

**General Education Curriculum Committee**  
**Meeting of May 7, 2013, Noon**

**Minutes**

*Attending (Voting):* Bernstein, Desoky, Mansfield-Jones, Pack, Reynolds, Romesburg, Singleton, Tillquist, Zimmerman

*(Non-Voting):* Bays, Carden, Dietrich, Gilchrist, Karega, Partin, Reed

*Guest:* Il Barrow

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of April 12, 2013, were approved.

**Membership Transition**

Outgoing members (Masolo, Mansfield-Jones, Koerselman, Menezes, Zimmerman) were thanked for their service, as were all members who served on subcommittees throughout the year. Tillquist indicated that he may serve an additional term.

**CD Petition Review Update**

Karega reported that one recent CD petition was approved.

**Rubric Assessment**

Karega and Bays shared the proposal for assessing the validity and reliability of the General Education Program assessment rubrics in hopes of getting approval to move forward with the testing during the summer months. The reliability of the instrument needs to be tested to give credibility to the outcomes. Desoky opened discussion about the scale of reliability and suggested that there is a statistical way (percentages) to establish competencies based on the variability of the responses. Tillquest asked if there's a way to look at variability within the 1-4 scale, a consistent question that has been raised. Desoky recommended looking at data first and volunteered to assist.

**\*ACTION:** Given the scope of data for general education assessment, a motion was approved to apply the proposal to the Cycle II CT data, using it as a model for generating a pilot report. Bays explained that the reviewers will be looking for patterns and trends.

**CAAP Writing Results**

Gilchrist and Barrow, of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, reported on the results of the CAAP academic proficiency Writing Essay and Critical Thinking modules, an assessment of seniors (spring) in randomly selected upper-division courses and of incoming freshmen (fall). The institutional analysis summary, prepared by Barrow, shows the data by individual classes, academic unit, overall for UofL (internal), and nationally (external). The writing and critical thinking assessments take place in a proctored classroom setting. Then ACT scores the individual student reports, and students who achieve a score at or above the national mean receive a Certificate of Achievement. The goal at UofL is to use the overall assessments and trend data to help support and improve student success. Some associate deans/deans are sharing

the information with faculty. Faculty members initially were reluctant to use class time but are now more cooperative in all academic units and interested in the results of student performance over time. A base for native students is being established so that they can be followed through the senior year. Currently, seniors include transfer students and freshmen participating in academic orientation courses. Administering the instrument to all students at entry and exit points would be cost prohibitive and getting into all classrooms would be difficult; however, random samplings still provide a snapshot view of student success. The results for nursing and dental hygiene represent the whole student body, and most social work students are represented. Generally, engineers are very serious about the critical thinking assessment and incoming students perform at the national average. On the other hand, some senior students are performing at a lower level or not trying hard during the second assessment. Romesburg was concerned about comparing UofL freshmen and seniors to the large sophomore national average and suggested that internal measurements be set up. Although it's not a perfect instrument, getting students and faculty on board concerning the importance of assessment is a first step.

### **GER and Disabilities**

Mansfield-Jones reported on her subcommittee's proposed alternative pathway for students with suspected learning disabilities in mathematics, while maintaining the goals of the general education requirements. The DRC and other units were consulted prior to the drafting of the three-phase plan. An appropriate alternative/substitute course might include CIS 100, CECS 130, ECON 201, PHIL 211, or PHIL 311 for students with a severe mathematical disability, documented through an approved testing center. This option is not permissible for any student wishing to avoid a required prerequisite or program requirement for a major. However, a mechanism for identifying students who repeatedly have failed a math course such as MATH 65, General Studies 104, or MATH 105 (Contemporary Mathematics) includes proposed interventions, such as referral to the DRC, by instructors of these remedial and freshman-level mathematics courses.

Bays stressed the need for at-risk or previously-diagnosed students to take responsibility for contacting the DRC (the entry point of the pathway). Karega and Barrow were concerned about getting information to students about DRC services as early as Student Orientation. Bays commented that the first order of business for the GECC is proposing policy before developing a procedure. Although there is a low prevalence for this particular disability, Tillquist was concerned about students who cannot afford expensive testing without a sliding scale for fees.

Zimmerman gave an historical overview of the evolution of college algebra (MATH 111 at UofL) and shared examples of students who don't try because they think they simply can't do math. Some students just may need extra support through REACH tutoring and the math lab, but students with a clinically diagnosed abstraction and logic disability need a pathway for satisfying the general education math requirement in order to graduate.

### **Upcoming Meeting**

The first meeting of the fall semester was set for September 13 at 2:30 p.m. in the Jouett Hall Conference Room.