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

THTR 2690 – the committee decided to return the course because it did not have an LO that expressed goal 10.

# GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 3/1/04

Absent: Awad, Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron, Mosca, Sweeney

The committee considered the following courses for inclusion in the general education program –

Learning outcomes -- for Criminal Justice (sent by e-mail). The committee reviewed the resubmitted learning outcomes from Jim Conser, and found them acceptable. Crist moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Regular courses –

990478 -- ART 2692 (Critical Thinking). The committee reviewed Tom Shipka's comments on the application. They agreed that the syllabus needed to include a statement about meeting the critical thinking requirement, and that the answers to questions 5)a and 6 did not need to be made. The committee believed that there was sufficient information on the assignments and the critical thinking skills required. White moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to certify pending the submission of a completed syllabus.

990479 -- I-IPES 1500 (Personal and Social Responsibility). Jenkins indicated that the course has not cleared the dean's curriculum committee in Health and Human Services, but he wanted to get some feedback from the committee. There was concern expressed about it being a one-credit course and about the mechanical problem of checking on the completion of two additional physical activity courses. It was also noted that courses in Art, Music and Theater that involved performance were not given credit; rather courses that taught students how to appreciate the artistic production did count toward general education.

990480 -- COMST 2610 (Selected Topics). There was no syllabus submitted with this course. In addition, it did not appear to use goal 1 regarding speaking as a central goal because it was not explained under the criteria section. Furthermore, the criteria and narrative sections were intermingled, and needed appropriate separation.

# **GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 3/22/04 revised 4/8/04**

Absent: Awad, Kasuganti, Mosca, Sarro, Sracic

Jenkins discussed the need for more meeting time. After examining Friday afternoon, he indicated that he would try to stretch the Monday afternoon 2 PM meeting to 4 PM for a few weeks.

## **BASIC SKILLS**

COMST 1545 Title: Communication Theory and Practice

COMST 1545H Title: Honors Communication Theory and Practice

December 4 meeting – sent back both courses to Carey Horvath to examine Senate criteria. On 1/8/04 Horvath sent new LO's which have the same language, but added on is a list of topics corresponding to each goal. Jenkins indicated that these topics covered the criteria, and were to part of the departmental assessment of the course. Lovelace-Cameron moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

## **NATURAL SCIENCE**

CHEM 1500, CHEM 1505, CHEM 1506, CHEM 1515, CHEM 1516

The committee had previously asked the Chemistry Department to indicate more clearly what chemistry contributed to a scientific knowledge of the world in each of the courses. Howard Mettee had resubmitted revised learning outcomes. White moved, Hiznay seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GEOG 1503/H Title: Physical Geography

On 1/29/04 Craig Campbell, chair of the Geography Department, had resubmitted the learning outcomes in response to the earlier concerns of the GEC. The committee had no questions regarding the changes. Gergits moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GEOG 2630/H Title: Weather

On 1/29/04 Craig Campbell, chair of the Geography Department, had resubmitted the learning outcomes in response to the earlier concerns of the GEC. The committee had no questions regarding the changes. Lovelace-Cameron moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GEOL 1504 Title: The Dynamic Earth

The committee accepted learning outcomes 1, 2 and 4, but thought that LO3 did not express goal 6 satisfactorily – that the student understands the scientific method. In this instance, the student would be able to repeat scientific evidence available, but not necessarily explain the scientific method. The committee decided to return the proposal for revision.

GEOL 1510 Title: Geology of National Parks

After some discussion, Crist moved and Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GEOL 2602 Title: Introduction to Oceanography

The committee accepted learning outcomes 1, 2 and 4, but not 3. LO3 did not directly relate to goal 6 – that the student understands the scientific method. Rather it expects the student to be able to explain causal relationships. The committee decided to return the proposal for revision.

All of the physics courses considered below need a tie indicated in parentheses between a specific learning outcome and the general education goals established for the course.

PHYS 1500 Title: Conceptual Physics

Course covers goals 6 and 13, but Lo 3 refers to goal 7.

PHYS 2608 Title: Sound

Course covers goals 6, 7, and 13, but none of the learning outcomes seems to fit goal 7.

ASTRO 1504 Title: Descriptive Astronomy

Course covers goals 7 and 13. Committee would like department to consider wording of LO's 2 and 3. For instance, how measurable is the task of "developing a sense of perspective?" The verb, "see," in LO 3 is not usually listed in Bloom's Taxonomy; perhaps "identify the impact that astronomical knowledge has had on society" would be a better way of phrasing it.

The following physics courses need to distinguish the learning outcomes of sequence courses, such as 1501/1502, 2601/2602, 2610/2611 rather than group them together.

PHYS 1501L, 1502L, 2610L, 2611L General Education substitute laboratory courses

These learning outcomes are ok as submitted.

PHYS 1501/1502 Title: Fundamentals of Physics I, II



Course covers goals 6, 7, 13, and needs to correlate the LO's with the goals.

PHYS 260112602 Title: General Physics for Applied Medical Studies I, II

Course covers goals 6, 7, 13, but no learning outcome seems to cover goal 7.

PHYS 261012611 Title: General Physics I, II

Course covers goals 6, 7, 13, and there are learning outcomes for each, but the use of the word, "exploit," in LO3 raises a question about the measurability of that particular goal. Please review the possibility of assessing how well a student exploits natural laws for the benefit of society.

PHYS 2607 Title: Physical Science for Early and Middle Childhood Education

Course covers goals 6, 7, 13, but there is no learning outcome for goal 7.

#### ARTISTIC AND LITERARY PERSPECTIVES

English Department – Jim Schramer had resubmitted<sup>2631</sup> the learning outcomes for the following courses: ENGL 1590, 2610, 2617, 2618, 2665, and requested the following goal changes: delete goals 7&9 for 1590 and retain goals 8 and 4; delete goal 7 for 2665 and add goal 12. 1590 – Crist moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed. 2610 – Crist moved, Hiznay seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed. 2617 – White moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed. 2618 – Riley moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed. 2665 – Crist moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed. *2631 - FR moved, MC second. Passed*

Theater – Frank Castronovo resubmitted the learning outcomes for the following theater courses: 1512, 1560, 1590, 2690, 4860, and 4891. The major concern of the committee had been about the inclusion of world drama in the learning outcomes. His resubmission addressed this concern. White moved, Riley seconded a motion, to approve all of the courses and their learning outcomes. Motion passed.

#### SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS

GEOG 2626/H Title: World Geography

On 1/29/04 Craig Campbell resubmitted learning outcomes in response to concerns raised by the committee at its January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. The only problem the committee commented on was LO#3, which, as stated, was not a learning outcome. In particular, the committee wished the department to change the LO to a specific writing or researching outcome, or to drop the LO completely. Sweeney moved, White seconded, a motion to approve subject to deletion of the L03, or to its resubmission of new wording. Motion passed.

990016- GEOG 2640 Title: Human Geography

On 1/29/04 Craig Campbell resubmitted learning outcomes in response to concerns raised by the committee at its January 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. The only problem the committee commented on was LO#7, which, as stated, was not a learning outcome. In particular, the committee wished the department to change the LO to "the student should be able to prepare" or to drop the LO completely.

