

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
September 10, 2020 Minutes

Meeting Began: 11:00 a.m.
Meeting Adjourned: 11:56 a.m.

Present: Ernest Gobert, Gyanendra Baral, Ivana Pavic, Leslie Jones, Julie Rice-Rollins, Tamala Zolicoffer, Stephen Morrow, Steve Shore, Liz Miller, Peggy Newman, Max Simmons, Makenna Green Garrison, Glenne' Whisenhunt, Chris Shelley, Dana Passek, Katie King, John Claybon, Thomas Harrison, Vince Bridges, John Castree

Absent: Kim Jameson, Jennifer Brumley

Meeting began with a welcome, and introductions were made by each member. Ernest Gobert told the new members what the committee does and said there were two primary functions: collect and assess General Education data. The committee chair then produces the report and sends to Academic Affairs. The committee may review and approve new general education courses as well.

Committee reviewed the March 2020 meeting minutes. Julie Rice-Rollins moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

General Education assessment from last year was presented by Ernest Gobert. Peggy Newman asked what the 3, 2, 1 rating was, and it was explained that 3-Strong Pass, 2-Pass, 1-Fail. Another question was asked regarding who is doing the rating and how they are trained. Ernest explained there are 5 teams of 5 members each. They attend an intense 4-hour training session. Steve Shore asked if there were large discrepancies, and the answer was they are very minimal.

Ernest called for a new process for collecting data. Presenting a few slides, he stated the need for more considerable faculty participation. It is discouraging that so few want to take part in General Education assessment. Participation is needed for meaningful assessment data.

The first slide explained what the annual Gen-Ed assessment provides. The next slide stated why there is a need for a new process. Lastly, a proposal was presented, and discussion ensued.

Steve Shore asked about how divisions could all submit to the different outcomes. Ernest responded with an example of how he requires his students to write a paper on Sir Isaac Newton, the author of the first calculus book. Max Simmons said public speaking is difficult in his area, and Professor Gobert commented that the division would only have to look at developing one assignment to meet the artifact requirement.

Peggy Newman stated, "It would be more equitable if a percentage was used in lieu of 30-50 per division." She indicated she had submitted artifacts in the past and that she found the process to be difficult. Professor Gobert noted that the process has been streamlined and simplified through Moodle submission.

Glenné' asked if we need full-time faculty only or if adjuncts can be included. The answer was that full-time faculty and adjuncts could participate.

Max stated it was difficult for his division to achieve all five outcomes and suggested examples of what an artifact could look like in math. A description or example of each category could be created, and that may help. Ernest mentioned that there are some examples on the website already. It was also suggested each division could assign a particular report that could be submitted and that there is a need to have some type of accountability.

It was decided the committee was not ready to vote on the proposal, and it was tabled until the next meeting.

Everybody thanked Professor Gobert for all his time and effort as chair of the committee.