

General Education Committee Meeting
December 4, 2009

Members Present: Joy Hendrick (Chair), David Miller, Bruce Mattingly, Merle Canfield, Anita Kuiken, Joseph Rayle, Abby Thomas
Members Absent: Kelsey Baylinson (Student Representative), John Hartsock, Christopher Latimer, Claus Schubert, Carol Van Der Karr, Donna West

Topic	Comments	Action Item
Approval of the Minutes	One minor typo identified. Minutes approved as amended.	
Chair's Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - J. Hendrick sent letter outlining GE Assessment issues to the Provost prior to Thanksgiving. There's no response yet. - Conferred and confirmed with M. Canfield that the Provost sent thank you notes to faculty who were involved with the final assessment process during the summer. - Discussion ensued to determine when we should canvas faculty involvement for the next summer's assessment. Decided that an April or May time-frame would be ideal. - Reported that the Provost approved ANT 103 Archaeological Principles in Cultural Context for inclusion in GE category 12 to begin Fall 2010. 	
Director of Institutional Research and Assessment Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - J. Hendrick reported that GE Committee members had, via email, decided unanimously not to move forward with employing the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) tool/service at this time citing issues over data privacy. M. Canfield mentioned that we couldn't have utilized it at this time anyway, since we would have had to start working on it this Fall (2009). - M. Canfield handed out "Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in General Education" to aid in discussing the pending assessment process of students' Critical Thinking skills. A random sampling of the 17 GE12 category courses will be taken. The assessment process will require faculty of chosen courses to submit two articles to the GE Committee for approval. Faculty should identify a preferred article. These articles should be of reasonable length (1-2 pages) and density, so that 	<p>Merle To email a draft of the Critical Thinking Assessment Notification letter for committee review as soon as possible.</p>

	<p>students can absorb the facts and formulate their thoughts in accordance with the essay questions within a 50-minute class period; topic does not have to be course specific. Since concern was expressed that some students might have difficulty reading, absorbing, and responding in such a short period of time, we would assume, for now, that the articles chosen for assessment would be released in-class only. We will wait to see what kinds of articles we receive from faculty to determine whether it's fair to release the article ahead of time to allow students to read and think about it prior to the class chosen for the assessment. M. Canfield will send a letter to faculty which will communicate process requirements and timeline: articles are due to the GE Committee for review by the Friday of the first week of class; GE article approvals will be issued in early February; and faculty will execute the assessment in April.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M. Canfield informed that he was still awaiting approval of a revision of the assessment plan for certain courses. For example, Art History requested that an assessment be based on a work of art or artifact which would then be reviewed by department heads rather than normal written procedure. M. Canfield expressed uncertainty as to who would be the decision-making body for such a scenario. A decision was made to table this for future conversation. 	
<p>Additional Discussion of Results, Review, and Recommendations (RRR) from 2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ICC Department RRR awaits closure. ICC and GE expectations need further alignment regarding first-year students' language proficiency: GE believes first-year students should have a basic proficiency in understanding and in use of the language; ICC believes this is unrealistic. Both grapple with how to define "basic proficiency" and what benchmarks to utilize for measurement. GE committee decided we should meet with ICC to establish these benchmarks together, so we can finalize their RRR. - GE committee discussed hosting a meeting with representatives from previous RRRs to discuss if we could be doing anything differently to streamline the process. 	<p>Joy and Merle To send a letter to ICC inviting them to a meeting to discuss the establishment of benchmarks for GE9.</p>

Syllabi Review Sub-committees for GE categories: (1), 8, 9, 10b, (IM).

- GE 1 (Quantitative Skills) assessment will be extended to next year, because they're already doing a lot of work toward it already.
- IM: Gail Wood, Director of Libraries, provides the data for us.
- The rest we split into sub-committees as we had done last year. An initial pairing of committee members to categories was established, however, we await assignments for John, Chris, Carol, and Kelsey:
 - GE 1: extend to next year
 - GE 8: Abby & Merle (needs faculty representation)
 - GE9: Claus & Donna
 - GE10b: Joy, Anita, & presentation committee
 - IM: approach Gail Wood
- Two committee members will be on sabbatical next year: D. Miller and J. Rayle. We will need to contact the Committee on Committees to seek temporary stand-ins.

Joy

- Contact the Committee on Committees to seek replacements for 2 committee members taking sabbatical next year.
- contact absent committee members to ask what sub-committee they'd like to

Respectfully Submitted by Anita Kuiken 12/16/09
Approved by the GE Committee on 02/12/10