#### SELECTED TOPICS

990051 – SPED 2630 **Title:** Individuals with Exceptionalities in Society. **Goals 9, 11, 12**  
The committee agreed that each of the three goals related more to the goals of the special education program than it did to the goals of general education. Riley commented that there had been quite a bit of debate over this course earlier, and that the original proposal had in final form argued that it would be a general education course and not a course designed for majors. She believed that these learning outcomes did not represent that proposal well. The committee agreed.

Nancy Sweeney resubmitted learning outcomes for SPED 2630. Crist moved, and Gergits seconded, a motion to approve.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 3/29/04**

Absent: Awad, Kasuganti, Mosca, Sarro

The General Education Committee considered the learning outcomes from the following courses:

HIST 1511, History of World Civilizations to 1500, SI. Jenkins explained that the new learning outcomes were in response to committee criticism of the use of the goal language in the learning outcomes, and to the need to indicate the difference between the two World Civilization courses. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

HIST 1512, History of World Civilizations Since 1500, SI. White moved, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to approve if the recommendation to change "will become fluent" in LO4 to "will analyze." Motion passed.

COUNS 1588, Exploring Leadership theory and Practice, PSR. The committee returned the learning outcome to the department for further review. There were specific concerns about the coverage of the goals mentioned for each LO and about the wording of a number of the goals. Jenkins will talk with departmental representatives about the proposed learning outcomes.

PSYCH 3707, The Psychology of Intimate Relationships, PSR. The committee felt that the use of the wording, "demonstrate awareness," was not measurable and set too low a standard. It returned the learning outcomes for further development.

PHIL 2609, Technology and Human Values, PSR. Lovelace-Cameron moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

PHIL 2625, Introduction to Professional Ethics, PSR. The committee did not think that the course covered goal 11, which is the core goal for the societies and institutions domain, nor did the learning outcomes express that coverage. It returned the proposal for reconsideration of which other goal the course met.

PHIL 3711, General Ethics, PSR. Lovelace moved, Munro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

PHIL 3727, Environmental Ethics, PSR. The committee did not think that the course covered the natural science area, which is goal 13, the core goal of the natural science domain. It recommended considering goal 7 as the alternative goal for this course. Also it questioned LO3 and LO5 as critical thinking LO's. Understanding, explaining, and comparing do not mean that a student is developing the skill of critical thinking.

A stronger statement of engaging the student in the development of critical thinking skills needs to be considered by the department.

RELIG 2621, Religion and Moral Issues, PSR. The committee recommends that LO3 use the verb, "analyze," rather than "compare," because it better reflects the goal of critical thinking. Also in LO 4 "appreciate" is hard to measure. Please consider using a verb from Bloom's Taxonomy. Gergits moved, Munro seconded, a motion to approve if these changes were approved. Motion passed.

RELIG 2631, Religion and the Earth, PSR. Please review the use of the verbs, "understand" and "compare" in LO's that are related to goal 3, the critical thinking goal. Those words do not directly the development of critical thinking skills.

The GEC considered the following course proposals for inclusion in a domain:

990481 – CSIS 4840, Business Systems Analysis and Design, CA. The committee was concerned that the course appeared to be a content course rather than a capstone. The fact that a student could take this course after having only one upper division course seemed to violate the notion of a capstone.

990482 – GEOL 1513, Physical Evolution of North America, CT. Jenkins announced that Singler was reviewing this course further because the Ohio Board of Regents would not approve its inclusion in the Transfer Module as an upper division course.

990483 – BIOL 4822, Introduction to Pharmacology, OCI. The committee noted that the only problem was the lack of a statement in the syllabus indicating that the course satisfied the oral communication intensive requirement. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 4/5/04**

Absent: Awad, Gergits, Kasuganti, Lovelace-Cameron

990479 – Physical Activity Core Concepts, Personal and Social Responsibility – Jenkins introduced Rick Walker, chair of the Human Performance and Exercise Science department, and Frank Bosso, also from that department, to discuss their support for this course. Bosso defended the course as one that addressed the issue of obesity in American society and the fact that lack of physical exercise was a major contributor to that condition. He believed that students who had learned about the connection between wellness and physical activity needed further encouragement to undertake some activity; this course plus the two activity courses required for general education credit would provide such an opportunity. Finally, he pointed out that his department is unique in what it has to offer, and that the committee should consider HPES' approach to health and wellness (goal 9).

There were a number of issues that arose during the conversation of the GEC with the HPES representatives:

- 1) the lack of a second goal as required by the model. It was a general consensus that the proposal did satisfy goal 9, but not a second goal. Although the department had talked about diversity and about critical thinking in its application, there was no general designation or justification for a second goal.
- 2) the coverage of content. Some committee members wanted further explanation of how the fifteen topics listed in the application could be covered in a one-credit course. After much discussion, it was agreed that the department would submit an explanation regarding this concern.
- 3) the validity of a course with more activity than content. Nancy Mosca spoke in favor of the course as presented because of the interconnection of the activities to the promotion of wellness. Paul Sracic spoke about his concern that a general education course should be composed primarily of content. There were numerous opinions expressed, but no decision made pending re-submission of the proposal and the inclusion of the requested material.
- 4) the designation of the course as a prerequisite for any activity course. Nancy Sweeney suggested the possibility of doing so as a means of making sure that students engaged in both the learning of content and some physical activity. Jenkins pointed out that there was no requirement that this be done for general education. Walker responded that he would encourage the delivery of some content in every activity course so that there would be more of a direct connection between content and the activities, but he also thought that there would be many students who wanted the opportunity to take some activity courses only. Josh Hiznay confirmed that he was interested in taking a tennis course only.
- 5) the administration of tracking a single credit course with two activity courses probably taken at some other time. Teri Riley raised a question about how well

this tracking could be accomplished. She noted that there were complaints about the difficulty of administering the present general education requirements. Jenkins proposed that advisors be contacted by the next meeting regarding this concern.

Because a quorum was lost, the GEC recessed until next Monday at 2 PM.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 4/12/04**

ABSENT: Awad, Kasuganti, Mosca, Sarro

HPES 1500 – Jenkins explained that he had contacted Marie Cullen regarding the ability to track the completion of two activity courses after the student had taken the initial course. She was prepared to undertake the tracking through the degree audit system, which should be implemented next spring semester. Meanwhile, Nancy Mosca had talked with Jody Patrick, who did not respond to the problem presented, but instead suggested that there should be a representative on the General Education Committee. Committee members generally favored extending an invitation to attend, but noted that the representative should not have a vote, which would require action by the Academic Senate. Jenkins pointed out that much of the committee work would not be relevant to the advisors. White moved, Crist seconded, a motion to extend an invitation to the advisors to select a representative to attend the GEC meetings as an invited guest. The representative would receive an agenda, and be able to decide whether there was a need to attend. The motion passed.

