

General Education Council Meeting
Tuesday, March 1, 2011

Members Present: Conrad Shumaker, Cary Voss, Jim Deitrick, Destiny Davis, Rene Crow, Roger Pully, Kondwani Phwandaphwanda, Stephanie Vanderslice, Kathy French, Lori Isom, Renee Le Beau-Ford, Kim Eskola and Charles Watson.

Members Absent: Austin Hall, Ed Powers, and Bill Friedman

Meeting called to order at 1:42 pm.

1. Approval of the minutes from December 7, 2010. Motion made by Kathy French. Second by Stephanie Vanderslice. All members in attendance approved minutes. Jim Deitrick abstained.
2. Approval of the minutes from the February 1, 2011 meeting. Motion made by Kathy French. Second by Kondwani Phwandaphwanda. Minutes were approved. Rene Crow abstained.
3. Report from the Assessment Sub Committee
 - a. Charles Watson presented an example of an assessment evaluation matrix using Philosophy as the example.
 - b. He explained how General Education course proposals will be evaluated.
 - c. Comments? Members are supportive
 - d. Guide comments? (adequate? Not adequate, etc) so there could be some consistency
 - e. “Skills gained/knowledge gained” – should have more objective measurements. “attitudes and values ” –can use more subjective measurements, e.g. survey.
 - f. No one assessment should stand alone but at least a sample across a wide range of sections lessens concerns about subjectivity?
 - g. Students would probably also comment if they didn’t feel they were learning
 - h. Each course/syllabus should have goals and objectives listed as well as types of assessments listed.
 - i. Eyes other than instructor’s eyes involved in assessment (e.g. examples/ samples of assignments evaluated by rubric).
 - j. Samples of student work should be taken/ evaluated by an outside group for each course
 - k. If each area was looked at separately (say 6 or 8 areas per year) by GE council or other outside body, we could possibly evaluate all courses in 3 years or so.
 - l. The question was raised if there was any way we could involve other faculty? Get college curriculum committees involved?
 - m. Do we already do that?
 - n. In the GE Assessment timeline, we have added the “establishment of GEC assessment budget”
 - o. Goals and objectives – are they two different things? Should we not state them separately? Objectives – method; goals –where we want to get
 - p. A rubric would be very helpful – departmental assessment committees certainly would be nice but it is less standardized.
 - q. Positive reactions to rubric
 - r. Reminder to check out MyUCA group/ GEC group
4. Next step in WCT proposal
 - a. Council of Deans

- b. Resubmission = Stephanie Vonderslice and Lori Isom (follow – up)
 - c. What is the reasonable timeline?
 - d. We would like a response before the end of the semester
 - e. “attitudes and values” surveys in Philosophy and religion, world language/linguistics; take a look at data
 - f. Philosophy and religion data from past 7 years support need (other courses’ data needed as well)
 - g. Respectfully, though, is the Council of Deans objection relevant?
 - h. We are still lacking funding to go forward with substantive assessment of GE courses
 - i. This issue (fees not being used for assessment) should be priority
 - j. Lori Isom moved and Stephanie Vonderslice second the motion to have Conrad draft a response to the COD on the WCT proposal. All approved
 - k. It was decided that we can meet again to clarify the response if needed
 - l. A timeline was discussed that a response would be given in two weeks.
5. It was moved by Lori Isom to adjourn the meeting. Stephanie Vanderslice seconded the motion. All members approved and meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm.