

MINUTES

General Education Council

March 1, 2019

3:00 p.m.

Rader Hall 104

Attendance:

Present: Laurie Couch, Shannon Harr, Jeanne Petsch, Greg Corso, Keith Moore, Kerry Murphy, Lora Pace, Lesia Lennex, Constance Hardesty, Kim Sharp, Mike Fultz, Mark Graves, Sahar Ghanem, Chris Beckham, Tim O'Brien

Absent: David Gregory, Bo Shi

I. Minutes from November 12, 2018 and November 30, 2018 Meetings

- Mark Graves made a motion to approve minutes from both November 12 and November 30, 2018. Greg Corso seconded the motion. The General Education Council (GEC) voted and approved both.

II. Assessment Results (presentation slides are included at the end of the minutes)

- Shannon Harr presented assessment data:
 - Comparison of Fall 2017 to Preliminary Fall 2018 Assessment Results:
 - Fall 2018 data is not finalized but as of now, we are in compliance with the targets of 70% assessment and 70% attainment. The finalized 2018FA data and 2019SP data will be combined once completed and data will be reported as an academic year. The 2017-18 academic year is the first time that we were in compliance with both the assessment target and the attainment target.
 - 2018FA SLO 2d (articulate ethical consequences of decisions or actions) is not yet assessed. It is not automatically graded. It is currently being analyzed by the FYS Subcommittee. Laurie Couch reported that we did meet the 70% assessed on SLO 2d.
 - The general education plan specifies assessment of all students with the exception of allowing sampling of 1c (Write effectively for a variety of target audiences using conventions associated with standard English) and 2c (Analyze or evaluate diverse points of view) in English 100 and English 200.
 - Data has not been submitted for 39 sections. Upon questioning by committee member, Shannon Harr stated that 34 of those not reporting were in the Caudill College of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences, with 10 of the 34 being Eagle Scholar sections. Shannon Harr is in contact with Deans weekly to concerning obtaining remaining data.
 - Both Early College and Online courses are currently meeting the assessment target.
 - Evaluate/Monitoring of Areas that Need Improvement Based on Fall 2018 Data:
 - Although we are currently meeting targeted 70% assessment rate, there is a need to continue to encourage submission.
 - In ENG 200 Writing II, attainment was 56% for 1c and 27% for 2c for fall 2018. This is a continuing issue. The 2018-19 Action Plan includes strategies to improve in these area.
 - In MATH 123 Introduction to Statistics, attainment was 35% for 3b and 43% for 3c for fall 2018. This is the first term that MATH 123 was included in General Education. Tim O'Brien will discuss with instructor and Laurie Couch will discuss the results with the Department of Mathematics and Physics personnel in a meeting

scheduled for March 8th and will express the importance of ensuring consistency in delivery and assessment of the SLOs.

- Status of Items in 2018-19 Action Plan:
 - Encourage assessment of all students in general education - ongoing.
 - Implementation of a writing lab - Laurie Couch reported that with support from a CPE grant to support the co-requisite courses in english and mathematics, a team explored the development of a writing lab at MSU. They completed a literature review and visited and evaluated other writing labs. They developed and delivered a white paper in December that included the preferred model and expected cost. The writing lab is intended to be a resource center and not a mandatory component of a course. Currently investigating how to fund.
 - Immediately provide the grading rubric to students in writing courses - Mark Graves indicated that he has discussed with faculty and will provide an update in April.
 - Increase submission rates of Eagle Scholar course sections – Shannon Harr reported that the submission of data from Eagle Scholar sections fluctuate but currently are ok.
- Areas to be addressed from 2017-2018:
 - Gen Ed Capstone Survey Results – This survey is an indirect measure of SLO attainment used in addition to the direct measures. It is administered by Laurie Couch’s office every Spring and Fall semester to all students enrolled in a capstone course. It uses a Likert scale, with a rating of one (1) being strongly disagree and five (5) being strongly agree, to measure student agreement with statements. While overall we meet the 70% attainment level, the following specific questions on the survey warrant discussion. Results are reported as averages.

SLO 1. Communication Skills

d. Convey relationships using two or more of the following: equations, graphs, tables, maps and diagrams.

1. I can communicate how two or more things are related using equations = 3.66
2. I can communicate how two or more things are related using maps = 3.89
3. I can communicate how two or more things are related using (other) = 3.40

SLO 3. Quantitative Skills

a. Analyze problems using arithmetic, geometric, algebraic or statistical methods.
c. Verify answers to mathematical or scientific problems.