990385 – TEMC 3702, Characteristics of Early Adolescents and Implications for Curriculum and Instruction, WI. Jenkins noted that it had lacked more than one writing exercise, but now fulfilled the requirements. The distribution of points based on writing assignments was also now clear. Gergits moved, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Learning outcomes –

FNUTR 1551 – Jeanine Mincher had resubmitted revised learning outcomes based on committee feedback. Lovelace-Cameron moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Philosophy and Religious Studies -- Tess Tessier had asked if individual instructors for the same course could submit different means of assessment. Jenkins indicated that he thought it would be ok, as long as the department had an appropriate means of assessing the course overall. The Committee decided to encourage P&RS to submit assessment plans that include variations for individual professors within the same course. The intention is to see how well that would work once we get the plan. The committee also agreed to permit the use of "appreciation" in a learning outcome, and to wait until it could see the assessment plan before judging whether appreciation could be assessed.

PHIL 2600 -- renumber the LO's because there are two number 1's. The new LO6 does not really speak to goal 11, and it needs a fuller statement of its commitment to both world diversity (goal 10) and American diversity (goal 12).

PHIL 2619 – Michael Crist moved, Nancy White seconded, a motion to approve. Motion

passed by the committee.

PHIL 2630 -- LO1 and 3 have writing or speaking as a goal (1), but the language does not suggest that the student is achieving either one. Also there is no language suggesting that the student is achieving goal 2, the research goal.

RELIG 2605 -- LO1, 5 and 6 list goal 1, but the stated learning outcomes do not include either writing or speaking as an outcome for the student. Please note that you do not have to include goal 1, but, if you do, then the LO should speak directly to what you want the student to achieve in writing or speaking. LO4 is confusing. It is not clear to the committee what the reference to "themes and concepts articulated by them" means.

HMEC 3780 – Virginia Draa had resubmitted learning outcomes based on committee feedback, and also reduced the course general education goals to goals 4, 9, and 11.

Under Goal 4

- 1) LO1 and LO 2 sound much alike. Should they be combined into one?
- 2) LO4 is confusing. How much is the buying and selling of goods simply based on the price or cost and the quality of the product, as opposed to "values and ethics?"
- 3) Committee members raised questions about the how much consumer choice is based on economic considerations and how much is really related to ethics. They also wanted to know how much emphasis was placed on the development of an ethical system in the course.

Under goal 9

- 1) In LO1 the committee questions use of the term, "trickle down effect" because of its use in the field of economics -- the so-called "trickle down theory."
- 2) L02, the sentence is grammatically incorrect, and needs to be rewritten.
- 3) LO1 and LO4 are much alike, and probably should be only one LO.
- 3) The Committee wondered about the study of money, credit, and banking as a direct influence on the "moral and ethical" impact of decision making. Many committee members felt that there was knowledge of how those elements work, but not a direct connection to morality and ethics.

Under Goal 11

- 1) "Gain knowledge" implies only an accretion of knowledge from a starting point, and not the meeting of a standard.
- 2) LO2 is grammatically incorrect, and needs to be rewritten.

PSYCH 3707 – Julie Thomas and Steve Graf had resubmitted a revised list of learning outcomes. The committee liked the verb changes, but questioned the inclusion of "non-human relationships" in the course. They were not sure what that meant. The committee also felt that the LO's did not give enough of a sense of the coverage of goal 9, which calls for more than mentioned in the LO's.,



SOCIO 1500 – John White had resubmitted these learning outcomes based on earlier committee feedback. Nancy White moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. The motion passed.

ANTHRO 2602 – John White had resubmitted these revised LO's with the SOCIO 1500 course. Sweeney moved, Sracic seconded, a motion to approve. The motion passed.

MUSED 2621 – LO1 does not cover world cultures.

The General Education Committee lacked a quorum at 3 PM and adjourned until next Monday at 2 PM.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 4/19/04**

ABSENT: Awad, Gergits, Hiznay, Kasuganti, Mosca, Sracic, Sweeney

Jenkins explained that, with the work schedule of Awad and the sabbatical of Kasuganti, he would consider the 7 members present as constituting a quorum, if there were no objections. No one objected.

The committee proceeded to examine the following learning outcome proposals:

MUSHL 2616 -- there were no problems with this proposal. Crist moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

MUSHL 2617 – the committee felt that LO2 did not express explicitly the world culture component. LO4 was expressed as a writing goal, rather than as a content goal; it needed to be reworded.

MUSHL 2618 – the committee noted that LO1 was actually covering goal 12, not goal 7, and that LO4 covered goal 7 rather than goal 12. With agreement from Michael Crist that the two would be reversed, Riley moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

The next four course proposals needed to indicate any differentiation of coverage. Both LO2 and LO4 needed to refer to world if they are to cover goal 10. A question was also raised as to how LO2 and 4 different?

MUSHL 3771 – MUSHL 3772 – MUSHL 3773 – MUSHL 3774 –

RELIG 2601 – (new) There were no problems with this course. White moved, Crist seconded a motion to approve. Motion passed.

RELIG 2617 – (new) Although LO3 and LO6 do relate to goals 10 and 11, LO1, 2, 4, and 5 sound more like values and philosophy connected to the personal and social responsibility domain than to societies and institutions. Thus, they fulfill, as described, goal 4. Please examine them for rewording or a re-emphasis that brings them more closely in line with goals 10 and 11. The committee does not intend to suggest that there should not be any values and philosophy discussed; only that the emphasis should be on their relationship to the historical development of the society overall. In LO4 the word transformation is used, but it is not clear whether the word applies to personal or social transformation.

AFRST 2600 – LO1 should emphasize African cultures and also use "their" as a reference. LO5 is too long, and appears to have several learning outcomes.

AFRST 2601 – LO1 misuses "its." LO6 does not need to refer to "the rest of the world."

The committee discussed the rubric for evaluating assessment plans. Next meeting will be on Monday, April 26, 2004 at the usual time.

## GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 4/26/04

ABSENT: Awad, Kasuganti, Mosca, Munro

The committee considered the following LO reports:

GEOL 1504 – scientific method (LO3) and GEOL 2602 – scientific method (LO3)  
Jenkins reported that Charles Singler had submitted two learning outcomes as part of 1504 and 2602 that represented a better statement of the scientific method goal. Gergits moved, White seconded, a motion to approve of both courses. Motion passed.

Jenkins explained that the Biology department had submitted an assessment plan, but that the learning outcomes had not been revised as suggested by the GEC. He indicated that he would return them to Diana Fagan for resubmission.

