

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

### **Meeting Notes**

#### **Benchmarking General Education program**

- Revisions were suggested to the General Education Comparison Matrix, previously provided to the committee, in terms of clarity and links. Suggestions should be emailed to Chris Foreman. Direct comparison of programs will be very difficult.
- Such comparison is a requirement in the Committee's charge.
- This falls under Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support.
- Criterion One (Mission) touches on comparisons in terms of how other institutions review their General Education programs, rather than a focus on the components.

#### **Final Report**

- Need to have clarity on purpose and audience.
  - Final report will be prepared for delivery to the Provost, General Education Advisory Council, and the campus community.
  - Report will also be relevant for University Assessment Committee and for Higher Learning Commission accreditation.
- Consider format:
  - Start with executive summary.
  - Should be consistency across the sections. Introduction for each section. Basic format will be that of Criterion Four.
  - End with recommendations. In terms of SWOT analysis, Opportunities can be rephrased as recommendations and Weaknesses are areas that need to be strengthened.
- Committee needs to decide on what should be highlighted and on prioritization.

#### **Quantitative Data**

Discussion of the attached "Quantitative Data" handout included:

- Subgroups should look into where data fits into their criterion. Seems most relevant to Criterion Four.
- Don't use the terms pass and fail, as this might be misleading, but rather "F to C-" and "C-A."
- Passing rates in General Education courses increased significantly at the same time that numbers of students and course sections increased.
- Writing Intensive courses are major classes designated as General Education, and not the typical 100/200 level courses. While inclusion of them in the data does not make a great deal of difference (less than 7%), it should be noted that they are included in the numbers.

#### **Attachments:**

Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct SWOT

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

Criterion Four: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement SWOT

Criterion Five: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness SWOT

Quantitative Data