

General Education Committee
Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 26, 2013
3:00 p.m. Room 746

Present: Carolyn Borg, Frank Nigro, Shelly Presnell, Lauren Hollingsworth, Anita Maxwell, Roxie Redd

Absent/Excused: Susannah Fulton, James Tate

Special Guests Present: Meridith Randall, Timothy Johnston, Marc Beam, Cathy Anderson, Kathy Royce

Welcome

Carolyn called the meeting to order at 3:02 with a short welcome. She indicated that today's agenda is short regarding GE courses. She welcomed Cathy Anderson and Shelly Presnell who will be talking about GELOs. Marc and Meridith are here for input also. Introductions were done around the table.

Minutes for approval – May 23, 2013

Discussion: There was a short review of the minutes from the May 23, 2013 meeting. No comments or corrections.

Motion/Second to approve the minutes as submitted: Redd/Maxwell; motion carried with the minutes approved.

Update committee membership 2013-14

The membership of the General Education Committee was reviewed for the new academic year with the following changes noted on the membership roster.

Discipline	Center	Dean	GE Committee Faculty
Natural Science	Science, Language Arts, and Math	Frank Nigro	Need replacement for Fulton?
Social and Behavioral Science	Arts, Communication and Social Sciences	Ralph Perrin	James Tate
Humanities	Arts, Communication and Social Sciences	Ralph Perrin	Shelly Presnell
English	Science, Language Arts, and Math	Frank Nigro	Lauren Hollingsworth
Oral Communication	Arts, Communication and Social Sciences	Ralph Perrin	Shelly Presnell
Mathematics	Science, Language Arts, and Math	Frank Nigro	Anita Maxwell
Living	Multiple Centers		Vacant

Skills/Multicultural			
Agric/Nat. Res./ Ind. Tech	Business, Agriculture, Industry, and Technology	Eva Jimenez	Vacant
Business	Business, Agriculture, Industry, and Technology	Eva Jimenez	Bob Googins Scott Gordon
Nursing	Health Sciences and University Programs	Wanda Spratt Kathy Royce	Roxie Redd
Physical Education	Safety, Physical Education, and Consumer Sciences	Gary Houser	Brad Rupert
Counseling	Student Services	Sandra Hamilton- Slane Timothy Johnston	Carolyn Borg

Remove Course from A1 Category

CMST 10 – Course Outline Review attached

Interpersonal communication was sent back to curriculum with a revised course outline – the character of course has changed. The course is listed on the CSU – General Education pattern for oral communication Category A1. It will need to be removed from A1 and will most likely go to another area. Shelly indicated that not all of the objectives were being met in the course and faculty decided to focus on the interpersonal content rather than evaluated presentations. Roxi was asked to bring this up to the nursing faculty as this course is a state board requirement. She will report back to the committee how or if it will affect the nursing students without the evaluated presentation component. The course still contains the components for the 13-14 school year, but in fall 2014 it will not be on the GE pattern for A1 Oral Communication.

There was further discussion as to how this will impact the Fall schedule. Will there be other courses added to schedule to compensate for loss in the area. It was asked where on the General Ed in the CSU system pattern it will apply, perhaps in D7- Interdisciplinary Social or Behavioral Science? Shelly will discuss it with the other communication faculty. She will also confirm that the course is intended to remain under 4B with other CMST courses for the occupational associate degree. The date to have this completed is in December.

No action today is required today, but a decision will need to be made as to where to put the course in the CSU pattern at a later meeting.

General Education Program Learning Outcomes

Shelly Presnell and Cathy Anderson presented information regarding the assessment and tracking of the GELOs. Cathy indicated that we are trying to do a better job of assessing the GELOs but the problem is that nobody owns them. It was noted that on flex day and at other meetings conversation has taken place with rubrics being developed but with very little participation. The question now is how to get more people involved in assessing the GELOs.

Cathy went on to explain that general studies degrees have PLOs; the university studies degrees have emphasis. GELOs were written by the GE Committee but they are actually PLOs for GE degrees.

Further discussion noted the uniqueness of the university studies degree – in that they do not have a major but an emphasis that totals 18 units. The discussion continued about the number of units. Carolyn noted that the University Studies degree is 40 units of GE and the other third is the emphasis. The General Studies degree is 21 units of GE, 18-21 units in an emphasis, and the remaining units are electives. The GELO's relate to the 21 unit GE pattern that is required for all degrees.

It was suggested that we need to start somewhere by identifying a program that has to do with these degrees. Another question came up on how to get the faculty to participate in the GELO assessments. It was asked if linking the GELOs to courses with SLO's that are being assessed will be enough to assess the GELOS. It was noted that the assessment needs to be voluntary.

The cycle for assessing PLOs was explained – assess, collect data, discuss, make changes. It was noted that there is no mechanism in place to assess the GELOs or to process the assessment data. We need this assessment as an evaluative tool to our GE patterns. We are required to assess the GE requirements. It was also noted that GELOs play a dual role in that we are required to have learning outcomes.