The committee considered the following new or resubmitted course proposals:

990479 -- HPES 1500, Physical Activity Core Concepts, PSR – Frank Bosso had revised and resubmitted this course proposal. There was general agreement that the course should emphasize goal 12 as its subsidiary goal rather than goal 3, because the work for goal 3 occurred on only one day. There was much discussion of the inclusion of activity courses as part of the proposal. Sracic argued generally against the inclusion of activity courses in general education because there was not enough focus on content and analysis. Sweeney, on the other hand, cited that the previous liberal arts tradition at YSU had permitted such courses; she believed, therefore, that it was appropriate to allow them to be included again, particularly given the nature of the physical activity courses and their relationship to well-being. Some argued that, since we did not permit **Art** or Music skill courses to be included in gened, we should not permit the activity courses. Others contended that the activity courses were closer related to the objectives of physical well-being and should be included. Gergits asked why the proposal did not include any learning outcomes for the two activity courses, since the intent was for them to function as part of the proposal. It was **generally** agreed that the committee would ask Bosso to re-submit learning outcomes for the activity courses, as well as a shorthand syllabus intended to be used for all activity course, before the committee would make a judgment about the course proposal. Jenkins invited Bosso into the meeting. Much discussion ensued, with the outcome being that Bosso agreed to resubmit the proposal with goal 12 as the secondary goal, and with learning outcomes and a syllabus for the activity courses.

~~HMEC~~ <sup>MERCH</sup> 990484 – ~~HMEC~~ 3760, Visual Merchandising, CT – approved by Tom Shipka. The committee thought that this proposal was exceptional. White moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

990485 – HMEC 4876, Undergraduate Research, CA – Gergits moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Then the committee discussed the following courses: POLIT 1550, POLIT 1560, POLIT 2640. Paul Sracic had added the appropriate domain goals to each learning outcome as requested. Crist moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve the three courses. Motion passed.

The committee then considered the following courses for certification:

HPES 1500, Physical Activity Core Concepts, PSR – Jenkins passed out copies of the resubmitted proposal. He noted that the committee had requested that the department develop a second goal for the course (probably goal 12), and present sufficient evidence in the proposal that the activity courses were also meeting the goals of the domain, in particular goal 9. Gergits expressed satisfaction with the inclusion of goal 12 and with the links provided in the activity course generic syllabus to the domain goals. Crist moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to accept the proposal with the contingency that the official course proposal include 15XX as a designation for the activity courses. The motion passed with one nay and one abstention.

COMST 2610, Intercultural Communication, ST – the committee felt that there were too many goals given the oral communication orientation of the course. They wanted more explanation of how the six goals would be attained. Jenkins, in particular, raised the question of how well the course covered goal 11, the central goal of the societies and institutions domain. Gergits expressed reservations about the overly broad coverage of culture; perhaps what was needed was a narrower definition of culture and communication. The committee also expressed an interest in looking at the textbook.

Finally, the committee considered the following assessment plans –

HPES 2698 – the committee raised questions about the first assessment tool, a series of three visits by a supervisor to examine "teacher effectiveness as it relates to student learning outcomes." Gergits expressed a concern about a potential problem with the union contract. It was also felt that a supervisor's visit was not an assessment of the student learning outcome, and thus an inappropriate measure. Questions were also raised about the feedback loop because it did not include a report back to the department, and about assessments that occurred only during the summer.

COMST 1545 – the committee graded the components of the assessment plan with its rubric, and gave approval to all of the components except for the feasibility of having part-time instructors do portfolio assessment.

FNUTR 1551 – the form did not include the year or time of measurement, and the assessment tools measured only students in the major. Since this course is for all students, there should be assessment of all students. There is also a need to address how the 50 point exam will demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes. Jenkins was asked to remind the department that embedded tests are an acceptable and more direct means of measuring student achievement.

In examining the geography assessment plan for courses GEOG 1503, GEOG 2630, GEOG 2640, and GEOG 2626, the committee determined that using assessment tools in the capstone course did not suffice because the students in the four courses, many of whom would not be majors, were not assessed. Also there was no feedback loop provided as part of the assessment plan.

ECON 1501, 1502, 1503, 2610, and 2630 – the committee accepted LO6 as a newly added learning outcome for 2610. The committee praised the assessment plans for each course as models for other submissions. 1502 and 1503, however, did not have the years of assessment designated because the courses had not yet been taught. The department indicated that it would delete the courses if they had not been taught by 2006. Sweeney moved, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to approve each of the plans. Motion passed.

## GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 5/6/04

ABSENT: Kasuganti

The committee considered learning outcomes for the following revised proposals:

AFRST 2600 – White moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve this resubmitted proposal. Jenkins indicated the changes made. Motion passed.

AFRST 2601 – Jenkins explained that similar changes had been made in this proposal from Africana Studies. Lovelace-Cameron moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

COWS 1587, Introduction to Mental Health & Wellness In Contemporary Society – the committee expressed concerns about LO1 because, as written, it fits Goal 1 more than Goal 3. White pointed to missing words in LO3 as confusing and raised a question about which goals it actually met. LO5 has a grammar problem, and does not indicate an activity that would engage the student in critical thinking, Goal 3.

COWS 1588, Exploring Leadership Theory and Practice – the committee expressed serious reservations about this course. The fact that the LOs did not seem to match up with the goals was the cause of the concern. Part of the problem seemed to come from the fact that the author of the proposal was not the instructor, and the instructor was not a faculty member. There was a general conclusion that the course's continuing certifiability as a course in the Personal and Social Responsibility domain should be questioned if there was no improvement in the learning outcomes.

HSC 1568, Healthy Lifestyles – the form submitted lacked identification of goals. In addition, LO2 did not give enough information to justify a link to goal 3. LO5 was not student-centered, and the last three LOs related more to goals 1, 2, and 7 rather than the chosen goals.

MUSHL 2617 – Jenkins noted the change from goal 7 to goal 12 as the second major goal. White moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

MUSHL 2618 – Jenkins explained that the committee had approved this course at the last meeting subject to the switching of goals 7 and 12 in LO1 and L04. The committee accepted the revised proposal with the switch having been made.

The committee then discussed the following four courses: MUSHL 3771, MUSHL 3772, MUSHL 3773, MUSHL 3774. The committee had requested more delineation of the content within each course of the sequence. Sweeney moved, Mosca seconded, a motion to approve all four courses. Motion passed.

## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 8/18/04

Absent: Crist, Sracic, Sweeney

History assessment plan for both U.S. and World surveys – committee noted that there was no timeline, description of the assessment procedure, or a feedback loop.

**Sociology/Anthropology** introductory courses assessment plans – in both cases the embedded questions were not reviewed or analyzed beyond the instructor in each section. The department also needed to provide a list of the learning outcomes for each course, and a description of how they would provide a baseline for subsequent years. Finally, the department should eliminate the first assessment tool because the process described only provides information to the students; it is not an assessment tool, which the department admits.

Psychology 3755 learning outcomes – Jenkins noted that Jeff Coldren had provided a new LO 3, which included as suggested a broader range of diversity subjects covered. White motioned, Lovelace-Cameron seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Counseling 1587 learning outcomes –Karen Becker had provided rewritten learning outcomes, which were for the most acceptable, except for L03.

Human Ecology 3780 learning outcomes – for the learning outcomes under goal 9, Terry Riley raised a question about the use of "trickle down theory" as a term not recognized by most economists. She also questioned how the students applied moral and ethical principles to the purchase of goods. The committee indicated that it needed more explanation of the selection of goal 4 as a major goal for the course. There were also questions raised about **LO2** (it covers material not related to goal 9), and L03, which seems to be a repeat of **LO1**. Goal 11 – **LO5** is incorrectly numbered, and seems to duplicate the **LO1**.

