

Attending: John Hemingway, William Thompson, Amy Brock, Sean Cordes, Judy Dallinger (ex officio), Steve Bennet, David Haugen, Candace McLaughlin (ex-officio), John Hemingway, Steve Bennet, Phyllis Rippey, Kathleen O'Donnell-Brown, Douglas Huff, William Thompson, David Casagrande, Jim Schmidt,

Meeting Called to Order: 3:29

1. Approval of minutes Minutes Approved
  
2. Announcements – Senate approvals:
  - a. **Policies and Procedures Faculty Senate approved our policies and procedures**
  - b. History 144 **Approved by Faculty Senate**
  - c. BAT 279 withdrawn This proposal was withdrawn.
  
3. Request for Inclusion – General Honors:
  1. Phyllis: Any questions?
    1. David Casagrande: It seems vague.
    2. Phyllis: This is a three hundred level course—it looks like an advanced course in the major, not a foundational course. How do we justify letting honors students take advanced courses when we don't allow other advanced classes into Gen Ed?
    3. Dallinger: What do the guidelines say.
    4. Phyllis: It has always been understood across the state that Gen Ed classes are foundational.
    5. Steve: Is this because of the new requirement for Fine Arts?
    6. Phyllis: I don't think so. Phyllis reads from catalog of the “advanced” honors courses.
    7. This item is tabled until the Honors College can speak to the issue of the advanced courses.
  
4. Writing survey results
  - a. Analysis: David Casagrand: Provides analysis. See attached.
  - b. Next steps: Phyllis: Will we continue to use this survey?
    - a. Actually this survey had about the same response rate as the longer survey. Perhaps we want to do the long survey one semester, the short

another? Or should we provide an opportunity for people to step-into a longer survey if they elect to do so?

- b. John Hemingway: Smaller classes seem to have longer papers. Perhaps we ought to look more closely at what kinds of papers / assignments these are. One nine page paper? Nine one page papers?
- c. David: If we want that level of detail, we can do two separate kinds of surveys or do a longer survey once a year.
- d. Phyllis: The more elaborate we make this process, the less likely it is that later iterations of this council may do assessment. If we keep it simple, later iterations may continue to do this. Question to Judy Dallinger: If the Gen Ed council were committed to doing this every year, could persons wanting more detail extract it from the assessments of other majors?
- e. Judi Dallinger: I don't know of any major assessment reports that provide a high level of detail about writing.
- f. Jim Schmidt: On the other hand, this short survey does tell us that writing is going on. We ought to be careful about doing the survey too often—as people will be likely to blow it off.
- g. Sean Cordes: Discusses relationship between survey and amount of writing. He wants to add a question that will get to number of assignments.
- h. Phyllis: Could the subcommittee produce a report that we can send up to the President. We would also like a recommendation on the frequency of the survey.
- i. Thanks also acknowledge to Tere North.

## 5. Assessment

- a. memo on reporting results Council reviews memo
  - a. Phyllis: Our policies and procedures say that we are to assess General Education.
  - b. David Haugen reads policy: To implement assessment of Gen Ed and evaluate results.
  - c. Phyllis leads discussion of Chemistry's response to the assessment. What are we expected to do with the data? Do we collect aggregated data from each department and then make a decision as regards that department? What is it you really want to see? How should we fulfill our charge?
  - d. Sean: Do we need to create an average (as with “Excellence in

Teaching”) above/ below which we rate success or failure?

- e. Phyllis: Good question.
- f. John Hemingway: You evaluate to arrive at some conclusion or decision? What decision are we evaluating for?
- g. Phyllis: Theoretically, whether a particular class will belong to Gen Ed or not. Perhaps this data is most useful to the department in which it arises.
- h. Jim: I thought our purpose in doing this was to look cumulatively across departments to see if we are, as a university, meeting the goals we set for General Education.
- i. Phyllis: Ancillary discussion of whether departments need to share their instruments with us. Do **\*\*we\*\*** need this data? Will we really look at those instruments and evaluate them? Do we have the time and resources as a council? I can imagine that the Provost's office would want to archive the instruments for accreditation.
- j. Phyllis more discussion of how this data might be presented to us by the Provost's office.
- k. Judi Dallinger: Laughing—you mean me.
- l. Phyllis: What is it the council really wants to look at?
- m. Judi Dallinger: We are considering this a pilot data collection. We probably want to know what departments themselves learned from this assessment process.
- n. Sean: Do we want to see data at the individual course level?
- o. Phyllis: That is a possibility.
- p. Sean: I would rather know whether we are generally meeting the goal across campus.
- q. John: discusses his impression of the data for Chemistry.
- r. David: We are not interested in whether they know Chemistry per se, but whether they can think critically or have a broad knowledge of the natural sciences. Overall, in the university population, are we meeting our Gen Ed goals?
- s. Jim Schmidt: Agrees
- t. Phyllis: If it is the case that we are to determine if courses in certain areas are meeting certain gen ed goals, at the end of the day, when this data comes in, we would end up with one piece of paper, only instead of classes, it would list goals. In other words, we will watch how goals are being met globally rather than by one particular course or not.
- u. Phyllis: We want the provost's office to submit for all students, all

courses, by area, for each goal the total number in that area. For goal one, for example, we want to know if there are 2000 students have taken math natural sciences for goal one, how successful were they? Goals by divisions. **To what degree does each area contribute to each goal.**

- v. Candace: You may want to break out math
  - w. David Haugen makes a motion in re **u**: above. John Hemingway seconds.
  - x. **Motion passes unanimously.**
  - y. Phyllis: We have to do this assessment by the end of the semester.
6. Phyllis: **Creation of a subcommittee to explore the digital preservation of the committees archives. Bill, Amy, David Casagrande, Phyllis**
  7. Discussion of what to do with courses that have not been offered in a few years, the deep freeze option.
  8. Judi Dallinger: Hmmm it looks like the Chemistry department mislabeled what goals they are reporting on. I will check up on this,
  9. Phyllis: Discusses whether or not we will see any course coming down the pike.
    1. Jim: There's a philosophy course coming in March.
  10. Phyllis: Perhaps we don't have to meet again in February. I will let you know.