

General Education Committee Meeting

12/6/2018

Ventress Hall Conference Room

Members Present: Noel Wilkin, Lee Cohen, Co-chairs; Holly Reynolds, Secretary; Danielle Ammeter, Ashley Bodie-Jones, Katie Busby, Ginny Chavis, Robert Cummings, Maurice Eftink, Rich Forgette, Kate Kellum, Stephen Monroe, Steven Skultety for Deborah Mower, James Reid, Jason Ritchie, Mindy Sutton Noss, Nancy Wiggers

Members Absent: Jon Moen, ASB representative.

Provost Wilkin thanked those who worked on the SACS report, then outlined the four reports flagged by the reviewers: the financial report; facilities; faculty credentials; and general education assessment. He mentioned that the financial report was expected given the timing of the IHL audit. Therefore, this was a very good result for the first phase of the review.

Kate Kellum said that it was how the report was written. (See attachments.) We had moved from 200 to 20,000 data points a year. We have good assessment method and use of results. It was just how we presented the information.

Maurice Eftink commented that the reviewers used the word 'consistency' several times, which is found in the Resource Manual. We used ETS test for general education assessment until 2016, which is commonly used at other universities. But, there were not generally robust use of results. We changed our perspective on general education assessment in 2015. While we are not using the same instrument across campus, we now have locally defined metrics of successful learning and better use of results.

Holly Reynolds asked about the most recent effort for data collection. Kate said that for the last three years all the general education courses were asked to submit at least one outcome. Last fall we had 21,000 data points and had 19,000 data points the previous year. She is getting good responses from the faculty for this fall.

Dean Cohen said that even though we already have lots of data, he appreciates the work of the department chairs to support general education assessment.

Katie Busby mentioned the distinction between direct and indirect measures in the report, and that the next round will need to make sure we put more emphasis on our direct measures.

Rich Forgette stated that we need to make sure we demonstrate clearly our efforts on continuous improvement.

Maurice responded that we want **local** control of instruction, assessment, and use of results. So many other universities use a school-wide national test and then ignore the results. "Where we are going...is where we should be going."

Katie pointed out to the committee that this standard recently changed, and we're among the first ones writing to the new resource manual.

Don Dyer asked about the relationship between the Focus Report and the onsite visit.

Maurice answered that we send the onsite review team our first report, the Focus Report, and the QEP about 6 weeks before their visit. The review team will probably focus more on the four findings, Focus Report, and QEP. Most of the onsite team work will be on the QEP. Other parts of our report must be evaluated again because they are federal reports. He also mentioned that this committee will probably talk with the team because of the selection of the QEP.

Bob Cummings asked how many faculty were listed on the faculty credentials finding. The answer was 15.

Rich said that the QEP effort is going well, with Communications and the Department of Art & Art History working on a marketing campaign. The art students created a poster campaign with puzzles and brain teasers. Katie said that the student focus group reacted really positively to the poster campaign.

Dean Cohen thanked the group and turned to the other agenda item, which was the review of the subcommittee recommendations from last year. (See attachment.) We want to see what kind of progress has been made and what this group might want to pursue in the spring semester.

James Reid (Mathematical Reasoning) discussed the following topics.

- Tutoring space in the library was piloted this fall as a "one-stop shop." There are some logistical problems being worked out. Stephen Monroe suggested that the Writing Center could share some best practices in assessment of tutoring effectiveness. Nancy Wiggers said that the renovated space in Johnson Commons should have tutoring space available, too.
- The permanent subcommittee should be set up.
- The pilot co-requisite program has been created between DS courses and Math 115 and 120 for those students with an ACT of 17 or 18.

Ashley Bodie-Jones (Oral Communication) discussed the following topics.

- The Department of Writing & Rhetoric did hire an additional speech instructor, so there has been an increase in capacity. Over the last five years, speech has doubled in capacity from 11 sections to 20 sections.
- There has been progress towards the creation of the Speaking Center. They are working with Facilities Planning on creating a budget estimate. Stephen Monroe thanked Ashley for her work on this project, including research on how to create and run such a center. He hoped for summer construction so that it can open by Fall 2019.
- Ashley provided a handout that gave updated numbers for number of students getting oral communication instruction. (See attachment.) The College of Liberal Arts is still the largest group of students not required to take speech.
- She pointed at the number one recommendation, which is to incorporate oral communication in the general education requirements wherever possible. Stephen said this is a problem that needs to have a solution underway soon. Holly Reynolds said she would get the College general education review committee going in January. Danielle Ammeter mentioned that BUS 271 is now part of the business

core that must be taken before students may declare their specific major. Ashley said that this Business Communications course now has more oral communication in the content.

There was not a representative of the Written Communication subcommittee present. Stephen Monroe said that the Department of Writing and Rhetoric is working with Patricia Treloar (Developmental Studies) on a co-requisite model between DS 098 and WRIT 100. Their team has consulted with other universities and is going to a conference.

As the QEP is about critical thinking, we are holding for that process to finish. Bob Cummings did make the point that analytical reasoning is a separate concept from critical thinking, and should be separated from the title of the competency.

Steven Skultety was attending the meeting on behalf of Deborah Mower (Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility). He discussed:

- The subcommittee has expanded include a few more members – Kyle Fritz (Public Policy Leadership) and Mark Ortwein (School of Education).
- They have ordered books ([Ethics Across the Curriculum: Pedagogical Perspectives](#)) for the subcommittee to read and discuss beginning in early spring.

Mindy Sutton Noss brought to the committee's attention that Student Affairs has created a self-assessment for student organization leaders that has them reflect on their growth in some of the areas that overlap with our competencies. Kate Kellum asked for that data.

Dean Cohen closed the meeting and said that we would meet several more times in early Spring semester.