Geography assessment plans for 1503,2626,2630, and 2640 – each of the plans used the same tools. The standard test was checked as an assessment tool, but the department was using tests prepared by each individual instructor rather than a standardized test. The identification of peer-review as an assessment tool was also problematic because of provisions of the union contract.

# GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 9/7/04

**Absent: Riley, Sracic, Sweeney**

## **Learning Outcomes –**

Psychology 3707 – Jenkins explained that the two earlier objections to the learning outcomes were that the first LO referred to "non-human relationships" and that the LO related to goal 12 was not stated broadly enough. He noted that Julie Thomas had explained that the instructors wished to leave in "non-human relationships" because it referred to animals and their function as pets. Nancy White did not like the open-endedness of the phrase, nor did she think that such relationships were intimate. Crist moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed 8 to 1.

Biology 1505 – the GEC had expressed concern earlier that there was no learning outcome related to goal 6 as promised in the original course proposal. The department had the option of adopting or dropping goal 6, and chose to include a new learning outcome that fulfilled goal 6. Lovelace-Cameron moved, White seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Biology 1551 – the GEC had noted the failure of the early submission to include goals 6 and 7. The department had eliminated LOs 9 through 12, and adopted new LOs 9 and 10 that fulfilled goals 6 and 7. Crist moved, Feld seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Biology 3718 – an early review had noted that the department was not fulfilling all of the goals originally proposed in the course proposal. In examining the new list of LOs, the GEC found that the department had included all of the goals, but had used the actual general education goal statements rather than LOs tailored to the course content. GEC decided to return the proposal.

## **Assessment plans –**

Biology 1505 – Lovelace-Cameron moved, Gergits seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Biology 1551 – There were two problems noted by the committee: 1) the student survey was misnamed and actually tested students, and 2) the use of only two embedded questions made the committee wonder if all learning outcomes were covered. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a provisional motion to approve subject to the above changes. Motion passed.

Jenkins related that there were other biology courses that had not been submitted. He would make the biology department aware of this need.



Math 2623 and 2625 – Jenkins explained that these two courses were the same except that the four credit 2625 had added on a statistic component for the nursing students. White pointed out that there really was not a use of an expert jury as a third assessment tool. Rather it was a faculty committee used to judge the second assessment tool, portfolios. Gergits moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve pending the rewording of the proposal to cover White's objection. Motion passed.

Psychology 3758 – the committee agreed that the proposal was complete. Gergits moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

### **General Education Proposals –**

**990482** - GEOL 3713, Physical Evolution of North America, CT. Jenkins explained that this course had not been submitted to the GEC, but it was a gened course changing from 15xx status to upper division status. The only change was in the prerequisite, a change from 1504 and 1505 to 1505 or its equivalent. Since GEC had passed a resolution requiring that each upper division general education course must have a required lower division gened course as a prerequisite, he had asked Charles Singler about the change and the use of an equivalent. Singler explained that they had dropped 1504 except for certain students, who would be allowed to take that course as part of their program requirements. The committee agreed that this change was appropriate.

**990488** – Art 5881, Twentieth Century Art to 1960, WI. Although Jay Gordon had approved of this proposal, Gergits noted that the syllabus lacked any information on writing, and the proposal did not appear to have a drafting and editing process. The committee agreed to return the proposal.

**990487** – Art 3783, History of Graphic Design, WI. Jay Gordon had approve the proposal, and the committee agreed. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

**990486** – Art 3783, History of Graphic Design, CT. Tom Shipka had discerned a lack of description of the actual critical thinking skills in question 5A, and on the syllabus. Sarro asked what kind of answers were sought by the committee; Jenkins noted that the criteria section included in the course proposal listed the critical thinking skills. These criteria had passed the Academic Senate as an additional definition of what was required. It was agreed to return the course.

**990489** – Art 3780, African Art, Artistic and Literary Perspectives. The committee found no problems with this course proposal. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a motion to certify. Motion passed.

**990480** – Comm 2610, Intercultural Communications, Selected Topics. Jenkins explained that the committee had questioned early versions of this proposal and the number of goals it sought to fulfill. Larry Hugenberg had attempted to indicate that goals

10 and 11 were subordinate goals, and that goal 12 was more central. White moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES 9-13-04**

ABSENT: Feld, Kasuganti, Sarro, Sweeney

Critical Thinking Intensive -

990482 – GEOL 3713, Physical Evolution of North America

Shipka raised a question about just how much critical thinking counts as a percentage of the grade because of the statement counting critical thinking as 35% of course grade, not including exams. He was also concerned about the teaching of creationism in the classroom. The committee did not believe that the critical thinking component was less than required, nor did it believe that creationism could not be discussed in this class which considers the evolution of the earth as a part of its scientific approach to the subject matter. Munro moved, White seconded, a motion to certify the course as critical thinking intensive. Motion passed.

Assessment Plans -

CRJUS 1500 – One of the problems is the use of student grades. It is not clear to the committee how the student grades, if done independently by the instructor, would assess learning outcome 1. A question that arose about Assessment Tool 1 involved how a student evaluation form could measure student comprehension of subject matter. The evaluation should check rather on whether the student believes that the learning outcomes have been accomplished within the course, not whether the student is satisfied. Several committee members raised questions about the selection of students under assessment tool 2. The sampling method should be consistent across sections, not all students in smaller sections and a random sample in large sections.

HSC 1568 – Riley moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve the learning outcomes. Motion passed. After some discussion, Crist moved, Scracic seconded, a motion to approve the assessment plan. Motion passed. Jenkins pointed out that LO1 satisfies goal 9 rather than 12, but it was not considered necessary to correct that detail.

PSYCH 1560 – the committee wanted the department to re-examine its scoring techniques for assessment tools 2 and 3. In each instance, it appears that the individual instructor grades the essays, rather than a team of faculty or some other committee. There is also a need to have a common rubric for questions prepared for use in each section sampled. The committee also wanted the department to consider whether assessment tools 2 and 3 cover enough of the learning outcome. In particular, Tool 2 asks the student to examine current events and how the psychological impact might affect the student's quality of life, but LO2 calls for the student to assess the impact of psychological processes on "the individual, family, and community." Tool 3 asks the student to describe one psychological theory and the implications for the individual, but LO3 calls for developing knowledge about multiple theories "as they relate to individual and family development."

# GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

## MINUTES 9/27/04

ABSENT: Feld, Lovelace-Cameron, Sracic, Sweeney

### **Critical Thinking**

COMST 3799, Designing Communication Research – syllabus needs statement about CT requirement, a listing of critical thinking under course goals, and a section on critical thinking assignments. The proposal also had incorrectly numbered the questions. The proposal was returned for refinement.

### **Learning Outcomes**

A&S 2690, Identities and Differences Goals 3, 4, 10, 12 – the committee expressed concern about the inclusion of goals 10 and 12 in the learning outcomes. It was felt that the language provided did not explicitly relate how diversity either in the world or in America was covered in the course. Also LO3 repeats the word, "sources," twice.

