

Meeting Notes

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Item | Description |
| Name/Title | General Education Review Committee |
| Date | January 14, 2015 |
| Time | 11:00-noon |
| Location | 200 McKenny |
| Members Attending | Zenia Bahorski, Doug Baker, Chris Foreman (co-chair), Christopher Gardiner, John Koolage (co-chair), Konnie Kustron, Peggy Liggitt, Gerald Newberry, Bob Winning |
| Absent | Lisa Klopfer, Mariana Nicolae, Mary Rearick (excused) |

Data:

IRIM has supplied data showing where General Education courses are housed, how this changes over time, and who is teaching these courses. This data will be distributed electronically to the committee. The information raises questions about passing rates, the number of students in individual sections, proportions of majors versus non majors in courses, how departments decide on the number of General Education classes and who is going to teach them, and on the allocation of resources. The committee will analyze this data and whatever is included in the final report will be referenced in an executive summary.

Progress of subcommittee SWOT Analyses:

Criterion Four - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement.

The attached matrix was discussed and input requested from the rest of the committee. The discussion referenced:

- The use of student electronic comprehensive education portfolios.
- Focus on process, not product.
- Student input on whether the experience was comprehensive enough.
- Do students know what outcomes should be expected?
- This General Education review could generate new questions for the exit survey.
- What should be done in terms of quality control of courses?
- What resources are needed to support General Education?

Criterion Five - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.

The committee chairs met to finalize changes to the SWOT analysis incorporating information covering program trends relevant to planning, fiscal and human resources, infrastructure, budget, and support.

Review of Quantitative Data Subcommittee.

Six years of data have been examined. Issues raised include:

- The number of courses has remained fairly constant over time.
- The need to look at courses with anomalous pass or fail rates.
- How does data looked at earlier in today's meeting relate to the data here?
- In examining data for this review, we might be picking up information useful to other areas on campus, such as Holman Success Centre and Advising; for example, why are first year students more successful in certain courses.
- This group will identify under which criteria data fall.

Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support

The subcommittee has the necessary data and framework within which to work. Group will be meeting further.

Moving forward

- Benchmarking data will be sent out from the General Education Office in advance of the next meeting.
- At the February 11th meeting subcommittees will present drafts for review.
- Final report will include recommendations on what important questions need to be asked, what data should be looked at more frequently than every five years, how this data should be acted upon, and what other committees might need to be formed.

Attachment: SWOT Analysis Matrix, Teaching and Learning Subcommittee