

General Education Curriculum Committee
Meeting of January 24, 2014, 2:30

Minutes

Attending (Voting): Banks, Bradley, Cobourn, Desoky, Fernandez, Futrell, Pack, Reynolds, Singleton (*Non-Voting*): Billingsley, Carden, Dietrich, Gilchrist, Karega, Partin, Reed

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of December 20, 2013, were approved.

Recommendations of Course Proposal Subcommittee

The modified MUH 217 History of Country Music proposal/syllabus was reviewed by the Course Proposal Subcommittee and approved.

General Education Course Listing 2014-2015

The new gen-ed coded courses become effective in the summer. The updated 2014-2015 course listing can be found on the general education web site at <http://louisville.edu/provost/GER/>.

CD Petition Update

Karega reported that one CD petition was approved.

Report on Spring 2013 Departmental Assessment

Karega reported on the Spring 2013 Mathematics assessment, a general education content area. To aid the GECC in an understanding of the assessment process, she reviewed the summary report by applying the rubric and SLO/Assessment-driven Template in a step-by-step committee exercise. The following factors were noted:

- The 4 measures in the summary report correspond with the 4 measures in the rubric.
- The scores of the 3 assessment groups (9-10 assessors per group) are broken down for each measure. Each artifact gets three readings as compared to only two in past years.
- The inter-rater summary reflects more reliability among groups 1 and 2, but a higher score from group 3, which was composed of assessors from mathematics only. Non-math assessors agreed with non-math assessors more than with the math group. The assessors did not know which group they were in.
- Solution keys were used that figured prominently into the training, but the application of the rubric was difficult for non-math assessors.
- Mean scores reflect that a score of 4 points (blue bar) or 3 points (green bar) is generally good; 2 points (red bar) or 1 point (orange bar) is not so good.

Futrell asked about assessment of the inter-raters for reliability to which Karega responded that a subcommittee is looking at this. Billingsley was curious about the range of variation in each group to see if there's a statistical pattern with a particular reader.

NOTE: Karega believes that the outcomes demonstrate the need for more content area assessors to determine better reliability in the differences in the ratings. Bradley and Futrell agreed. With the upcoming English Composition assessment in May, she hopes to gain the assistance of deans and chairs to recruit content-area assessors.

Billingsley reiterated the need to fulfill the original charge of interpreting the data and making general recommendations to the departments with the intent of improving learning outcomes at a programmatic level and general education as a whole. Karega commented that the template for program goals, SLOs, measures, targets and findings are a step in this direction. The GECC can submit the findings in a narrative but cannot make specific recommendations by course at the instructor level. Strengths and weaknesses can be identified by the GECC, as well as comparisons from base-line and current assessments, but the department is responsible for discussing ways to improve student achievement. Dietrich commented that she already is using the data in this way. For example, based on the CT results she found that students cannot deal well with contrary evidence. Continual improvement is the goal.

Report on AAC&U Project Meeting

Billingsley, Karega and Fell participated in the Quality Collaboratives (QC) Project Meeting in D.C., January 21-22, 2014. Nine states were represented at this “update meeting” and discussions centered around what each state was doing to enhance quality learning, with an emphasis on the role of the DQP (Degree Qualifications Profile). Goals also were discussed. A report will be shared in July. UofL already has done some work with the transferability process, but there is hope of expanding the model beyond Biology to include Written Communications. Dietrich wondered if this initiative could overlap with committee work on common core standards, looking at the entry-level gen ed courses.

DRAFT Policy: Gen Ed Course Substitutions/Math Disability

Billingsley reported that Dean Ferre’s letter supported the proposal for substitute courses for students documented through the DRC with a mathematical processing disability. However, Dietrich explained that the proposal now is going to the A&S curriculum committee following approval by the dean and the Admissions & Appeals Committee, as well as to the A&S Faculty Assembly, even though the GECC approves the general education curriculum. Billingsley noted that the math department previously approved the proposal with the removal of the CIS course and thought it should be noted that only 2-3 students are hindered by this particular disability each year.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the GECC is scheduled for February 21, 2014.

Prepared by Kathy Carden