Subcommittee Reports

Criteria 3 and 4
Please see attached document with changes from previous draft highlighted. This includes a draft of potential data collection.

Criteria 1 and 2
Please see attached document with revisions suggested at previous meeting included. Non-relevant data sources have been eliminated.

Action Item: Goal for the next meeting of making decisions about what sources we could collect and what sources might not be viable for now, but might be considered in future review.

Quantitative Data Review
- There is a lot of data. If the committee wants the subcommittee to examine any specific data, they are willing to do so.
- Data on passing rates for students raised the issue of 100% passing rate in large classes. Also of concern was low passing rates in biology. Is this data going to departments and, if so, what are they doing with it?
- Recognizing such patterns useful for the Assessment Committee.

Instructor Survey Results
A problem exists with loss of demographic data during administration of the survey. This data was only collected for instructors who responded prior to the email reminder being sent out. With regard to the original error in sending out multiple surveys to individual instructors, IRIM assures us that they have successfully picked up any duplicate submissions. Looking at the demographic data that does exist, it seems that results did not fall all that differently with regard to length of service and only slightly with regard to college.

Review of closed questions:
- General Education teaching experience. It might be useful to break down the data on the basis of those who have never taught General Education courses.
- General Education program services:
  a. Where the word “beneficial” rather than “appropriate” was used, the percentages are higher.
  b. More valuable to look at the item responses, than the averages.
  c. If take out the “no opinion” column, that changes the numbers significantly. Might be useful in future to ask why the “no opinion” option was chosen. This could be because the instructor never taught General Education, or not that particular area, and/or relate to the language used in the question.
- General Education program knowledge: The high percentages might speak to who answered the survey and also to the fact that their opinion of their knowledge, not their actual knowledge, is being tested.
Review of comments:
- The themes identified are those of the survey administrator. The committee needs to do the theme analysis.
- Interesting to see if some of what is identified as weakness is also identified as strength.
- Useful to divide into subsets of those who never or seldom teach General Education and those who teach it regularly or often. This data would help in assessing the transfer of skills from General Education courses to other courses.
- Critiques offer insights into areas where we might do a better job of educating people on the purpose of General Education; e.g. comments regarding the program being too diffuse, not providing a firm foundation, lack of need for General Education.
- Is the criticism of too many courses reflected in anecdotal comments on campus? Does it also include a criticism of course vetting?

**Action Items**

- Continue work on adaptation of HLC/CAS template.
- Reparse the data as suggested above.
- Read through the comments and make some notes on how they should be re-categorized. Comments will be emailed out to the committee in Word format.
- In future, email handouts ahead of meeting time, when possible, and specify between meeting homework.

Attachments:
Revised Draft Template - Criteria 1 and 2
Revised Draft Template - Criteria 3 and 4