Minutes
General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday, 10 March 2020
Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102, Zoom
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Susanne Forrest
Excused: Geoffrey Bennett (UCC), Catherine Read
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none

2. Minutes – vote via email

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
   a. Gen Ed Assignment Workshop scheduled for April 23 and 24
      (attachment: Q&A document for Assignment Workshop)
      Spring events, Ann is waiting on the exact timing of the events, in part due to Coronavirus concerns. Will be working on events geared to North West Accreditation
   b. Assessment Plan updates: Math and Physics
      MATH 1143/1147 and Physics’ Astronomy course assessment plan have been submitted. Jardine added those to the New Business section of the agenda.

4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine
   They did not meet. There is no update. Members had been encouraged to attend the Academic Integrity Policy open forum meeting held a couple of weeks ago.

5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
   No Report at this time.

6. Upcoming GERC due dates:
   a. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports due
      a. Both committees have met and are working on their tasks.

7. Unfinished Business
   a. Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – progress report
      This is on hold. The survey administrator has been ill and unable to make requested changes. Once the amendments are made, the survey will come back to GERC for final review before it goes out to campus faculty.
   b. Review of annual Assessment Reporting (attachment: spreadsheet)
      Objectives 1, 2 and 4: Jennifer Attebery and Neil Tocher

**Objective 1:**

It appears that English and Philosophy department is trying to do the job. However, the project is massive. They are trying to pull in all the different places where written communication courses are being taught. That includes College of Technology (COT) and Early College courses. The COT has been very active in participating. The same cannot be said regarding the Early College
course teachers’ participation.

Evaluation of ENGL 1101 and 1102: Comment – they might wish to work better with the Honors course (that is actually an 1102 equivalent course). Would a common assessment work? These courses are unique in foundation. Honors program has started communicating with the English Department.

The way Honors 1101 is being taught is not a tight fit with Objective 1.
There was discussion about the English 1101 course content and intent.
There was discussion about the current analysis being all aggregate. They may wish to separate locations or on-campus, on-line, early college.

Results: English has identified issues and will be holding a workshop to close the loop.

Objective 2:

Strength that this objective only has one course, and it is well structured to assess the learning outcomes.

Results: It appears that online courses are not doing as well as face-to-face on the assessments. They are looking for ways to increase student engagement in the on-line courses.

Results: There was concern about faculty – mostly Early College – that are not turning in the requested assessment materials. Written guidance from GERC and/or SBOE would be helpful.

Objective 4: A lot of courses in this Objective

Suggest departments use some tool to generate random samples.

Results: In philosophy – it did not work to assess a couple of outcomes each year. It worked better to assess all outcomes all at once every 2 or 3 years. A revised plan should be submitted to GERC.

Results: In language courses, it appears that individual instructors are doing the assessment. We do not have a “language program” doing assessment. It becomes a course level assessment instead of a “Program” level assessment. There was discussion regarding the difficulties of doing a program level assessment instead of course by course. However, it is a direction they should attempt to move towards.

Discussion regarding the difficulties students face in planning their studies when so many courses are not offered regularly or “on demand.” The catalog listings are somewhat misleading in this respect because students see some course offering they are interested in taking, only to find out the course will not be offered any time soon,

Objectives 3 and 5: Spencer Jardine and Shannon Kobs Nawotniak

Objective 3:

Results: Some of the comments were terse to the point of not providing meaningful information. Perhaps this was a result of frustration with the process. Perhaps they do not see much value in assessment. Ann stated this may identify the need for assistance.

Courses from Business seem to have much more buy-in and active participation in the assessment.

College of Tech:
RCET: Scores seem very high. There may be some sense that they need to defend their program.
TGE: The reporting was unclear, with “finished” being “False” for many rows. It appears multiple reports are being submitted for each course, rather than a coordinated effort with one
person designated to file the report. Data show that students are mastering a couple of learning outcomes, but struggling with others.

*The remaining agenda items were deferred until next time due to time constraints:*

**Objective 5**
Objectives 6 and 7: Tayo Omotowa and Jim Skidmore
Objectives 8 and 9: Shu-Yuan Lin, Matt Wilson

c. Frequently asked questions:
   (attachments: 5-year schedules and Annotated GenEd Proposal/Assessment form)

d. Office of Assessment and Gen Ed Committee relationships and ideas -

e. Next Steps – where should GERC go from here? NWCCU accreditation review is next year...

8. Adjourn: **4:22 p.m.**

Approved by GERC: April 28, 2020
Accepted by UCC: April 29, 2020 via email vote
Accepted by Faculty Senate: May 6, 2020 via email vote
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 6, 2020