COUNS 1587, Introduction to Mental Health & Wellness in Contemporary Society Goals 3, 9, 12 -- Jenkins explained that the committee had seen these LOs several times. After the most recent review, the committee was concerned about LO3 and the use of "confer", and also the lack of sufficient relationship to goal 12 in that LO. Karen Becker had changed "confer" to "agree with," which the committee accepted. Jenkins noted that Becker expressed difficulty with including more explicit wording relating to goal 12 in that LO. White felt that the LOs had the student deal only with their individual differences and not with societal differences. The committee is recommending that Becker add on another goal to express what is in goal 12.

GEOL 1505, Physical Geology Goals 6, 7, 13 – Crist moved, Munro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

GEOL 1514, Life of the Geologic Past Goals 6, 7, 13 – LO3 does not identify the scientific method clearly. Sarro moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve pending the department submitting the suggested change regarding the scientific method.

GEOL 2611, Geology for Engineers Goals 6, 7, 13 – In LO1 "be familiar with" is too vaguely worded to be assessed. In LO4 the word "appreciate" is also too vague. The committee recommends that the department consult with Bloom's taxonomy for a choice of words. Riley moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve pending resubmission of a reworded proposal. Motion passed.

ENST 1500, Introduction to Environmental Science Goals, 6, 7, 13 – the committee was not sure how Goal 2 fit into L04. They recommended either a change of wording to reflect goal 2, or dropping the goal. Munro moved, Riley seconded, a motion to approve pending the change in L04. Motion passed.

### **Assessment Plans**

ART 1541, 1542, Survey of Art History I, II – the proposal has multiple measures and years, but a question arose about the adequacy of the number of measures used? The committee agreed that there should be at least one more assessment tool, such as a student evaluation. Jenkins also indicated that the feedback loop needed to include at least a report to the department. Sarro agreed to amend the proposal and resubmit.

SOCIO 3745, Sociology of Health, Wellness, and Healthcare – the proposal needs to exclude the first three columns on the chart because they do not represent an assessment tool. The second assessment tool, embedded questions, should be collected and the data provided to the instructors and then the department. Answers on the embedded questions should be compared from year to year. In the last few sentences under feedback loop, the department intends to change the test rather than change either the material covered or the teaching techniques. Indeed the test may need rewording, but the results of the tests should lead generally to improvement in instructional techniques. The last sentence might be more specific about actions to be taken.

## **GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 1014104**

ABSENT: Crist, Sracic

**990490** – COMST 3799, Designing Communication Research – Dan O’Neill had returned the proposal with all of the questions correctly numbered and answered. The committee accepted the proposal, but noted that the syllabus lacked a statement about meeting the critical thinking requirement and a description of the critical thinking components in the course that meet the 30% criteria.

### **Learning Outcomes –**

History 2605, U.S. Survey I (Goals 11,12) –

History U.S. Survey II (Goals 11,12) The committee accepted the goals in general, but noted that some of the verbs used, such as "consider", "explore" and "see how" were imprecise and difficult to measure. The committee suggests the usage of verbs such as those in Bloom's taxonomy.

Astronomy 1504, Descriptive Astronomy ( Goals 6, 7, 13) – The committee felt that the LO2 wording, "develop a sense of perspective," posed problems in measurement, and suggested that employment of verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy would be more usable. It also suggested that LO3 be divided into two learning outcomes, one for goal 7 and one for goal 13 because they are more than likely not measurable by the same means.

Physics 1500, Conceptual Physics (Goals 6, 7, 13) – the committee thought that LO3 should be divided into two learning outcomes, one for goal 13 and one for goal 7.

Physics 150111502, Fundamentals of Physics I, II (Goals 6, 7, 13) – LO2 does not connect the material regarding the development of technology to its impact on society. Perhaps there should be separate learning outcomes developed from LO2.

Physics 260112602, General Physics for Applied Medical Studies (Goals 6, 7,13) – LO3 was not very clear to most of the members of the committee,

particularly the latter portion of the sentence. There needs to be some clarification. LO1, on the other hand, 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).

Physics 2607, Physical Science for Early and Middle Childhood (Goals 6, 7,13) – LO1 does not relate to goal 7.

Physics 2608, Sound (Goals 6,7,13) – Goal 7 is not really covered. The chair should make the department aware that it does not have to include goal 7. The department should forward a letter indicating its desire to drop goal 7, though. Gergits moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve the three learning outcomes if the department agreed to drop goal 7.

Physics 261012611, General Physics I, II (Goals 6,7,13) – LO3 needs a clearer statement about the effect on society.

Physics 1501L/1502L/2610L/2611L (Goal 6) — There was some discussion of the fact that the courses were on two different levels. Sherri Lovelace-Cameron, however, indicated that these courses were similar in content, but were numbered differently because the student body was not the same for each of the courses. Munro moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

### **Assessment Plans –**

HPES 2698, Survey of Dance – Jenkins explained that the committee had raised questions about the first assessment tool, a series of three visits by a supervisor to examine "teacher effectiveness as it relates to student learning outcomes." Gergits had expressed a concern about a potential problem with the union contract. It was also felt that a supervisor's visit was not an assessment of the student learning outcome, and thus an inappropriate measure. Questions were also raised about the feedback loop because it did not include a report back to the department, and about the timing of the assessment -- only during the summer. Christine Cobb had returned the proposal with the elimination of the supervisor visits, an expansion of the feedback loop and an inclusion of assessment in the fall and spring

semesters. Although the committee was concerned about how much work this assessment package demanded, White moved, Sarro seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

History 1511, History of World Civilizations to 1500 –  
History 1512, History of World Civilizations after 1500 –  
History 2605, U.S. Survey I –  
History 2606, U.S. Survey II -- since each of the courses had the same assessment plan, the committee considered them as a whole. The first objection arose over the use of the standardized Praxis exam as an assessment tool for students taking the survey classes. The students sampled – upper-division students who were majoring in teacher education for the social studies area – were not an appropriate sample. There was also much discussion of the fact that individual instructors constructed and graded different types of testing used for assessment purposes. There did not appear to be a common rubric by which to judge achievement of the learning outcomes, nor was the selection of 1 "A" assignment and 1 "C" assignment considered an adequate random sample of students taking the survey courses. Finally, there was a concern that the instructors were taking on more work than necessary, particularly in requiring daily written assignments.

Psychology 1560, General Psychology – the committee raised questions about the use of only one assessment tool per learning outcome. Patricia Sarro pointed out that she had been asked to use multiple assessment tools on more than one learning outcome. Jenkins talked about a conversation he and Sharon Stringer had with the North Central Association regarding multiples measures. They had no strict rules. Teresa Riley interjected that the economic assessment plans had mostly one assessment tool per learning outcome. Jenkins concluded that there was a need to examine Psychology 1560, the Art 1541, 1542 proposals, Psychology 3758, and Psychology 3755 at next week's meeting, and to discuss how many assessment tools were needed per learning outcome. There was a need for the committee to establish consistency in regard to this issue.

Next Meeting – Monday, October 11, 2 PM.



## GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 10/11/04

ABSENT: Munro

HMEC 3780 -- **Jenkins** introduced Janice Elias from Human **Ecology**, who had come to answer questions about the HMEC 3780 learning outcomes. Elias had discussed with Virginia Draa the concerns of the committee from its August meeting, and had revised the proposal based on that conversation, as well as departmental concerns about accreditation. She provided copies for the committee members.

**Jenkins** asked about the use of the trickle down theory, which had been eliminated from the new list of learning outcomes. Elias responded that the term had arisen from Diffusion Theory, not from economics, and that the department chose to use Diffusion Theory in the learning outcomes. The committee then discussed with Elias the justification for the inclusion of goal 4 in a course on consumer buying. She elaborated on the impact that choices have on the welfare of the society – overpackaging and the environment, auto emissions and gas consumption, consumer debt and the family, etc. Elias contended that many of these areas involved "rational choices" which related to morality and ethics. White noted that **LO3** under Goal 4 related to goal 12, not goal 4, and Elias agreed to drop that learning outcome. There were also complaints raised about the duplication of learning outcomes under different goals. The committee advised **Elias** to make a list of learning outcomes and add in parentheses the **goal(s)** covered. Finally, the committee was concerned about **LO4** under Goal 9. It seemed to emphasize principles of financial management rather than application to the individual, family and global community. Elias decided to examine **LO1** and **LO4** under Goal 9 to reduce duplication and to clarify the relation to Goal 9. Elias was invited to resubmit the proposal, and thanked the committee for its work.

Multiple Measures -- Jenkins raised a question about the use of multiple measures and committee application of that principle to proposals. He noted that GEC had produced an apparent contradiction between its earlier acceptance of the Economics assessment plan and the Art plan. Meanwhile, we had also begun considering assessment plans for three psychology courses. That morning he chose to call Diane Nyhammer of the Higher Learning Commission, who was serving as the YSU contact for the NCA visit in 2007-08. She made the following comment:

We do not have any specific rules as to how many or what kinds of measures should be used for specific outcomes. The scholarship on learning and assessment and the Commission's statement on assessment (included in the Handbook) suggest multiple measures, including direct and indirect, provide more useful and meaningful data for analyzing student learning. But the Commission does not promote prescriptive rules or

guidelines as to how many (or what types of) measures should be used.

He then called for a discussion of what should be the GEC approach to multiple measures and the proposals from Psychology, Art and Economics. The committee generally agreed that we should not impose a particular number of measures for each learning outcome, but that there should be the use of multiple measures in the overall plan. Sweeney moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to permit as few as one assessment tool for each learning outcome. Motion passed.

PSYCH 1560, General Psychology – Nancy ~~Sweeney~~<sup>White</sup> brought a revised copy of the assessment plan for this course. She had left out the timing of the assessment on the chart, but had indicated the timing in the description of the assessment tools. There was also no clear statement indicating that the department reviewed the findings of the General Education Coordinator. Gergits moved, Crist seconded, a motion to approve pending submission of a corrected proposal (indication of timing on the chart, and addition of department review to the feedback loop).

PSYCH 1555, Child Development – **Jenkins** pointed out the need to demonstrate how the department is involved in the feedback loop. Gergits commented that assessment tool 3 did not, as suggested, follow the pattern of the previous assessment tools, but the description was the same as the previous assessment tool segments. Since AT3 involved a critical analysis of a research paper rather than a test, there was a need to develop a rubric and to select papers from among those written. Nancy White indicated that she would return the proposal for further review and revision.

PSYCH 1558, **Lifespan** Development – **Jenkins** asked if the committee wanted to reconsider anything about this already accepted proposal. He had asked the committee to reconsider this proposal in light of the problem with multiple measures. The only area for change was an additional statement in the feedback loop that provides for departmental review. Nancy White agreed to revise, and the committee agreed to maintain its approval of the proposal.

ART 1541, Survey of Art History I -- ART 1542, Survey of Art History II --  
These proposals had multiple measures and years, but a question had arisen in an earlier review about the adequacy of the number of measures used. In light of the decision on multiple measures, it was decided that no changes were needed in that area. **Jenkins** indicated, though, that the feedback loop still needed to include at least a report to the department. Sarro agreed to amend the proposal and resubmit.

**THERE WILL BE NO MEETING NEXT MONDAY, OCTOBER 18<sup>TH</sup>,  
BECAUSE OF THE VISIT OF THOMAS PATTERSON, THE  
FRESHMAN READERS DIALOGUE SPEAKER.**

# GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 10125104

ABSENT: Feld, Munro, Sarro, Sracic

**A&S 2600** – Jenkins passed out a letter from Bob Bolla, Dean of **A&S**, regarding the lack of progress on writing learning outcomes and an assessment plan for this course. He had indicated that the science faculty were not satisfied with the way this course was **working**, and that they were in the process of revising it. The committee agreed to permit the science departments to proceed without submitting learning outcomes or an assessment plan, but the committee wanted a report within six months on progress made.

## ASSESSMENT PLANS

**PSYCH 1560** – Nancy White submitted a proposal form with the appropriate dates and a feedback loop that included the department. Crist moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

**Psych 3755** – Jeff Coldren had resubmitted an assessment plan that now included the department in the feedback loop and a better description of tool #3 with a rubric for assessing a written paper. Crist moved, Sweeney seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

Discussion of COUNS 1588, Exploring Leadership: Theory and Practice – **Jenkins** explained that the unfortunate passing away of Dr. Jan Gill-Wigal had created a gap regarding that course. He noted that Marty Manning was now the teacher – he had recently become an instructor within the department of Counseling – and was replacing Gill-Wigal as the one chiefly responsible for the course. The committee agreed that Jenkins should discuss the learning outcome and assessment questions relating to this course that had developed with the previous submission from Dr. Gill-Wigal.

# GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

## MINUTES 11/8/04

**ABSENT: Feld, Riley, Sracic, White**

### **Assessment plans**

PSYCH 3707 – Julie Thomas had submitted the assessment plan for this course. Patricia Sarro raised a question about assessment tool #3, which was identified as an essay question on the matrix. Since the "question" called for the student to express what changes in thinking and attitude had occurred as a result of the class, Sarro did not think that it qualified as an essay question. Rather she considered it a student survey, and wondered how a rubric could be designed to grade the response. Committee members concurred with Sarro's analysis.

For assessment tools 1 & 2, the committee raised a question about the selection of 3 of 6 sections of the class. GEC members thought that it was better to randomly select a limited number of students from each class because that would provide a better overall coverage. There was also concern raised about assessment tool 1 and the designation of the pretest-posttest as a "free writing" exercise that was self-designed. There did not appear to be any standardization of the test, perhaps making it difficult to design a rubric as precise as the one mentioned. Jenkins indicated that he would return the proposal for further review.

THTR 1590 and 2690 – Jenkins passed out the copies of these assessment plans, and asked the committee to review them for the next meeting.