1. I can use mathematical or statistical methods to solve problems (3a) = 3.74
2. I can verify the validity of scientific or mathematical results (3c) = 3.80

SLO 4. Knowledge of Human Cultures

a. Investigate the history of the basic principles or operations of the US government with a view to being a responsible citizen.

1. Understand the foundations of the US Government = 3.92

2. Understand the functions of the US Government = 3.92

SLO 5. Knowledge of the Natural World

b. Apply scientific or technological concepts to solving problems of natural systems.

1. I can apply scientific or technological concepts to solve problems in nature = 3.96

SLO 6. Knowledge of Aesthetics

a. Discuss how ideas are communicated through the expressive arts; e.g., literature, theatre, dance, music, or visual arts.

b. Analyze the aesthetic value of creative productions in cultural or historical context.

1. I can discuss how ideas are communicated through the arts (art, literature, music, film, dance and theatre (6a) = 3.97

2. I can analyze the aesthetic value of creative productions in a cultural or historical context (6b) = 3.89

Tim O'Brien commented that the survey results showed students opinion of whether or not they had attained the skill, not whether they actually attained the skill. The committee discussed student's lack of confidence, specifically in the mathematics areas, and how it affected the outcome. Connie Hardesty asked how the results report as a median compared to the averages reported. Lesia Lennox asked for the percentage of students who responded at three (3) or below. More information will be presented at the next meeting.

III. General Education Task Force Update – Michael Fultz, Mark Graves, Chris Beckham

- Mark Graves reported that the recent survey concerning the LUX proposal was very helpful. The task force revised/simplified the proposal. It was then presented to Faculty Senate on February 21st and has since been distributed to all faculty. There is another opportunity to give feedback between March 6th and March 25th. Based on the feedback, there may be further revision prior to a formal full-faculty vote. The version currently being proposed includes 10 SLOs. Current general education courses are being used but possibly in different areas. Chris Beckham stated that not all courses in current general education are in this version but all were carefully considered. Mike Fultz reported that capstone courses have been removed. He stated that courses could count in both general education and in the academic major and Mark Graves indicated they could count in the academic minor also. Mike Fultz stated that FYS 101 was not removed. He commented that some faculty had reported they were unaware of the changes that had been made to FYS 101; however after review of the content, most were supportive of the class remaining in the proposed general education program. Mark Graves stated some faculty had expressed concern that FYS 101 was mainly being taught by staff, not faculty, and requested greater faculty involvement as the MSU financial environment will allow. Laurie Couch stated that in addition to access to the Blackboard shell for content review, she had given a presentation to the committee. She

had shared assessment results; evaluations of teaching; amount and content of staff training; and student feedback type and frequency. Overall, the final course and staff evaluation results were very good. There are a couple of areas that were assessed that needed improvement. Two of these areas (civic engagement and leadership development) were not part of the course content but were assessed as part of the strategic plan initiatives related to First Year Programs. The remaining areas that need improvement were related to career selection and knowledge of the required steps leading to a desired career. Upon review, it was determined that the wording of the question may be a fault for the lower than expected results. The course and faculty evaluation was a combined, self-developed survey which was completed online. All FYS 101 sections reported data. Further information concerning the assessment of FYS will be distributed to the GEC and can be discussed at the next meeting. Mark Graves stated that the timeline indicates that a decision will be made by mid-April. If approved, the focus of the Task Force will shift from development to implementation.

The GEC adjourned.

NEXT MEETING

April 5, 2019

3:00 p.m.

Rader Hall 104



**MOREHEAD STATE
UNIVERSITY**

MAJOR IN YOU.

**General Education Council Meeting
September 12, 2018**

2017-2018 General Education Data

Fall to Fall Comparison

Fall 2016

SLO	Enrolled	Assessed	%		
			Assessed	Attained	% Attained
1a	1288	1108	86.0%	1023	92.3%
1b	5387	3580	66.5%	2711	75.7%
1c	933	645	69.1%	425	65.9%
1d	2274	1218	53.6%	980	80.5%
2a	3368	3026	89.8%	2545	84.1%
2b	911	536	58.8%	459	85.6%
2c	1271	758	59.6%	556	73.4%
2d	1232	680	55.2%	552	81.2%
2e	1711	885	51.7%	760	85.9%
3a	1200	1115	92.9%	930	83.4%
3b	1200	1118	93.2%	922	82.5%
3c	1200	1098	91.5%	909	82.8%
4a	1036	429	41.4%	361	84.1%
4b	1769	970	54.8%	880	90.7%
4c	761	357	46.9%	315	88.2%
4d	2446	1472	60.2%	1312	89.1%
5a	1208	1162	96.2%	1000	86.1%
5b	2119	1611	76.0%	1326	82.3%
5c	911	519	57.0%	439	84.6%
6a	1008	546	54.2%	498	91.2%
6b	1008	552	54.8%	487	88.2%

