

**General Education Curriculum Committee 2004-05**  
**Meeting of February 25, 2005 – 2:00 p.m.**

**Minutes**

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

1. The minutes of January 28, 2005 were approved.
2. The updated 2005-2006 General Education Course Listing (2-1-05) was distributed.
3. Billingsley shared information from Jim Applegate of CPE Re: a state-wide meeting in mid-April to discuss general education reform, with a focus on the general education curriculum. This initiative is part of the Greater Expectations project. A delegation of 5 will be chosen to represent UofL (\*Billingsley will advise the Provost). Volunteers from the GECC include: Billingsley, Kolers, Mahony, Dietrich, Allen, Gray, and Berman.
4. Gray reported that the A&S Council of Advisors has concerns about students not being able to find the on-line general education requirements. Carden commented on suggestions that have been made in the past to link the requirements to logical sites. \*Billingsley will make a recommendation to Communications and Marketing.
5. Although the DRAFT Assessment Plan has gone forward, A&S chairs have not yet discussed it. Dean Hudson is awaiting the final product from the GECC. Since the burden of the work falls on A&S, their “general approval” (not on all points) is needed.

Dietrich commented that sample portfolios are the most minimal requirement of students and reminded the committee that the “program” is being assessed, not the student and not the instructors (cannot assess faculty at the same time). Only students who complete their GERs at UofL (not transfers) will be part of the assessment. Billingsley stressed the need to show a good faith effort in the assessment of the program, beginning with the larger, more global competencies now and then enriching the program from those results. Mahony was in agreement with this approach – choosing the areas of least resistance and then building from there (Georgia Tech model). There are fewer leniencies with each new assessment year. Time is of essence in collecting base-line data and having an assessment plan in place before spring 2006. Sound rubrics are important for portfolio assessments. Kolers volunteered to convene a **Rubrics subgroup** (Kolers, Allen, Black, Crim, Dietrich, Gray, B. Williams) to flesh out

the scoring for 3 competency areas. Assessment of the composition program has already begun for 2004-2005. Williams can provide sample rubrics. Then, in September, data will be available from the assessment of the composition program. He concluded that it's unrealistic to assess without the aid of technology.

Bronwyn Williams stressed the need to identify resources for the logistical planning. Billingsley has asked IT to start looking into the costs of integrating software, adding servers, storing, keeping track, etc. The Provost is aware of the budgetary needs (estimated \$250,000 up front). Faculty time and technician time must also be factored in to the costs. Boyd was concerned with resistance from faculty if too much time is required; Billingsley responded that any assessment will cost faculty time, however, the goal is to make it as effective and efficient as possible. Chairs may have to decide how to divide hours between teaching and assessing, although the number of general education courses cannot be cut due to course demands. Incentives for compensating faculty can be explored. A **Logistics subgroup** was identified (Billingsley, Berman, Boyd, Johnson, Mahony, Weinberg) to consider options and to address questions.

\*The Rubrics and Logistics subgroups were scheduled to meet on March 11. A LiveText demo--a portfolio system used in Education--will be conducted by Karen Grove.

6. Black reported on the AAC&U Conference on General Education Assessment, which was also attended by Billingsley, Mahony, and Dietrich. She shared a summary of the key themes and assessment methods and pointed out approaches where there seemed to be a broad consensus. The course content approach and standardized tests are not well-accepted; however, portfolio assessment is the leading method. In the tailoring of a successful model for UofL, it will be important to engage the faculty – to communicate information and to spark interest in the development of the process and in the teaching of outcomes. Students also need a clear understanding of the learning objectives and, hopefully, feel a sense of accomplishment in the measurement of value added as they build their portfolio. The creation of capstone classes, including the upper-division, was also discussed.

The conference team talked to IUPUI representatives and requested a visit and demonstration of their model.

Kathy Carden, recorder