**General Education Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**November 26, 2018, at 9 a.m.**

**HSS 3035**

Voting Members Present: Zahid Hossain, Rebecca Oliver, Joseph Rukus, Marc Williams, Lillie Fears, David Harding, Paige Wimberley, Ferebee Tunno, Hong Zhou

Ex-Officio Members Present: Summer DeProw

Staff Support: Mary Elizabeth Spence, Elizabeth Wakefield

Members Absent: Ali Khalil, LTC Brian Mason (proxy CPT Robert Anderson), Robert Schichler, Gauri Guha, Karen Yanowitz, Bert Greenwalt

Meeting called to order at 9:02 am by Chair Paige Wimberley

1. Meeting minutes from October 29, 2018 – Dr. Joe Rukus motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Rebecca Oliver seconded. All approved.
2. Meeting minutes from November 12, 2018 – Rebecca Oliver motioned to approve the meeting minutes and Dr. Ferebee Tunno seconded. All approved.

**Old Business**

1. Strategy for reviewing Social Science General Education Learning Outcomes and/or all General Education Learning Outcomes
	1. Appoint a chairperson - The Gen Ed committee decided to wait on making a sub-committee until Dr. Salo is able to bring some information to the committee.
	2. Faculty/Assessment fellow opportunity – The office of Assessment would like to offer a research associate to look at what other schools are doing and what their general education looks like. Dr. Ed Salo is the Assessment Fellow that we would like to offer this for this opportunity. Rebecca Oliver mentioned that we might look at interdisciplinary courses or team taught. Dr. Harding motioned that we hire Dr. Salo as the General Education Research Analyst and Dr. Lillie Fears seconded. All Approved.
2. Sub-committee #3 Presentation
	1. ECON 2313 Principles of Macroeconomics-REVISED REPORT – Dr. Harding had a question about the benchmark being 60% of students will score more than 55% on the exam. We clarified that this is 55% of student scoring a 50% or higher. That is mathematically correct. This benchmark was inspired by the Major Field Test, and not on previous data. Dr. Fears asked, “Does their accrediting agency not want more than 50% of their students to pass?” We should be able to get more than 50% of their students scoring a passing on the student learning outcomes. Dr. Harding added that he did like the item analysis and that they are digging deeper into the questions. Numbers 9 and 7 did not meet the benchmark and thus the faculty will be looking at those questions. The sub-committee made a motion to approve. All Approved.
	2. ECON 2333 Economic Issues and Concepts – Dr. Harding says that we have very much the same comments on this one. This one has a higher benchmark. It's more of a survey of macro and micro. This one has a benchmark of 60% of the students will score 55% or above which is mathematically impossible. The benchmark needs to be changed to either 50% or 60%. Dr. Harding again likes the way they analyze the items, and there were a couple of questions that are lower but meet the benchmark that the faculty will be reviewing. Dr. Harding motioned that the report be approved with clarification on the benchmark. All Approved.

**New Business**

1. Sub-Committee Reports
	1. Sub-committee #1:

HIST 2763 US History to 1876 –These were turned in a couple days after the deadline, and the assessment office was not asked to read over them. We could read them as is and make comments, or we could deny the reports and send them back to be worked on for the spring. Dr. Rukus said there are two issues on the table. The macro issue is how much change does the committee allow without approval of the committee, and the micro issue is what do we do with the current history reports? Rebecca Oliver has questions about the continuity of data and if they were actually completing assessments. Dr. Wimberley asked whether the instrument was embedded in Blackboard or not. Dr. Zhou had a few comments from Dr. Yanowitz and Ali. They do not have two years of data, and they did not copy the original assessment plan. They don’t have any analysis either. They don’t really address anything in the action plan. Dr. Zhou wanted to look at number 11 specifically. Dr. Rukus and Dr. Zhou said that the report isn’t that bad, but it seems they are still struggling with a good process. Dr. Hossain asked if there is a timeline for the department assessment committee to continue to implement the new process. Dr. DeProw asked five questions about the history reports including: Has the department established an assessment process?, Has the department attempted to hold themselves accountable?, Has the department been transparent?, Has the department reported the assessment process, data, and analysis well?, and Has the department addressed student learning? Rebecca stated all that they gave us was a mean score, but we don’t have any deep dive into the material. Dr. Zhou mentioned that they have a significant amount of data that wasn’t used or analyzed in the report. This committee does set rigor for the assessment process and it’s important for us to discuss how much change we can allow before we even start to address the new work that they are doing. Dr. Harding is willing to accept it with a statement of what needs to happen when the process changes. They were piloting this in Fall of 17, but this was approved in Fall of 16 and there are at least 3 semesters of missing data. Dr. DeProw provided three options for the GEC: (1) accept the report and ask the History Department to continue to improve the process, (2)ask the History Department to complete the report form correctly and resubmit early spring 2019, (3) submit an interim report in fall 2019 with additional data, context, and analysis. Marc Williams asked what the interim report would look like. The example given was the Oral Communications report from this past Spring. They collected data in a spring and a fall and submitted the following fall and then presented in the spring. Dr. Wimberley said that it sounds like this is the way we need to go and that we would like a report with specific questions to be submitted to the sub-committee. The committee also agreed that this must be an assignment for a grade. These comments apply to all four of the history reports. Dr. Wimberley plans to draft a proposal for the four history reports and it will be reviewed and voted on in the next meeting.

* + 1. HIST 2773, US History since 1876 -
	1. Sub-committee #2:
		1. None for this meeting
	2. Sub-committee #3:
		1. HIST 1013 World Civilization to 1660 -
		2. HIST 1023 World Civilization since 1660 -

**Old Business for Future Meetings**

1. Task Force for Book of Committee
2. ULO Report from Assessment Office
3. Report from Teaching Award Committee
	1. Dr. Harding has submitted a report. If time allows, we will discuss at the December 3 meeting.
4. Substantive changes to assessment plan discussion