

**General Education Committee
Minutes**

December 9, 2009

Present:	Bernie Quetchenbach Kurt Toenjes Mike Havens Mark Fenderson Michael Scarlett Rita Kratky (ex-officio)	Melinda Tilton Neil Suits Matt Redinger Neil Jussila Richard Pierce Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)
Absent:	Tom Regele Brent Roberts George Czyz – <i>excused</i>	Kathe Gabel
Presiding:	Matt Redinger, Chairperson	

Matt Redinger called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Missouri room.

The minutes of November 18 were accepted as presented.

I. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Update on Reform of General Education Course Outcomes

Social Sciences and Cultural Diversity are the only categories without outcomes. It was stated that Social Sciences should be done by the end of the semester. Cultural Diversity is almost done, and will be finished after a review.

It was noted that it is up to the instructor of each course how those outcomes will be assessed. Each instructor is going to have to show where the data came from.

B. Sampling and Rotation of Sections for Fall 2009 and Spring 2010

The Spring 2009 assessment list was reviewed and more than half of those courses not entered into the database are taught by full-time faculty. The Committee has harangued people over and over again, with no success. It was suggested that in the future, should we use a sample of the Gen Ed courses, say one third of each category? It was cited that if faculty are not required to report this data every semester, they may stop doing it all together. It may be easier to simply require this task of all Gen Ed instructors every year. It was noted that some faculty are not entering data because they disagree philosophically with the assessment itself. The issue of bad timing with database problems was also raised. The question was raised that if the Committee only samples a third of the Gen Ed courses, and we have this low of a participation rate, will we even get enough data? It was stated that if we do decide to use a sample rather than all Gen Ed courses, we will need to send a notice

to each instructor so they can be aware ahead of time and plan tests or projects to assess the outcomes. It was cited that the only way to legitimately sample the Gen Ed courses is to randomly select them, regardless of category. It was noted that we are essentially getting a sample by the lack of data from these faculty members. We now have simplified outcomes and simple directions for data entry. What could stop them now?

It was noted that this system is not really a good evaluation technique, but we are stuck with it until we get MAP.

The question was raised as to whether the Spring 2009 database is still open for data entry. Most likely it is not. The Committee needs to move forward and remind faculty that they still need to enter data for Fall 2009.

It was noted that it seems excessive to evaluate the same course two semesters in a row.

It was cited that part of the randomness of a sample is the faculty who do not enter data.

It was stated that we can tell NWCCU that we were not satisfied with our first assessment system. We have modified it, but we are still not satisfied. It was cited that we must also show what we are doing as a result of the data we have. It was countered that we should really sell our process to NWCCU, rather than continuing to say we are dissatisfied and reworking.

C. Spring 2009 Assessment Data Narrative

It was noted that unfortunately and strangely, the entire Gen Ed assessment system is controlled by one person. She is out until December 18. There is no data accessible, so there is no narrative at this time.

It was noted that this data is not confidential. It should be someplace public. Dr. Redinger stated he would contact IT about moving the data to a more public spot.

D. Score Guide for Advising Center/Minimum COMPASS Scores

Dr. Redinger assembled a sheet based on the feedback he received from his survey of the faculty. The Committee members agreed to discuss this sheet with their colleagues.

E. Possible Meeting Times for Spring 2010

If you have schedule changes for next semester, please let the committee know. Wednesday afternoons seem to work well for most members.

F. What is the goal of General Education and Assessment?

It was noted that this discussion mostly sprang from the “70% rule” and its implementation in the assessment data gathering. Do we need to develop a different measure, perhaps a four-point scale?

It was stated that the goal of assessing Gen Ed is not about NWCCU, but about what our students are getting out of Gen Ed.

G. Updating Outcomes – Technical Issues

Dr. Redinger stated that I.T. has told him it will take many, many hours of work to change the outcomes in the database. Perhaps they could have the new outcomes entered and ready to go by the end of the Spring 2010 semester.

It was noted that if our system is so difficult to update, we need a more flexible system. We could make it a SharePoint where people could simply dump spreadsheets of information. The system we are using now is part of Banner and is designed to be used with thousands of courses. We assess less than 100 per semester. The only issue with using a Sharepoint is that instructors could see other instructors' data.

It was cited that we could have the information collected by department or by category. It was responded that by category would make the most sense, since some categories are made up of many different departments.

It was agreed to ask the I.T. staff involved in Gen Ed assessment to come to a meeting in the Spring semester.

H. Survey of Graduates: General Education/Academic Foundations Opinion Survey

Dean Khaleel noted that Career Services administers the survey for her, and the questions are taken word-for-word from the outcomes listed in the catalogs as they have changed over time. It was noted that this survey, and, by extension, the outcomes in the catalog, are unrelated to what the Committee is doing now to assess Gen Ed.

It was stated that there is almost nothing that can be interpreted from the results of this survey. All the results are flat, with the exception of the last few questions on social awareness and cultural diversity. Students basically said we are not addressing social awareness in Gen Ed.

It was noted that these surveys, though not linked to the new Gen Ed outcomes, do need to come to the Committee for analysis. Dean Khaleel noted that Joe Floyd has been doing the analysis, but his post-retirement agreement ends after this year. Mike Havens said that he would use grad student time to do analysis in the future. Dean Khaleel said that she has all the data from all the surveys in her office.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.