General Education Committee

Draft of Minutes

December 2, 2011

Present: Kuiken, Thomas, Klotz, Schutt, Burk, Hokanson, Kelley, White

Excused: Mattingly, Forde (student member), Van Der Karr, Pickett

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments** | **Action Item** |
| I. Minutes from Nov. 18 |  | * Approved with date change of 2011
 |
| I. Chair’s Report | Spring Semester meeting schedule: Discussion of our spring scheduleNew GE Assessment Plan - status of final edits Carol working on plan:Assessment notification letter revamp – consider elements of the embedded assessment submission form & results form; review changes & comments; read for toneSeveral suggestions and discussion; in how it reads, word choice, clarity.Discussion of letter and attached forms | Members reported on tentative Spring schedules to come up with dates. So maybe Fridays at 11:30am, or maybe same time or maybe alternate. Carol Van Der Karr will finish final edits of new GE plan. Nothing to change the content of final outcome, all are grammatical or consistency issues. Letter Discussion: Quick review of the proposed letter to faculty regarding their involvement in assessment. Both Abby and Anita had investigated where it was stated that faculty are required to actively participate in the assessment process. Both were not able to find something that stated that explicitly. Committee will follow up. Decided to deal with it with a more general statement: “your participation in this process fulfils the requirement that GE courses be assed.”Other reading and grammatical changes and suggestions. eg. ‘provide’, ‘by the end of the semester’Abby Thomas suggested word choice change ‘the learning outcomes’. And also change where to submit assessment. Larry Klotz suggest delete “preferably after the assignment has been completed” Other suggestions as well. Final Form: Larry Klotz asked do we need students name and C numbers. Does Institutional Advancement office need name and C# for ongoing correlation research? research regarding correlation of course grades and GE rubic assesment. Anita will follow up and contact Carol V. and Meryl. Abby mentioed that this was the form that was used last year. Larry K. suggested what letter grades correspond to what rubric GE assesment grade. |
| III. Other | Brainstorming:Continue conversation regarding interest and feasibility of category specific rubrics | * Where does the course reflect the 5 – 7 page writing criteria? Should be places on the syllabus.
* Change title. Participation confirmation AND syllabus response form.
* Clarity of email addresses in forms. Possibly a curriculum email account.
* Date of forms at the bottom of Instrument form.

Discuss with each category as that category comes up for assessment. Maybe rough draft by committee members that asks for feedback from faculty that teaches in that area. What is faculty role in the process? Others on the committee will investigate their role in teaching and requirements and maybe the philosophy of GE on campus.  |
|  | * What do we do with all these data that we are collecting?
 | Certainly feedback to faculty members that teach in that GE. Especially if there is a more category specific rubric.  |
|  | Adjourned at 10:05 am |  |

Respectfully Submitted by Jim Hokanson December 15, 2011