Fall 2017					
SLO	Enrolled	Assessed	Pct. Assessed	Attained	Pct. Attained
1a	1482	1398	94.3%	1276	91.3%
1b	6245	5124	82.0%	4044	78.9%
1c	1025	1012	98.7%	760	75.1%
1d	2271	1908	84.0%	1577	82.7%
2a	3305	2963	89.7%	2466	83.2%
2b	1016	751	73.9%	613	81.6%
2c	1139	962	84.5%	728	75.7%
2d	1257	1011	80.4%	901	89.1%
2e	1853	1532	82.7%	1361	88.8%
3a	1323	1293	97.7%	1136	87.9%
3b	1323	1279	96.7%	1050	82.1%
3c	1323	1270	96.0%	1032	81.3%
4a	971	800	82.4%	670	83.8%
4b	1616	1312	81.2%	1135	86.5%
4c	725	523	72.1%	435	83.2%
4d	2550	1904	74.7%	1693	88.9%
5a	1250	1167	93.4%	1018	87.2%
5b	2266	1990	87.8%	1739	87.4%
5c	1016	742	73.0%	606	81.7%
6a	891	749	84.1%	679	90.7%
6b	891	718	80.6%	638	88.9%

Note: SLO 1c and 2c enrollment numbers adjusted for sampling in ENG 100/200

Spring to Spring Comparison

Spring 2017

SLO	Enrolled	Assessed	% Assessed	Attained	Pct. Attained
1a	1436	1142	79.5%	1068	93.5%
1b	2826	1936	68.5%	1579	81.6%
1c	1197	942	78.7%	651	69.1%
1d	1692	945	55.9%	794	84.0%
2a	2861	2550	89.1%	1960	76.9%
2b	778	661	85.0%	550	83.2%
2c	949	697	73.4%	458	65.7%
2d	295	193	65.4%	164	85.0%
2e	1091	698	64.0%	625	89.5%
3a	925	835	90.3%	671	80.4%
3b	925	833	90.1%	684	82.1%
3c	925	842	91.0%	720	85.5%
4a	704	284	40.3%	242	85.2%
4b	1306	836	64.0%	724	86.6%
4c	627	368	58.7%	313	85.1%
4d	1808	1216	67.3%	1126	92.6%
5a	820	732	89.3%	653	89.2%
5b	1598	1352	84.6%	1173	86.8%
5c	778	569	73.1%	438	77.0%
6a	679	525	77.3%	467	89.0%
6b	679	521	76.7%	450	86.4%

Spring 2018

SLO	Enrolled	Assessed	Pct. Assessed	Attained	Pct. Attained
1a	1376	1206	87.6%	1090	90.4%
1b	2974	2262	76.1%	1884	83.3%
1c	1180	1085	91.9%	839	77.3%
1d	1943	1737	89.4%	1490	85.8%
2a	3005	2453	81.6%	1949	79.5%
2b	875	690	78.9%	609	88.3%
2c	1203	1066	88.6%	813	76.3%
2d	166	131	78.9%	115	87.8%
2e	954	816	85.5%	748	91.7%
3a	1238	1227	99.1%	1130	92.1%
3b	1238	1222	98.7%	1012	82.8%
3c	1238	1219	98.5%	999	82.0%
4a	954	834	87.4%	725	86.9%
4b	1520	1191	78.4%	1022	85.8%
4c	685	479	69.9%	410	85.6%
4d	1986	1653	83.2%	1474	89.2%
5a	997	979	98.2%	885	90.4%
5b	1872	1788	95.5%	1535	85.9%
5c	875	669	76.5%	575	85.9%
6a	835	603	72.2%	521	86.4%
6b	835	608	72.8%	527	86.7%

