General Education Committee

May 12, 2011 Minutes

Present: Klotz, Thomas, Canfield, Trunfio, Kelley, Hokanson, White, Van Der Karr, Latimer, Harms, Mattingly

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments** | **Action Item** |
| Minutes from 4/21/11 | Two corrections noted and minutes were approved. | Minutes approved.  |
| Current Assessment | Current assessment progressing, but some follow up needed (White, Canfield). Will send out invitations before graduation. Additional assessment scoring would be done in the summer.  | Invitations will be sent out to academic departments to gather materials before graduation.Some scoring will take place over summer. |
| Upcoming Assessment | Carol presented General Education Assessment Process draft as a potential model. It focused on three primary assessment areas: Institutional Level; Category Level; Course Level. Some concern was expressed about how the Course Level Assessment may be perceived as too intrusive. Various approaches to Course Level Assessment were discussed. It was noted that one goal of the process is to provide information and feedback for individuals teaching the course as a basis of helping them meet the course category requirement. Additional approaches included national assessment; subgroup, and forms for embedded assessment.  |  |
| Timelines for Assessment | Abby presented a calendar for a three-year assessment plan. It could be a useful tool for academic departments and individual faculty. After discussion on the various options—three, four, five, and six yea-assessments, a four-year plan was viewed as the best compromise. It was noted that some courses may not get covered, especially those taught in the fall semester. Bruce noted that the assessment process could be spread out over a longer period without compromising standards. | The GE Committee will focus on developing the four-year plan. |
| Reliability/validity; Instruments; Committees | Merle found that the essay had a low reliability among the instruments that are used for assessment. He also noted that course grades did yield reliability. Larry took the position that faculty grades were reliable and could be considered the final authority. Carol pointed out that there was strong support for embedded assessment. | The issues will be reviewed over the summer. |
| Support to those being assessed  | A recurring theme during the meeting was recognizing that the primary task of assessment is helping teachers achieve success in meeting the goals and objectives of the GE category in which they are teaching.  |   |
| Meeting Adjourned  | Abby thank everyone.  | Meeting was adjourned. |

Respectfully Submitted by Sam Kelley, September 9, 2011