

## General Education Committee Meeting: November 13, 2009

Members Present: Carol Van Der Karr, Merle Canfield, David Miller, Joy Hendrick, Donna West, Claus Schubert, Joseph Rayle, John Hartsock, Abby Thomas

Members Absent: Anita Kuiken, Bruce Mattingly, Christopher Latimer, Kelsey Baylinson

Minutes by Abby Thomas

1. Discussion of minutes from 10/30/09. A few minor typos were noted. J. Hendrick will amend. Minutes approved as amended.

### 2. Assessment of Critical Thinking

Discussion of utilization of Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) to assess critical thinking (courses under GE12 category). CLA is currently being used as a pilot with approximately 10 SUNY campuses. M. Canfield is interested in trying here and Nancy Willie-Schiff from SUNY System says we can participate. CLA would cost \$6,000 and M. Canfield indicated there is money in his budget to cover this cost. M. Canfield anticipates receiving \$1,700 from SUNY to help cover assessment costs, but we could not apply this money to the CLA because it is a pilot. The CLA would be administered to a random sample of 100 freshman and 100 seniors online in a computer lab under the supervision of a proctor. Participation in the CLA would need to be approved by the Faculty Senate. Questions arose around how the results of the information collected would be utilized. Is it okay for the data to go public? How can we secure the information on a campus level? How does the cost of this compare to our current costs of assessment? M. Canfield will send out additional information about the CLA. Committee will review the information provided and have an email discussion about how to move forward and whether we want to forward the information to Faculty Senate.

### 3. Discussion of Letter to Provost re: GE assessment issues

Letter is intended to be proactive, avoid future problems and make the Provost aware of some concerns regarding response from some faculty/departments. The message the students receive from the faculty administering the assessment seems to impact the response from the students. The letter will reflect these general concerns. J. Hendrick will share additional revisions to the letter before sending forward.

Additional suggestions to help with responses:

-Ask Provost to send letter of support with the information M. Canfield sends to those being asked to participate in assessment.

-Perhaps send something upfront to students about what they may be asked to participate in so they have a clearer understanding of the role of the assessment.

-Confirm the Provost sends a thank you to those faculty who participate in the assessment.

Discussion about upcoming assessment timeline:

Letters to those teaching the possible course being assessed should go out right away. Indicate to those teaching GE12 that we might be assessed through CLA. Better to inform them of the possibility and not do it then to inform late.

#### 4. Discussion of RRR Results from 2008

M. Canfield distributed report. Review of results brought up concern about the rate of reliability. How can we compare results if questions are different? Discussion on developing anchor questions for the future. Work to bring consistency through the training of the raters. Discussion on creating benchmarks; what do we want for our students, where are they now and how do we get there. Discussion on how grades compare to the meeting of goals and could grades give us a baseline. Does a correlation exist between grade and learning outcome? This could be very different across disciplines. Continue conversations on how we establish benchmarks.

5. Syllabi Review Sub-Committees for GE categories – to be discussed at next meeting.