

**General Education Curriculum Committee 2004-05**  
**Meeting of January 28, 2005 - 1:30 p.m.**

**Minutes**

*Voting Members Attending:* Ann Allen, Karen Black, Lynn Boyd, Susan Crim, Richard Dugger, Karen Gray, Sarah Hester, Carol Holloman, Anna Marie Johnson, Avery Kolers (Chair), Babu Nahata, Larry Tyler, Bronwyn Williams, Wiley Williams  
*Others:* Dale Billingsley (non-voting), Kathy Carden (staff)

1. The minutes of December 10, 2004 were approved.
2. A correction to the 2005-2006 General Education Course Listing was noted. The Women's Health Issues-CD2 course has been lowered to a 300-level for general education credit. The new course numbers are HSS 364 (formerly HSS 564) and WGST 364 (formerly WGST 535). A revised syllabus has been requested.
3. Billingsley gave an overview of the 1/21/05 DRAFT Assessment Plan. The original plan required a huge amount of work. The new plan will assess the program rather than specific GER courses. The first step will require the assessment of work graded in general education courses in three foundational areas of competency: 1) thinking critically, 2) communicating effectively, and 3) understanding and appreciating cultural diversity. More refined or precise levels of assessment could be incorporated later. The loading of the material into the portfolio system will entail some oversight, even though students will do the uploading to an online portfolio. The assessment is based upon student portfolios built from graded course work within an established timeline. Trained evaluators will randomly assess the portfolios (from a large sampling) using a rubric to measure the demonstration of the general-education competencies. The intent is to use the results of the assessment to make improvements to the general education program. This method will not assess course content, nor look at the course grade or identify the student. Instead, it will assess the demonstration of competency in one or more of the three overarching areas, such as whether the student can write.

Concern was expressed about the technological costs, if more servers are needed, and about the interfacing of PeopleSoft with the IUPUI portfolio software. Details about uploading work electronically and scanning math and other assignments, without the grade, will be addressed. Also, a mechanism will be established for insuring that students submit the work within the designated timeframe.

\*ACTION: It was suggested that a group visit IUPUI to research the implementation procedures.

The proposal will be presented to the Undergraduate Council and the Deans before going to the faculties. It was suggested that the proposal be prefaced with a longer report on the plan that was previously considered and a rationale for why Plan B is recommended. Due to the time crunch, there will not be an extended opportunity for debate.

\*ACTION: Billingsley would make the suggested editorial changes and electronically circulate the revised proposal to the GECC prior to consideration by the Undergraduate Council.

4. Kolers and Billingsley commented on the response from the Provost concerning the report on unmet course demands. Although nothing is being done structurally at this time, the Deans are beginning to realize that there is a problem. Some solutions are on the table to address the issues. Billingsley explained that the Provost and President want to look at the problem at a deeper level. For now, the work of the Course Demands Subcommittee is completed.

5. Since the work of two subcommittees is finished for the year, Kolers suggested re-allocating to assist the Assessment Subcommittee. Boyd suggested the possibility of starting with a paper version if the on-line version initially presents difficulties.

Kathy Carden, recorder