

General Education Committee Minutes

October 5, 2018

Buddy Green Family/Liberty National Bank Student Meeting Room

Present-Travis Childs (Chair), Marco Columbus, James Dover, Mandy Husak, Sarah Janda, Marge Kingsley, Danyelle Lee, Hong Li, Edris Montalvo, Kyle Moore, Karla Oty, Ali Soylu, and Wensheng Wang.

Absent-Edna McMillan and Matthew Van Sant.

Time- 9:33 a.m.

1. **Approval of April Meeting Minutes**

The minutes from the September 7th meeting were reviewed. There some corrections needed to accurately reflect a discussion about face-to-face versus online courses. There was another correction suggested to clarify the language during the discussion about the CAAP replacement. Sarah Janda made a motion to approve with minutes with the corrections. Edris Montalvo second. The motion passed.

2. **Gen Ed SLO and CAAP Replacement**

Travis Childs reminded the committee to ask various programs if a Gen Ed SLO can be aligned with an existing assessment instrument in capstone courses.

3. **Writing Intensive**

Sarah Janda asked for an official clarification about “writing intensive” meant in the context of general education assessment. After some discussion, it was suggested to ask the programs to provide examples of the types of writing assignments their students are already performing.

4. **Examine Bias in Gen. Ed. Instruments**

During a lengthy discussion, the committee clarified cultural bias in general education assessment. An important goal is to remove any bias from general education assessment instruments. During the Spring 2019 semester, some programs aligned with selected Gen. Ed. SLOs will be asked to submit their instruments of assessment so that the committee can review and evaluate for cultural bias.

5. **Gen. Ed. on the W:/ Drive**

The loss of institutional knowledge of general education assessment is significant problem when a program has one or a few individuals responsible and those individuals leave or retire. To mitigate the lapsing in general education assessment, IT was asked to create folders specific for general education assessment in a share folder. IT reported that ‘read-only’ access could be permitted and folders could be generated by SLOs. Chairs and other department

heads would be given read/write access to store general education assessment instruments.

6. **Action Plans for Indirect Measures Capstone**

IDEA surveys are administered and scored at the end of capstone courses with specific embedded questions that are aimed at capturing student's perception of their Cameron University experience. There were 3 areas that did not meet the target of students responding with either agree or strongly agree. These areas (Ethics, Wellness, and Information Literacy) need action plans by October 24th.

There was a general discussion why some targets were met and others weren't. Danyelle Lee and Karla Oty suggested students need to be carefully read the question on the IDEA form so that they are thinking and responding about their Cameron University experience and are not answering the questions based on the particular Capstone course the student is taking. Marco Columbus asked about response rate differences between pencil and paper IDEA forms and the new online IDEA forms. Several strategies were discussed to get high response rates on the online forms including taking the entire section to a computer lab or checking out the tablet's form the library.

7. **Action Plans for Indirect Measures Gen. Ed. IDEA Forms**

IDEA surveys are collected at the end of general education courses with specific embedded questions that match the learning outcomes for general education. Karla Oty disseminated a packet that reported the question the student was asked, and the responses organized by course, semester, and academic year. The committee discussed those SLOs that did not meet their target. For example, with a target of 80%, only 78% of students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they learned problem solving skills in those gen. ed. courses that are aligned with problem solving. Critical thinking and aesthetics also did not meet their stated target.

A lengthy discussion ensued about possible reasons students do not perceive to learn problem solving skills or critical thinking skills. It was agreed that students may need reminders at the beginning and throughout the course when they are developing their problem solving skills. Some language was discussed about possible action plans which are needed by October 24th.

8. **Adjournment**

The next meeting was set for November 2nd at 9:30am. Sarah Janda motioned to adjourn the meeting. Edris Montalvo seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:40am.