It was then asked where does this put students? At some point there is a need to have the conversation about the students regarding this. Most students taking these courses are taking them because they need GE courses.

The immediate need is to find a way to complete the assessment cycle where the GELOs are concerned. It was suggested that a transfer of ownership of GE courses to faculty who are doing the courses needs to take place and that some instructors who showed up at the flex day training did not know if their courses were in the GE patterns. The committee agreed that a question for the faculty is how does their course fit into the general education patterns?

Marc noted that no one has volunteered to do the work of recording the GELO assessments in Tracdat. It was suggested to ask this committee after discussion to enter the responses in Tracdat. Another suggestion was to have the committee members go to their department meetings and have conversations with other faculty about the GELO assessments and data recording in Tracdat.

It was asked if the counselors should be involved too. The committee is not sure how this would fit. Counselors are the most familiar with the general education patterns and requirements, but not involved with course SLO's.

We do have a set of PLOs that are GELOs that can be moved through a cycle. It was asked if we can start with what we have and go from there. The question is now what do we do next? The following is a list of one recommended process for assessing GELOs:

- 1) Have the discussion at the committee level (GE committee)
- 2) Have faculty do the assessment individually
- 3) Have committee representation within the division
- 4) Six GE areas – don't need to do all six, but do two to gain momentum

Basically the committee members will have faculty in their areas meet for discussion and record the conversations and evaluations.

It was noted that we did do this for two areas, but the process did not have momentum. It was suggested to re-write a cycle of evaluation and hit it hard. Of course, it is voluntary. A timeline with a mid-year report would help to know where we are in the process.

Marc noted that he would like to have the committee volunteer to take ownership of the evaluations. Carolyn stated that the need is to have the broader assessment of GE at the faculty level. She also indicated that we have a problem with a lack of representation on the committee. Marc asked if the committee does not do the evaluations then who will do them? Shelly asked then how do we get this done?

Kathy Royce suggested that this committee be a nucleus to take the information out and then bring it back. All areas would have to have the conversation about GELO assessments. It was noted that this is voluntary because there is no contractual requirement to do GELO assessments. Changing the mindset that this is something that needs to be done and not changing the way to assess the SLO is varied around campus is the ideal. The important thing is to get faculty from different areas and have structure of conversation looking at individual courses (SLOs) that are in the GE areas and how GELOs are being met. Then the cycle would include a re-write of the GELO.

It was also discussed that using Flex day in January, which is after the start of the semester for a workshop to schedule for a meeting about GELO assessment and recording. Each area representative on the committee will need to talk to their faculty and discuss the GELOs.

The question remains of the committee: Do you want ownership of the GELOs? This means that the committee would initiate the conversations and set sessions when needed and have a GELO focused meeting during flex day without competition with another meeting.

It was also suggested to use the flex day time to have a group meeting to show faculty the GE patterns and which courses are involved. This meeting would consist of having the conversation; having someone document the conversation and any that are made to the GELOs; and communicate back with committee

A point of clarification was made in that GE college-wide choices are two degrees: University Studies and General Studies. We would be focusing on university studies, the six GELOs which are lumped together, but are separate in Tracdat. And then have these done by the end of the semester which will allow Marc to report on in spring. The timeline would be to have a plan by the end of the semester and start on flex day in January.

It was indicated that we do have information that can be put into Tracdat now. We can get the information so that members of committee can begin inputting the data which is by subject area and by the GELO. It was suggested to assign a committee member to each area and have the conversations by the end of the semester. We can meet outside of flex day.

Marc stated to send any communications to the co-chairs of GE committee and they will delegate to the membership.

The final question was what to do on flex day? It was suggested to have a speaker talk about general education and that there is a grant available for this through Academic Affairs.

The co-chairs will need to let Marc know who to assign permissions in Tracdat. If there are questions about Tractdat or the faculty can contact Marc or Tracy; any questions about GELO assessments the faculty can contact Shelly or Cathy.

No further discussion.

Review GE Committee Webpage

Peggy Himbert provided a brief presentation on the newly developed General Education Committee webpage. [Thank you Peggy for your work on this! cb]

Other

Committee membership was discussed. We still need someone from CTE and living skills. Carolyn will contact Brad Rupert and Matt Evans as they are listed on the membership of the committee.

Additional discussion

A review of living skills PLOs, SLOs, and an assessment of the GELOs – it was noted that if they are the same you would need to assess the GELO separately. It was also noted that faculty should decide the form of assessment: by opinion, examination, or with a project. The assessments are to be once a year with two areas per year completed. A check of the past meeting minutes is required for further clarification.

Next Meeting dates

October 24, November 21, and December 12.

Next meeting: October 24, 2013 at 3:00 p.m. Room 746

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Peggy Himbert, Administrative Assistant - Science, Language Arts and Mathematics Division