

## Meeting Notes

Item	Description
Name/Title	General Education Review Committee
Date	February 3, 2014
Time	2:00-3:00
Location	200 McKenny
Members Attending	Zenia Bahorski, Daryl Barton, Chris Foreman (co-chair), Christopher Gardiner, John Koolage (co-chair), Konnie Kustron, Peggy Liggitt, Gerald Newberry, Mary Rearick, Michael Tew

### **IRIM Data:**

John Koolage discussed the attached handouts. The data obtained from IRIM already existed. Future data requests will need organizing questions from the committee. Data from before the implementation of the Gen Ed Program is not as well organized and will take longer to pull together.

### **General Education Program Review document (attached) – Committee Guidelines:**

Daryl Barton questioned the nature of the ongoing course level assessment referenced in the first bullet point on committee guidelines. Chris Foreman stated that only a sampling of courses is done at the program level (mostly on Global Awareness and U.S. diversity as theses are campus-wide), whereas course level concerns are handled at the department level. With regard to the issue of removing an approved course, while there is no process currently in place, this committee could recommend that the General Education Evaluation Committee change its methodology to allow this.

Daryl Barton asked for assurance that the recommendations of this committee will be acted upon. There was discussion that this should be written into the committee recommendations. A meeting should be scheduled by the end of winter semester 2015 to review feedback on these recommendations.

Peggy Liggitt emphasized that the function of this committee is program review and making recommendations. The committee has a clear list of items for review and needs to ask how we capture these. Our goal, for example, is not to do assessment but to perhaps recommend that more assessment be done. John Koolage agreed and added that the committee should decide if the list is exhaustive in its present form.

### **General Education Program Review document (attached) – items for assessment and reflection:**

Mary Rearick suggested using materials available on the Association of American Colleges and Universities' (AAC&U) website on global awareness and continuous improvement in forming clear criteria on what this committee should be examining. An email with the AAC&U materials and web address will be sent to committee members.

Peggy Liggitt stated that, at a minimum, the committee should prioritize the list of items on the General Education Program Review document so that it can manage its time and resources.

Michael Tew asked that the sentence on, “whether or not we should limit the size of certain choice categories” (under the second bullet point) be struck as, while it is in the purview of this committee to make a recommendation on limiting the size of choice categories, this cannot be done without data on learning outcomes. The committee can make recommendations on getting more assessment data, but--based on student outcomes as a criterion—it does not currently have enough data to address the question.

Christopher Gardiner stated that the committee needs to first decide if limiting the size of choice categories is actually an issue.

Daryl Barton stressed that the committee is looking at program components, not at a specific outcome for a specific category. Are the categories we have sufficient? We need to have appropriate metrics and criteria for these broad comparisons. Chris Foreman agreed that we need to look at this at a national level. Are we in line, and should we be in line, with these national standards? By what criteria do we assess if that degree of alignment is appropriate or not?

It was agreed to:

- Remove the second sentence of the second bullet point concerning limiting the size of certain choice categories.
- Decide on the set of questions for this self-study. How do we write these questions without bias or where do we get them? AAC&U materials on continuous improvement were suggested as a useful source.
- Rewrite statements included under bulleted points as questions.
- Prioritize questions.
- Split the third bullet point into two as follows:
  - Faculty
    - Perceptions of the program
    - Concerns about the program, if any.
  - Students (current and alumni)
    - Perceptions of the program
    - Concerns about the program, if any.
- Consider what questions to ask in the faculty survey and focus groups.
  - Need clarity on what information is being sought and why.
  - A generic survey to instructors and administrators could inform the choice of focus group questions.
  - Establish demographics in the survey:
    - What college?
    - What department or what discipline? (Department is narrow enough to identify individuals.)
    - Do you teach a general education course?

Chris Foreman confirmed that the Provost’s Office will provide funds to hire facilitators for focus groups as discussed in previous meetings.

- Include computer literacy, possibly under the first bullet point, regarding program components.
- Consider the value of employer feedback as it would only indirectly measure the contribution of general education. While critical thinking, communication, and quantitative skills are vital to employers this would be difficult to measure. The committee could look at the national data on this.
- Use existing ECA data as data point for student feedback.

**Meeting with some members of General Education Reform Committee:**

On the issue of next week's meeting with some members of the General Education Reform Committee, it was suggested that this take the form of an open dialog. Specific suggestions for questions were why they made the choices they did; if there was anything left out that they would like revisited today; seven years later what are their thoughts on the program; and what standards, criteria, or metrics did they use in decision making.

Chris Foreman referenced pages 3 and 4 of the "Education for Participation in the Global Community" document which specifies the five main categories of the program structure and also "Additional Expectations," including computer skills and interdisciplinary courses which might also be of interest in the discussion.

**Attachments:**

General Education Program Review

Benchmarking FTIAC Persistence

FTIAC Retention and Graduation Rate Trends

Impact of Attempting General Education Course Requirements in First Two Semesters on Six-Year Graduation Rates