

**General Education Curriculum Committee 2004-05
Meeting of December 10, 2004 - 2:30 p.m.**

Minutes

Voting Members Attending: Julie Berman, Lynn Boyd, Susan Crim, Richard Dugger, Karen Gray, Carol Holloman, Anna Marie Johnson, Avery Kolers (Chair), Babu Nahata, David Schultz, Larry Tyler, Bronwyn Williams, Wiley Williams
Others: Dale Billingsley (non-voting), Kathy Carden (staff), Julia Dietrich (guest), Dan Mahony (guest)

1. The minutes of November 19, 2004 were approved.
2. The new Speed School representative, Larry Tyler, was welcomed.
3. The following courses were approved for general education credit, effective Summer 2005:
 - CHST 335 China Through Film-CD1 (Zeng)
 - CHST 351 Chinese Literature in Translation I-CD1 (Zeng)
 - CHST 352 Chinese Literature in Translation II-CD1 (Zeng)
4. Mahony reported back from the SACS annual meeting Re: the place of general education assessment in the new reaffirmation process. Many schools are non-compliant under the faculty qualifications category. UofL may face probation, even if general education assessment is taken seriously. The assessment of three years of data is not possible at this point; however, the University can demonstrate a serious effort to move forward in a positive direction.

Billingsley gave an overview of the 12/3/04 version of the assessment proposal, which is in question if the current general education program is to be revamped. He doesn't want to require a large amount of departmental work and then change direction midstream, thus nullifying it. One concern that warrants review of the general education program itself relates to course demands for foundational courses. Mahony suggested envisioning how the program might change and then setting up an assessment system that could incorporate the possible changes.

The current bias of the committee is toward a course evaluation; however, Dietrich favored focusing on the competencies (students being able to do certain things no matter what course they take). If the competencies don't significantly change, the system will last longer. Time spent evaluating a particular course may not be efficient.

Dietrich reported that past evaluations were poor since faculty members had no information allowing them opportunity to teach to the test.

Schultz and B. Williams suggested a random sampling, beginning with the Written Communications Requirement, if every program does not have to be assessed at one time. The task of the Assessment Subcommittee is to design the assessment process. Dietrich commented on a model that uses a committee to evaluate a sampling of work for one or two requirements each year. If the requirement does not do well, the previous year is also evaluated. Many schools do electronic portfolios; part of the grade is to upload good work, which motivates the students. B. Williams endorsed this suggestion as a course requirement. The problem is the question of what the course is doing for the program – it may be a great course, but may not be satisfying the general education requirement. The University could establish broad overarching goals, such as critical thinking, expanding on those already in place. Suggestions included quantitative literacy and computer literacy.

Billingsley shared IUPUI's Six Principles of Undergraduate Learning, which includes: 1) Core Communication & Quantitative Skills, 2) Critical Thinking, 3) Integration and Application of Knowledge, 4) Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness, 5) Understanding Society and Culture, and 6) Values and Ethics. Students are provided with a laminated bookmark of the condensed document. These six principles are assessed in any given course. The volume of data is reduced when the students choose their 3 best portfolio pieces for the competency sampling.

Remaining questions include A) funding of the mandate and B) who will do the actual assessment. Scenarios included the General Education Curriculum Committee or a parallel committee, or a larger group with a couple of members designated to look at each product (a secondary reading of a portfolio, for example). A consistent rubric would be used in the evaluative process. Dietrich posed two questions: 1) Does the course meet the objectives? 2) Does the program demonstrate "value added" (improvement since the student arrived)?

*ACTION: Mahony will find out how far along UofL needs to be in the assessment process and what the expectations are to demonstrate good effort, per the suggestion to start with Written Communication and then establish a time table.

*ACTION: The Assessment Subcommittee will revisit the proposal and think about frequency and depth of samplings and suggest 4-5 comprehensive goals that cut across all of the general education requirements. Mahony suggested a two-year assessment and the demonstration of effort to make changes. Also, there's the issue of being responsible for students who transferred in but who were generally educated elsewhere. Thought will also be given to identifying capstone courses.

5. Kolers received approval to go forward with the course demands proposal with minor editorial changes. The memo will go to the Provost, Deans, and Undergraduate Council.

6. W. Williams reported back on math test-out results. Only about 40 students might qualify to test out of MATH 111, based on ACT scores. He will define a sub population based on the scores. Given the small numbers, he's not sure how big of an effect the pilot project will have.

Kathy Carden, recorder