General Education Committee Meeting Minutes

September 24, 2020

Members Present: Nancy Diller, Carol Van Der Karr, Bruce Mattingly, Steve Cunningham, Daniel Radus, Garrett Otto, Gregory Ketcham, Ryan Fiddler, Eunyoun Jung, Doug Armstead

Members Absent : Meche Nagel, James Hokanson, Lauren Delaubell, Pam Schroeder, Student representative (vacant)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Comments** | **Action** |
| **Approval of Minutes** | No corrections | **Approved** |
| **Election of Committee Chair** | Lauren expressed interest in being chair of the committee. Doug motioned for an election to be taken with Lauren as the candidate, Dan seconded it. Thank you Lauren for taking this on and congratulations on the universal support from the committee. | **Election held, Lauren Delaubell is the unanimous winner.** |
| **Consideration of GE6 for ECO 315** | The proposal was discussed for GE6 (Contrasting Cultures) designation, concern was expressed about the lack of specificity in curriculog/boiler plate entry. Syllabus noted as having appropriate specificity. Writing intensive status of course confirmed. Dan motioned for the course to be considered for a contingent pass, Ryan seconded. | **Unanimous vote for contingent pass, applicant will need to update the goals and learning outcomes sections on curriculog to more directly apply to this course.** |
| **Assessment Update** | Steve reported on status from last year:  Last year committee tabled assessment after many syllabi were submitted for GE1, GE4, and Writing Intensive/Information Management. New class samples will need to be made this year. Results from 2019 assessment still need to be made. |  |
| Outline of process | Steve also outlined procedure:   * Contact depts. to be assessed * Sample 1/3 of courses * All instructors required to participate (including contingent faculty) * Instructor provides syllabus, embedded assessment method * Sub committee takes three steps   + Review rubric   + Review Syllabus   + Review Assessment tool (late fall semester) * Results shared w/ committee and then departments in aggregate form as this assessment is not an evaluation of the instructor. |  |
| Comments on best practices | Carol pointed out that the committee’s use of embedded assessment tools and a living assessment rubric that is revisited leads to a much more meaningful assessment process and to **much better participation** as a result. |  |
| General questions on process | * Role of committee vs working group * Can work reviewing syllabi last year be used this year? (yes where samples overlap) * Where can rubrics be found? (moving from shares drive to teams) * Only vote that is needed and expected happens in committee meeting. |  |
|  |  | **Meeting adjourned 9:18am** |
|  |  |  |
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