



**General Education Curriculum Committee  
Meeting of April 14, 2017, 2:30**

**Minutes**

*Attending:* Barrow, Boehm, Carden (staff), Cobourn, Cooksey, Fuller, Fuselier, Futrell, Gilchrist, Johnson, Libe, Myers, Pack, Partin, Patton, Reynolds, Riedel, Seif, Shanahan, Singleton, Walton, Wiggins-Romesburg, Willey

*Absent:* Bertacco, Desoky, Hagan, Howarth, Wright

**Introductions**

Johnathan Fuller, the newly-elected SGA Academic Vice President, will serve as one of the student reps effective 2017-2018. Cooksey and Myers are rotating off the committee. Dr. Beth Boehm, the new Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, replaces Billingsley in this current academic year.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of February 17, 2017, were approved.

**Update on CD Petitions**

Wiggins-Romesburg reported that three Life Experience petitions were approved for CD1 credit in March. Shanahan commented that the consensus of the CD Petitions Subcommittee is that military students who have had life experience in another culture still will need to submit an essay when petitioning for CD credit, demonstrating the outcomes.

\*ACTION: A sample essay of military life as a CD life experience will be posted to the web.

**Fall 2016 Written Communication Assessment Report**

Shanahan reported that the results of the written communication assessment were good, showing significant improvements in student performance on all rubric measures since the 2014 assessment (see table on page 14 of the report). However, the inter-rater reliability results (ICC statistic) were not as good, although still within the acceptable ranges. Theories on the reliability results were discussed.

\*ACTION: The report was approved and will be posted to the gen-ed web site.

**Spring 2017 Assessment**

The Natural Sciences assessment is set for May 19. Shanahan needs reviewers who can understand the sciences. In the physics category there aren't many reviewers who want to score heavy computations. Only three faculty from physics participated in the last assessment, but there were many samples to score. The insight of faculty from the discipline is helpful not just during the reviews but during the training. It is hoped that they report the results to their departments.

### **Update on General Education Assessment Subcommittee**

The Assessment Subcommittee met and talked about the findings of the WC report. Also, strategies for the Spring 2018 Oral Communication assessment were discussed. Shanahan is working with Katherine Taylor to explore the possibility of capturing a sampling of speeches through Panopto. In the past, reviewers scored reflection papers of speeches rather than the speech. The AAC&U VALUE rubric for OC will be used for the assessment. This approach makes more sense than updating UofL's own EC rubric. As written into the Cardinal Core Proposal, and in collaboration with Gilchrist and Goldstein, plans are being made to participate in the Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment (MSC). This initiative, led by AAC&U, allows campuses to collect samples of student work and have them evaluated with the AAC&U VALUE rubrics by a group of external faculty. Initially, artifacts for seniors will be collected and submitted to the external reviewers. The current internal assessment process will continue.

### **Update on Cardinal Core Program**

Wiley conducted two Course Revision Workshops with the assistance of Fuselier. On April 7, fourteen faculty members attended and nineteen attended on March 31. Additional course proposal workshops will be held in early September. In the meantime, May 3 is the first-phase deadline for course revisions so that they can be processed in time for the May 10 GECC review.

### **Structure of Cardinal Core Committee**

It's been recommended that a faculty member from the History Department be invited to serve as an ex-officio rep, given the questions that are arising about the Historical Perspective component of the new Cardinal Core Program.

\*ACTION: The History Department chair will be asked to designate a member, who will be invited to the May 10 meeting to help review syllabi/proposals designated SBH.

### **Cardinal Core Implementation Date—Transition Between Catalog Years**

Since the catalog/academic year for 2018-2019 begins in the summer, the effective date for the new Cardinal Core Program will become **Summer 2018 rather than Fall 2018**. The issue surrounding this bureaucratic reality includes degree audit, making the new policies and course changes/codings available for students who pre-register for fall classes in late May and June, complying to the effective date of course inventory and degree program changes set by Goldstein's office. The first-year cohort of students would all be under the same requirements.

\*ACTION: Academic units and departments will be informed and CIFs for gen-ed courses under the new program will reflect Summer 2018 as the effective date.

### **Discussion Items – Issues to Resolve**

**Natural Sciences Learning Outcome 4 and Large Lecture Classes** – Fuselier raised the issue of how large-lecture classes can satisfy the new writing component of the NS outcome #4. For Biology, writing is only done in the associated lab, which is a separate course. To address this issue, it was proposed that faculty teaching these courses might make reference to the associated labs for outcome 4. Boehm questioned instances when a student does not take the lab or comes in without a lab credit. Futrell commented that SB courses like PSYC 201 are large lectures that do not have an associated lab. Shanahan explained that this new outcome was, in part, an incentive to push for smaller class sizes. However, funding to facilitate that intention is unknown.

Regarding a proposed exception for certain classes, there is the issue of SACS accreditation. Willey explained that SACS measures the outcomes and that the university must be diligent. Shanahan reminded the committee about the overarching themes across the curriculum, including an emphasis on critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, effective communication, and the understanding of historical, social, and cultural diversity. These areas will be assessed. She believes that most courses embed the communications component. Although writing might be captured across the curriculum, Gilchrist pointed out that there could be a problem if a specific course or percentage of courses do not satisfy all student-learning outcomes. Shanahan said that SACS and state guidelines are aimed at ensuring that the General Education Program has an assessment of student learning (outcomes) in place. Willey suggested that the syllabus not reflect any falsehoods but, instead, state whether the communication component (writing or speech) can be satisfied.

**Transfer Equivalency Issue and AP Courses** – Willey asked the GECC to check with their departments about reviewing AP courses. Concern has been raised about how the new outcomes will affect transfer students. Willey is consulting Partin and Sawyer to obtain clarification on the levels of certification and also asking them to re-evaluate the AP credits based on the new historical perspective outcomes. Partin said that if students do not come in as certified they must take UofL's history; no credit is given for U.S. History. Boehm recommended easing difficulties for high-achieving students who want AP credit. Cooksey commented that some students are choosing other institutions, such as WKU, that grant more AP credit.

**Historical Perspective** – Willey explained that since the Task Force did not consider the “historical perspective” coding outside of the History Department, it became a SB content rather than a free-floating competency like diversity. However, a professor who teaches art history questioned whether he could develop his course to combine two content areas (AH and some new historical perspective coding other than SBH such as HP). Boehm mentioned that a humanities course might also want to incorporate the new learning outcomes for the historical perspective category. Cobourn questioned the difficulty of effectively teaching a course (outside of Honors courses) that would cover two content areas. Willey raised the issue of multiple sections being taught to which Futrell responded that a new course number could be created to differentiate the courses that are taught differently.

\*ACTION: Willey will update the GECC about the historical perspective complication.

Shanahan recalled that when the faculty-approved Cardinal Core Proposal was developed, that the historical perspective category (three-hour requirement) was intended to be part of the Social and Behavioral Science disciplinary content area.

### **Upcoming Meetings**

The next meeting is set May 10 at 1:00 for the purpose of reviewing course proposals under the new Cardinal Core student learning outcomes. All proposals will be loaded into Sharepoint

Prepared by Kathy Carden