

**General Education Committee
Minutes**

February 13, 2023

Present: Mark Jacobson Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey
Melinda Tilton Paul Pope
Emily Arendt Mara Pierce
Keeara Rhoades Ana Diaz
Jason Comer Daniel Willems
Daniel Charlton Debra Schoenfeld
TyRee Jenks Bryan Grove (ex-officio)

Absent: Jeff Willardson* Lance Mouser*
*excused

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. in LA 627.

I. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 23 were accepted as presented.

II. ITEM FOR APPROVAL

Title	Status	Received
ARTZ 101: Art Fundamentals	Deleted	1/26/2023

- Motion by Emily Arendt, seconded by Mara Pierce to **approve the deletion of ARTZ 101.**

- Motion carried.

III. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

**A. Finalized Assessment Rubric for each Programmatic Outcome Category
- Feedback on those rubrics**

New members to the committee Debbie Schoenfeld and Dan Charlton were assigned to subgroups. The groups are now:

Respect Diversity

Mara Pierce
Emily Arendt
Debbie Schoenfeld

Think Critically

Dan Willems
Jason Comer
Ana Diaz
Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey
Paul Pope

Problem Solve

Lance Mouser
Jeff Willardson
Keeara Rhoades
Mark Jacobson

Communicate Effectively

Melinda Tilton
Tyree Jenks
Bryan Grove
Daniel Charlton

Rachel Schaffer of English, Philosophy & Modern Languages sent feedback on the rubrics. The committee broke into subgroups to discuss.

When the GEC reconvened as a whole, the terminology for the performance criteria was discussed. It was agreed that they will use: (1) emerging, (2) progressing, and (3) proficient.

B. Test Rubrics with Your Course Artifacts

The “test drive” will be completed using the artifacts submitted in the Box folder.

The Respect Diversity group will review courses submitted for Problem Solve.

The Problem Solve group will review courses submitted for Think Critically.

The Think Critically group will review courses submitted for Communicate Effectively.

The Communicate Effectively group will review courses submitted for Respect Diversity.

Committee members should consider:

- Are there sticky places in the rubric?
- Did the rubric apply to the course?
- What could make the rubric clearer?

Feedback should be organized by the subgroup and submitted by March 3 at 5:00 p.m.

It was noted that we should definitely ask faculty who are submitting artifacts to consider size. Don't submit a 10-page paper when a 1-page one will work! Meaningful and manageable is the motto we should subscribe to.

C. Curriculum Mapping

The GEC also needs to check in with the faculty who teach Gen Ed courses to review and complete the curriculum map. Once the map is complete, faculty will be asked for an assignment/artifact that demonstrates achievement of the program outcome, if it is so marked in the curriculum map. So, we need to be clear on which courses should be marked “achieve.” This information gathering could be done through a Qualtrics survey.

D. Next Steps

Eventually, we will need to decide if a three- or four-year rotation would work best for assessment. Recently it was pointed out to the Committee that the program outcome #9 “Produce scholarly projects or creative works conforming to appropriate disciplinary methods,” is actually an artifact and not an outcome. So, that leaves us with 8 programmatic outcomes. Should we do two a year? How big of a sample of courses in a category do we need?

It was noted that converting a qualitative assessment to a numerical score is very difficult. We really need to know if the results of our work are in any way valid. We need a clear, meaningful standard to assess an artifact, relevant to the discipline.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.