

General Education Curriculum Committee
Meeting of December 20, 10:00

Minutes

Attending (Voting): Banks, Bradley, Cobourn, Fernandez, Reynolds, Singleton, Song, Swanson, Tillquist

(Non-Voting): Billingsley, Carden, Dietrich, Karega, Partin, Reed

Introductions

Professor Cobourn was welcomed as a new member of the GECC.

Approval of Minutes

The revised minutes of September 13 and the minutes of October 18, 2013, were approved.

Recommendations of Course Proposal Subcommittee

Carden reported on the outcome of the course proposal reviews by the subcommittee members (Bradley, Fernandez, Futrell, Mabry, and Song) as listed below. Banks questioned the initial rejection of MUH 217 for CD2 credit. Additional discussion resulted in reconsideration of the proposal pending explicit modifications and clarifications.

--**LALS 200** Exploring Latin America-HCD1 – *syllabus modifications approved following second review*

--**MUH 217** History of Country Music-ACD2 – *approved for Arts initially but not CD2; CD2 being reconsidered “pending review of modified proposal with requested clarifications”*

--**MUH 317** Popular Music in American Culture-CD2 - *approved*

--**PAS 317/HUM 377** African American Religion-CD1 (crosslisted) - *approved*

--**PAS 349/HUM 349** African Americans & Islam-CD1 (crosslisted) – *approved*

***ACTION:** Carden will follow up with Professor Shadle and submit the revised syllabus to the course proposal subcommittee for final review prior to the January 15 deadline for course changes.

CD Petition Update

Karega reported that one new CD petition was approved but three were not. Although study abroad petitions generally are improving when students are redirected to the assessment criteria and parameters of the four outcomes, the life experience petitions are weak. Few transfer petitions are approved. Billingsley suggested that the International Center be consulted regarding the benefit of this possibility since most students are petitioning after their study abroad experiences. International travel alone is not a justification for CD credit.

***ACTION:** Karega will follow up with the International Center and provide the web site link.

Assessment Subcommittee Report

Karega reported that the Assessment Subcommittee met in early December with the CEHD reps. They looked at the Kentucky Statewide Assessment Plan and SACS criteria and then revised the assessment model (see attachment).

1) Dates for the content-area assessments during a 3 ½ year cycle were proposed. Billingsley questioned whether it's feasible to conduct assessment readings in May due to Commencement and Derby. Karega will negotiate the dates as necessary following discussion with the subcommittee and CEHD. Karega explained the collection process for sample assignments and student responses, which requires a full semester working with departmental chairs. Bradley commented that there's a need to collect artifacts in the spring if reading in the fall. Singleton asked if faculty could be contacted in early December for spring assessments.

2) The number of raters/readers for each assessment will be increased, including more readers from the discipline who are familiar with the content areas. With quality readers and training, reliability results will be improved. Billingsley recommended that Arts & Humanities be subdivided into two readings. Also, he pointed out that history falls under SB, and historians are particular about their learning outcomes, requiring more reading specialists.

3) Dietrich discussed the rationale for using three rubrics (CT, CD, EC), when applicable, to assess the artifacts. Since general education is set up as a "program," rather than a menu, the theory is that teaching a writing course such as ENGL 101 also can promote CT, CD and EC outcomes. Karega explained that for double-coded courses, the faculty inform her of which competency students are being asked to demonstrate. For example, a SB coded course was overwhelmingly assessed for CT with little concentration on the CD component. Now CD is a separate category for assessment. WC assessments primarily are seated in the English Composition Department.

4) To provide greater controls and tracking, the assessments can be structured so that raters score the artifacts in a specific order. The subcommittee also is looking at control factors regarding how readers are scoring.

5) Additionally, modifications to the CT rubric were proposed to a) redact the Point of View measure, b) add an Influence of Context and Assumptions measure, and c) add an Implications measure. These new measures are part of Benchmark institution measures and are in response to the GECC's recommendations following the reliability and validity testing.

6) In response to using the data to close loops, a SLO/assessment-driven template was conceptualized for each topical area as a tool to a) identify the Program Goal and b) Student Learning Outcome, c) measure student performance (reporting percentages), d) establish targets (such as the percentage of students who we want to obtain a score of 3 out of 4, and e) close the loop (to reach the targets/goals). Using this sheet, the results are tied back to the learning outcomes and identified program goals, the data are interpreted, and a narrative report will provide the findings. Tillquist was concerned about the details of the narrative. However, Karega explained that while recommendations may be made in a broad way, the departments

will be responsible for developing specific strategies for improvement. She cited as an example the work of Joanna Wolf, former director of Composition, who used assessment results to develop recommendations and conduct a workshop for her faculty. Billingsley explained that the GECC cannot write prescriptive findings. Dietrich concurred that the department develops the action steps where there is a deficit. However, support through the Delphi Center or in the form of workshops might be provided.

Billingsley stressed the urgency in reporting to CPE the university's move to topical assessment. A motion was made to move forward with the assessment model revisions and no one opposed.

***ACTION:** Billingsley will submit the report to CPE and Karega will implement the changes to the assessment model and CT rubric.

Spring 2014 Assessment Dates

Karega reported that the next round of assessments for Written Communication will be scheduled in May, following collection of documents beginning in January.

Prepared by Kathy Carden