

**General Education Committee
October 11, 2018 Meeting**

Begins: 12:30 p.m.
Adjourns: 1:23 p.m.

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

Guest: Sarah Mathew, Professor of Computer Science

Absent: John Helton, Teresa Luper, Greg Gardner, Dana Tuley-Williams

Committee members reviewed the September minutes. Charles Myrick's name was omitted from the minutes. He was not present for that meeting. A correction was made to the fifth paragraph to indicate that the HLC site visit will be fall 2021. The actual cycle will begin sooner.

Steve Shore made a motion to accept the minutes with those changes. Shanna seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Next, Ernest recognized Sarah Mathew and explained that she was present to discuss potential artifacts from the CS 1143, Beginning Programming class. Sarah presented committee members with two examples of printouts. One would be more appropriate for assessing the math outcome. The other would be more appropriate for assessing critical thinking. After looking at the two examples, committee members discussed whether a separate rubric is needed for problem solving as a subset of critical thinking. Max mentioned that many institutions now are assessing that as a more specific way of addressing critical thinking. A distinction between problem solving and critical thinking is that problem solving requires a demonstration of the appropriate process and the correct answer. Currently, the critical thinking rubric only addresses the process. A student is deemed competent if the process is correct even if the answer is wrong. If the committee decides to pursue this, it would be a major task. The committee will have to define problem solving, develop a rubric to measure it, present it to Academic Affairs and get buy off on it, and then change the catalog to include this as one of the outcomes. Max suggested that this might even allow inclusion of some AAS degrees.

If the committee begins accepting the artifacts from the programming faculty, someone who teaches the programming class would be invited to serve on that assessment team. The committee is receptive to receiving programming artifacts. Sarah stated that all assignments and rubrics for these classes are uniform among all full time and adjunct faculty.

Ernest next skipped to Item 4 on the agenda dealing with his presenting the General Education data for Fall 2018 to the Dean's Council on October 10, 2018. Janet asked to skip back to the previous item related to outcome assessment results and recommendations. She said that one of the things the HLC will ask for is what is actually done with the recommendations. Are these

shared with faculty so that changes can be made at the course level? Makenna explained how the data are used in program reviews. Michael added that faculty use the data when redesigning courses.

Continuing with Item 4, Ernest pointed out a graphic outlining where most artifacts are from across campus. He presented this information to the Dean's Council and encouraged Deans to encourage their faculty to provide artifacts. Dr. Harrison, Dean of Arts, English, and Humanities, invited Ernest to speak at the next division meeting. He will also address faculty in the Division of Business and IT and in Health Professions. Those three divisions have relatively new deans, and Max indicated that he would speak with Dean Harrison, Dean Claybon, and Dean Bridges to update them on what the committee does and why artifacts are important.

Time was running short, so the committee agreed to table Item 3 until the November meeting. Makenna asked for volunteers from the committee to beta test the new Moodle submission process. She also asked that assessment team members on the committee test the assessment piece of the process. Committee members volunteered for both processes.

The meeting adjourned.