

Gen Ed Committee Meeting Minutes - 9/08/2022

Meeting called to order at 11:02 am.

Those in attendance: Ernest Gobert, Kathy Earl-Wilcox, Susan Fryrear, Jennifer Cuneo, Johnny Hill, Renee Thomas, Sara Mathew, Pamela Stout, Max Simmons, Matt Eastwood, Kathy Wheat, Justin Garrett, Mickey Jack

The meeting with introductions of committee members and those in attendance.

Ernest asked for a volunteer to take minutes – Mickey Jack accepted.

Sara Mathew makes a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Max Simmons moves to accept the minutes.

The committee began discussions regarding Gen Ed results and working on a recommendation for Academic Affairs.

- Ernest and Jennifer talked about the reports at the all employee meeting, but didn't go into much detail due to lack of time.
- Jumping to slide #7 where all the data is for all the categories:
- Mickey Jack began discussion regarding Math scores and how they had reverting to pre-pandemic levels.
- Kathy Earl-Wilcox discussed the variance of in-person vs. online, Matt pointed out it was only 12 people for on campus reporting so the numbers may be skewed.
- There was also discussion about math labs (when open, etc.).
- Jennifer Cuneo pointed out that the pass rate was very high for those who did score well.
- The worst rubric metric score for Math was "calculation steps"
- Math artifacts came from everywhere (4 divisions), not just the Math department; however, only 8 instructors submitted artifacts.

***could be a recommendation that students show work on assignments to know what the answer means and checking the answer if possible.**

- Susan Fryrear offered to work on getting more submissions from the HP division as much of their work requires Math
- Mickey Jack asked if there were any reported issues to submitting? – Jennifer Cuneo explained that many instructors use 3rd party platforms for teaching (i.e. Cengage & McGraw hill) which can make it can be challenging to get info pulled out to submit as artifacts.
- Max Simmons pointed out that there aren't enough samples to decide about the difference between Traditional and Online
- Sara Mathew – another issue is when we are going through this assessment, how much they are able to apply in the other classes. They have math in Business, but there is no one there to understand Coding in artifacts reviewers. What are examples of what we

need for review? We need examples by division to show what kind of artifacts are acceptable. As a committee, we need to come up with a solution.

- Max asked if we need the instructor to assess the artifacts. Sara said no. She has asked in the past about paying someone externally.
- Susan Fryrear liked the idea. She said she was intimidated by Math when she first started reviewing artifacts. She suggested a Zoom training with those who will be assessing coding or a score sheet.
- Ernest Gobert– up until a few years ago, we had people from the area assessing the artifacts specific to them. AA chooses the teams for the assessment groups.
- Max Simmons confirmed that yes, before that change we had subject experts. **That may be a good recommendation to go back to that model.**
- Ernest Gobert– that change was made by people who are no longer in AA. The committee was never approached by anybody about that so, we will make that a recommendation of content experts.
- Renee Thomas asked if there was a base number of artifacts that must be submitted for each division and Ernest Gobert explained that there was a 30 to 50 artifacts minimum recommendation from the committee.
- Max Simmons suggested this could maybe be a recommendation. We probably need to memorialize that process and bring that up front so people understand we are not looking to have thousands of artifacts. Committee members do have to assess them and devote their time to doing it.
- Jennifer Cuneo – is it possible to get more assessors?

Ernest offered that he and Jennifer will get together and make the recommendations into a draft which will be sent out to the committee. This will allow for discussion via email as the committee has to ultimately approve it during a meeting.

Kathy Earl-Wilcox thanked Ernest and Jennifer for working on this and putting the results together.

Max Simmons add that when looking at writing, public speaking and critical thinking scores, they seem really high. Is our process adequately assessing these things? Ernest explained that when he saw these averages, he verified they were consistent on rating.

Sara Mathew asked if we have ever gotten feedback from assessors and Ernest explained that yes, we usually ask for trends or anything they thought would be beneficial.

Max asked if it is part of our responsibility as a committee to approve new courses for Gen Ed., are there any? Ernest explained that the paperwork on our website and Mickey Jack stated no course had been proposed to be considered Gen Ed courses.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00.