Note: SLO 1c and 2c enrollment numbers adjusted for sampling in ENG 100/200

AY 2016-2017 to AY 2017-2018 Comparison

AY 2016-

SLO	Enrolled	Assessed	% Assessed	Attained	Pct. Attained
1a	2724	2250	82.6%	2091	92.9%
1b	8213	5516	67.2%	4290	77.8%
1c	2130	1587	74.5%	1076	67.8%
1d	3966	2163	54.5%	1774	82.0%
2a	6229	5576	89.5%	4505	80.8%
2b	1689	1197	70.9%	1009	84.3%
2c	2220	1455	65.5%	1014	69.7%
2d	1527	873	57.2%	716	82.0%
2e	2802	1583	56.5%	1385	87.5%
3a	2125	1950	91.8%	1601	82.1%
3b	2125	1951	91.8%	1606	82.3%
3c	2125	1940	91.3%	1629	84.0%
4a	1740	713	41.0%	603	84.6%
4b	3075	1806	58.7%	1604	88.8%
4c	1388	725	52.2%	628	86.6%
4d	4254	2688	63.2%	2438	90.7%
5a	2028	1894	93.4%	1653	87.3%
5b	3717	2963	79.7%	2499	84.3%
5c	1689	1088	64.4%	877	80.6%
6a	1687	1071	63.5%	965	90.1%
6b	1687	1073	63.6%	937	87.3%

2017-18 AY

SLO	Enrolled	Assessed	Pct. Assessed	Attained	Pct. Attained
1a	2858	2604	91.1%	2366	90.9%
1b	9219	7386	80.1%	5928	80.3%
1c	2205	2097	95.1%	1599	76.3%
1d	4214	3645	86.5%	3067	84.1%
2a	6310	5416	85.8%	4415	81.5%
2b	1891	1441	76.2%	1222	84.8%
2c	2342	2028	86.6%	1541	76.0%
2d	1423	1142	80.3%	1016	89.0%
2e	2807	2348	83.6%	2109	89.8%
3a	2561	2520	98.4%	2266	89.9%
3b	2561	2501	97.7%	2062	82.4%
3c	2561	2489	97.2%	2031	81.6%
4a	1925	1634	84.9%	1395	85.4%
4b	3136	2503	79.8%	2157	86.2%
4c	1410	1002	71.1%	845	84.3%
4d	4536	3557	78.4%	3167	89.0%
5a	2247	2146	95.5%	1903	88.7%
5b	4138	3778	91.3%	3274	86.7%
5c	1891	1411	74.6%	1181	83.7%
6a	1726	1352	78.3%	1200	88.8%
6b	1726	1326	76.8%	1165	87.9%

Note: SLO 1c and 2c enrollment numbers adjusted for sampling in ENG 100/200

Assessment by General Education Category

2017-18 AY	Sections	Sections Assessed	% Sections Assessed	Enrolled	# Assessed	% Assessed	Attained	% Attained
Oral	59	59	100.0%	1474	1437	97.5%	1263	87.9%
WRITE I	87	86	98.9%	4563	4027	88.3%	3279	81.4%
WRITE II	75	74	98.7%	2213	1951	88.2%	1523	78.1%
MATH	131	131	100.0%	2561	2522	98.5%	2307	91.5%
FYS	64	62	96.9%	1423	1273	89.5%	1142	89.7%
Capstone	121	109	90.1%	1394	1284	92.1%	1248	97.2%
HUM1	69	55	79.7%	1726	1375	79.7%	1261	91.7%
HUM2	61	54	88.5%	1410	1256	89.1%	1125	89.6%
NSC1	75	74	98.7%	2256	2208	97.9%	2025	91.7%
NSC2	65	59	90.8%	1939	1698	87.6%	1499	88.3%
SBS1	53	49	92.5%	1925	1648	85.6%	1468	89.1%
SBS2	66	63	95.5%	2289	2080	90.9%	1742	83.8%
Total	926	876	94.6%	25173	22759	90.4%	19882	87.4%
Early College	233	204	87.6%	--	--	--	--	--
Online	152	150	98.7%	--	--	--	--	--

Action Plans for Implementation in 2017-2018

- Plan to address below target attainment of SLO 1c in 2016-2017
 - *GEC recommends to Implement writing laboratory*
 - *GEC recommends the grading rubric be made available to students in writing courses immediately.*

Targets for Consideration in 2018-2019

- Modify attainment target for specific SLOs (currently 70%)
- Modify assessment target for specific SLOs (currently 70%)
- Modify both attainment and assessment targets for specific SLOs
- Continue with current targets for 3 consecutive years of compliance before considering changes

Considerations for Targets/Action Plans for 2018-2019

- 2017-2018 is first year we have achieved compliance (70% in both assessment and attainment)
- Possible areas to consider going forward
 - Continue to encourage assessment of all students in general education courses (except for SLO 1c and 2c)
 - Maintain current trends of data submission
 - Evaluate/monitor areas that need improvement
 - Eagle Scholars submission of general education data
 - ENG 200 attainment of 1c = 47%, ENG 200 attainment of 2c = 39%