**General Education Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**October 15, 2018 at 9 a.m.**

**HSS 3035**

Voting Members Present: Zahid Hossain, Rebecca Oliver, Joseph Rukus, Lillie Fears, Paige Wimberley, Ferebee Tunno, Hong Zhou, Zahid Hossain, Bert Greenwalt, Gauri Guha

Ex-Officio Members Present: Summer DeProw,

Staff Support: Mary Elizabeth Spence

Members Absent: Ali Khalil, Karen Yanowitz, LTC Brian Mason (proxy CPT Robert Anderson), Elizabeth Wakefield, Marc Williams, David Harding, Robert Schichler

Called to order at 9:06 am by Chair Paige Wimberley

1. Meeting minutes from September 17, 2018 – Rebecca Oliver made a motion to approve. Lillie Fears seconded. All approved.

**Old Business**

1. Memo from Composition Course – Guest: Assessment Leaders – Drs. Kristi Costello and Elizabeth Chamberlain – Fall 2018 pilot project
   1. Dr. Costello talked about the need to standardize the measure over Composition sections. The conclusion was to make a cumulative portfolio to get an overall look at student work. The pilot began this fall in select sections after the faculty completed a workshop funded by an Assessment mini-grant. The Comp class had a lot of problems with inter-rater reliability and validity and would like to see if the pilot data could better prove student learning. There were a few concerns from the committee about errors in the memo and the symposium piece of the memo, which Dr. Chamberlain says were addressed by email. The committee discussed whether or not to vote on the pilot at this time, and decided to withhold a vote until the results were presented in the fall of 2019.

**New Business**

1. Sub-Committee Reports – The only reports missing are the political science reports.
   1. Sub-committee #2 ANTH 2233 Intro to Anthropology – Dr. DeProw and Dr. Wimberley talked the committee through the process of reviewing the reports, by first looking at the process for clarity. There were a few questions about the nomenclature in the reports from Dr. Hossain and Dr. Tunno. Dr. DeProw clarified the matrix score sheet versus the rubric in the report. Mr. Williams noted that both outcomes are touched, but only one outcome is actually measured. Dr. Hossain asked for a sample of the student work to be included. Dr. Fears raised a concern about the missing data and how that was going to be improved in the future. Dr. DeProw replied that there have been procedures put in place for the missing data problem not to occur again. Dr. Fears mentioned that the faculty could use an LMS to manage this more efficiently, but the faculty have opted not to do so. The score sheets are completed by hand and uploaded to faculty 180 to be reviewed by the department chair. Dr. Guha commented on the instrument and made recommendations on the endpoints, benchmarks, and their sufficiency. The committee discussed changing the exam and applying the same rubric. The committee approved the report including recommendations about the outcome and the data collection process.
   2. Sub-committee #3 ECON 2313 Principles of Macroeconomics – Dr. Rukus commented on the benchmark of 50% of students scoring a 50% or better. Dr. Deprow clarified that this is on the total instrument and gave some history on the background of the benchmark. The committee discussed that the new assessment plan needs to address benchmark since 4 years of data have been collected. The committee also discussed that the exam should be application questions not recall questions. Dr. Guha mentioned that these questions are taken from the Major Field Test identified by weak areas. The committee discussed the major field test and its use in different areas on campus. Dr. DeProw suggest that the committee add comments regarding rethinking the benchmark. She also asked if the action plan was robust enough considering the years of data that they have. Ms. Oliver and Dr. Rukus replied that they think it is. Dr. Hossain asked about the reference to the Mexico campus in the report and whether or not it should be included. Dr. DeProw explained how the Mexico campus should be referred too and Dr. Wimberley questioned whether it should have even been discussed in this report? Dr. Guha stated that AACSB wanted to see identical plans and finds for the business courses, but this may not be the case for all specialized accreditors. The committee debated whether the information for Mexico should be removed or not, and decided to table a vote on the report until edits can be made to the document.

**Old Business for Future Meetings**

1. Task force for Book of Committee
2. ULO Report from Assessment Office
3. Report from Teaching Award Committee
4. Substantive changes to assessment plan discussion

Meeting adjourned.