

General Education Committee Meeting Minutes
March 14, 2019

Meeting began: 12:30 p.m.
Meeting adjourned; 1:20 p.m.

Present: Ernest Gobert, Mary Turner, Jennifer Brumley, Dr. Steve Shore, Michael Boyle, Julie Rice-Rollins, John Helton, Dr. Glennie' Whisenhunt, Dr. Makenna Green, Dr. Janet Perry, Dr. Shanna Padgham, Charles Myrick, and Stacie Warner

Absent: Dr. Max Simmons, Teresa Luper, Greg Gardner, Johnny Hill

Approval of November minutes: Julie made a motion to approve them. Michael seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Approval of February minutes: Shanna made a motion to approve the minutes. Steve seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

The meeting began with an update on uploading artifacts in Moodle. There was a small issue with this that has been resolved. We are currently waiting to see how many artifacts we receive digitally. Faculty still have the option to submit them as hard copies.

Ernest said that he went to the Business/IT division meeting to discuss artifacts and it was a positive meeting.

The issue of submitting group artifacts was again clarified. If one member of the group is eligible, then the artifact can be submitted.

Ernest and Makenna created a handout on how to upload artifacts in Moodle. Shanna said that she has used it and that it was very helpful.

Stacie discussed the use of general education outcomes in writing program reviews. She said that the AOAC had questions regarding the general education rubrics and the fact that the rubrics varied depending on the outcome being measured. There was discussion about how the rubrics were developed and the rationale for why they are different. Feedback from the AOAC recommended using an ABCD model. Ernest explained why the assessment teams rated the artifacts differently. Stacie expressed her appreciation for the clarification and believed she could better address questions and concerns posed by the AOAC.

Further discussion of the assessment rubrics highlighted the fact that artifacts come from many disciplines across campus, so the assessments are not the same as grading criteria. The rubrics must be more general to accommodate a variety of assignments from various courses.

Michael suggested that it is probably time for the assessment teams to review and make updates to the rubrics, if necessary.

It was also suggested that the rubrics and examples be shown in each division meeting so that faculty and program directors can see them and ask questions.

Janet brought up the issue of what we do with the results when we get them. This is especially important as we move toward our accreditation review. Ernest said that he met with Kim Jameson and got some ideas for how these can be incorporated into curriculum changes. It was suggested that it would be helpful to have a workshop for faculty during Prep/Planning week. Glenne' said that Susy attended a conference recently and could present information from it.

Ernest said that he would be contacting former assessment team members soon to see if they wanted to continue on their respective teams. Members of the writing assessment teams would meet to norm their responses to sample artifacts.

Steve suggested that the teams look for common errors and strengths in the artifacts so that there would be more specific information to highlight what the results mean.

The committee adjourned.