### **Assessment reporting form**

Jenkins passed out a form he had worked on in conjunction with Sharon Stringer, the Director of Assessment, which would serve as the department reporting form for general education assessment. He asked committee members for feedback, which included the following: 1) several areas needed word changes to indicate that the form was for gened assessment, and not program assessment; 2) inclusion of Jenkins' email address; 3) numbering of each question; 4) rewriting of question 1 to include a reference to the previously submitted assessment plan and to ask why any changes were made; 5) several minor changes in question 2 that relate to the structure of the sentence; 6) addition of another question – What additional resources are needed to improve the assessment results from this course? Finally, there were many concerns expressed about providing documentation, about the amount required, and about the specific items to be included. Jenkins indicated that he would talk with Sharon Stringer about documentation.

**Next meeting will be Monday, November 15, at 2 PM.**

# GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

## MINUTES 11/15/04

ABSENT: Lovelace-Cameron, Kasuganti, Sarro, Sweeney

### ASSESSMENT PLANS

THTR **1590** – submitted by Frank Castronovo. GEC had the following concerns:

- 1) Assessment tool #1 was identified as a portfolio, but it is only one written film critique. It is appropriate to have a commonly assigned paper as an assessment tool and to designate it as such. There is also no indication that the instructors will create a commonly accepted standard for the paper and a common rubric. Finally, there is a need to indicate what kind of sample must be taken to properly represent the range of students in the classes.
- 2) Assessment tool #2 appears to have two objectives –judging the knowledge of the student and finding out the feelings of the student regarding the course. Is this a student survey or another form of student evaluation?
- 3) Assessment tool #3 does not appear to have a commonly developed group of questions that will enable the department to determine the overall effectiveness of the course. Although individual instructors should use these for their individual classes, there is a need to look at the results overall. Use the term, embedded, for these questions.

Overall, the assessors did not appear to be developing overall standards, but relying more on the individual instructor, and there was no mention made of developing baselines. Finally, there is a need to bring the results back to the entire department.

THTR **2690** – submitted by Frank Castronovo. GEC had the following concerns:

- 1) Assessment tool #1 should have a post-test that is very similar to the pre-test rather than a unit exam. Test questions should not just "echo" the pre-test.
- 2) Assessment tool #2 has two objectives just as with assessment tool #2 for THTR 1590. Please refer to that commentary. There is a reference to the "history of film," but that is not the subject of this course.
- 3) Assessment tool #3 is not a portfolio, but a paper.
- 4) There are no indications of the development of common standards for each of the assessment tools, means of gathering the data, the use of rubrics, or the development of baselines, all points of reference in the general education assessment plan report form. Finally, assessment must extend beyond the individual instructor and incorporate the department as a part of the feedback loop.

**YEARLY ASSESSMENT REPORT FORM** – The committee examined the draft of the annual general education assessment report form. Apart from minor editing of typos, the GEC agreed to use GenEd as the reference to general education on the report; to change Academic Unit to **Department/Program**; to include Jenkins' e-mail address after his name; to place Yes/No boxes in the middle of questions 1; to change "are being taken" to will occur in question #3

# GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES 11/22/04

**ABSENT:** Crist, Lovelace-Cameron, Riley, Sweeney

## Learning Outcomes

HMEC 3780, Consumer Economics – Jenkins reminded the committee that Jan Elias had prepared this new statement of LOs as a response to our earlier concerns. He distributed the evaluation that Teri Riley had written. After some discussion, White moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed.

## Assessment Plans

ENGL 1550, 1551, Composition I, and II – the committee offered the following comments on the proposal:

1. the department should be encouraged to use the standard form.
2. the department should provide answers to all the questions asked on the form.
3. there is a need to identify who "we" are. Is it the department at large, or a subset thereof?
4. there is only one assessment tool used for ENGL 1550. Please use multiple measures.
5. check on 25-30 student essays as to whether they are at least 10% of the sample. Also what are the criteria used to ensure randomness?
6. there is no feedback loop that includes the department.
7. separate ENGL 1550 from 1551.

SOCIO 1500, Introduction to Sociology – the committee agreed that there were concerns about the following items: 1) the statement about the 'entire roster of selection of SOCIO 1500 classes taken at random" does not clearly express how the random sample would be taken; 2) instructors can grade the pre- and post-tests, but there is a need to review the grading as well as the results; 3) the department mentions only modification of the test as a response to poor scores or inadequate survey results rather than examining components of instruction as key contributors to test improvement.

ANTHRO 2602, Introduction to Anthropology – the committee had the following concerns: 1) under Tool 1 the use of "the entire student roster of ANTHR 2602 which is part of the sample chosen" is confusing. Please identify the sample and how it is taken; 2) instructor grading is ok, but requires a check or a rubric and some sampling to see that the rubric is followed; 3) under the feedback loop there is a mention of embedded questions, but there is no previous reference; 4) also under feedback loop there is mention made of changing the test rather than changing strategies or techniques within the classroom.

THTR 1560, -- Tool 1 is a pre-test with a unit exam, but the committee agreed that it should be a post-test. Tool 2 has a problem with determining whether it is a student survey or a student evaluation, and whether it is attempting to gauge attitudes or knowledge. Tool 3 is not a portfolio. Finally, there is no mention of collecting with embedded questions over three exams, but the committee agreed that it should be a post-test. Tool 2 is not a portfolio; it is a research project. Tool 3 only asks one question as a student survey, which raises question about the thoroughness of the survey. Finally, there is no departmental involvement in the assessment.

THTR 4891, -- In the goals it says that students will "acquire familiarity," a vague description that needs to be more accurately defined. Tool 1 is a pre-test with embedded questions over three exams, but the committee agreed that it should be a post-test. Tool 2 is not a portfolio; it is a research project. Tool 3 only asks one question as a student survey, which raises question about the thoroughness of the survey. Finally, there is no departmental involvement in the assessment.



GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES 12/6/04 **Corrected 12/8/04**

ABSENT: Crist, Feld, Lovelace-Cameron, Munro, Sweeney

CRJUS 1500 – previously reviewed. Jenkins pointed out that the revised form had corrected the original problems cited by the committee: including use of student grades done by individual instructors, the sampling method, and the use of a student evaluation that checked comprehension rather than opinions. Riley moved, Kasuganti seconded, a motion to approve. Motion passed with provision that Jenkins would ask about whether the test was an objective one or whether it included essay questions that might need a rubric.

FNUTR 1551 – the committee wanted the portfolio section to elaborate on what was in the portfolio, and to mention the development of a rubric. The committee was also confused by the sampling. It appeared that all students in all sections would take the embedded question test. Was the intention, then, to survey only 10% of those tests? Finally, the goal for assessment tool #3, passage by 75% of the students, should be developed by all faculty involved, and not be a personal goal.

SOCIO 1500 -- the committee agreed that there should be a specific statement noting that data was not simply collected, but also aggregated. There was also concern expressed about the last part of the last sentence – "as the instructors become better at their job." Perhaps that statement should be excluded.

**Jenkins announced that there would be no more meetings until after New Years.** He would accumulate any new proposals or revisions, and try to have a meeting before school started. He would check on times available after January 1<sup>st</sup> and also provide a lunch.