

MINUTES

General Education Council

March 2, 2022 9-9:50 a.m. Webex

Present: Dr. Christina Conroy, Dr. Laurie Couch, Dr. Julia Finch, Dr. Morgan Getchell, Dr. Wilson Gonzalez-Espada, Dr. Mark Graves, Dr. Kouroush Jenab, Ms. Kerry Murphy, Ms. Lora Pace, Dr. Robert Royar, Dr. Chris Schroeder, & Dr. Timothy Simpson

Absent: Dr. Robin Blankenship, Dr. Bo Shi, & Dr. Suzy White

I. Welcome (L. Couch)

Dr. Couch spoke briefly about the need to meet today and likely one additional time this semester.

II. Minutes from October 12 and November 3, 2022 (M. Graves)

Dr. Graves reminded the committee that the minutes were posted to the SharePoint site and he shared them on-screen. Chris Schroeder moved to approve the minutes from October 12. Dr. Simpson seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously. Dr. Simpson moved to approve the minutes from November 3, 2022. Dr. Royar seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. Director of Assessment Position (L. Couch)

Dr. Couch stated that Dr. Harr moved from the Director of University Assessment position to another position at MSU. Dr. Jill Ratliff is assisting in this capacity for now. Dr. Graves stated that an internal search is occurring. He stated appreciation for Dr. Ratliff agreeing to assist with assessment until a replacement is finalized.

IV. Clarifying Sampling in Assessment Plan (M. Graves)

In reference to the [General Education Assessment Sampling Document/Process](#):

Dr. Graves stated that the subcommittee for identifying sections for assessment consists of himself, Dr. Conroy, Dr. Schroeder, and Dr. Simpson. He stated that last Spring term, the subcommittee collected data from all courses that included SLO 3 and 5 and now the sample needs selected. The SLOs scheduled for assessment during the current term are 4, 8, and 10. The committee discussed the process for choosing the sample that captures 10% of students (or 10 students whichever is greater) for each general education course offered while “ensuring diversity” (types of instructors, delivery location, delivery method) of the sections. The council discussed difficulty with selecting the sample sections due to the complexity of course offerings and low enrollment numbers within them. After a lengthy

discussion, the process for identifying the assessment sample was determined to be: 1) Compile a list of all courses for each SLO and determine the total number of students enrolled. 2) determine the percentages of each delivery methods/instructor types represented in the whole. 3) Select courses that represent the percentages determined in step 2. 4) Select courses whose enrollment is equal to 10% of the total number of students from step 1. Dr. Graves stated that the subcommittee would determine the sample and notify instructors as soon as possible.

V. Assessment Cycle (L. Couch & M. Graves)

Dr. Couch stated that according to the approved assessment plan, in addition to assessing identified SLOs each semester, there are SLOs that are identified for “Planning” and “Implementing”. Initially it was assumed that the Director of Assessment would be leading the activity involved in these two stages, however Dr. Ratliff does not have sufficient time to do so which lead to the discussion of the council leading the organization of these two stages. Dr. Couch asked for a discussion of how the council envisioned these stages and their role in relation to them in order to move forward. Dr. Simpson stated that if there were no issues with the assessment results he did not support requiring activity in those stages. Dr. Couch stated that is the case for the assignments and rubrics during the Planning and Implementing stages but stressed the importance of continuous improvement of instructional methods beyond the minimum requirement to meet the assessment goal. When being developed, the intent was for instructors/coordinators from all of the courses included in teaching the SLO to collaborate and develop plans for increasing scores. This would foster cohesion in the general education program in line with best practices. The council discussed the intent, merit, and challenges of these two stages of the assessment cycle. It was stated that discussing successful and less than successful approaches across disciplines can benefit all instructors. Challenged noted include the low number of faculty instructing general education courses to participate in the effort, the expectations of adjuncts, and the logic of putting forth effort when the assessment goals are met. The council discussed ways to increase instructor participation if the council decides to move forward with the tasks intended for the two stages including incorporation of a set day each semester to gather all parties and complete the tasks. Dr. Couch asked that the committee contemplate the discussion and be prepared to make decisions at the next meeting.

VI. FYS Subcommittee Report (L. Pace)

Ms. Pace stated that the FYS subcommittee would meet for the first time this semester the week of March 21 through 25. The agenda will include the final evaluation review. Based on preliminary review of the evaluations received, the subcommittee made minor adjustments for the spring term. During the fall term, there were sixty-one sections including three reading enhanced, two living learning community sections, one DREAMS section, and one Appalachian educators section. Ms. Pace reported that she is currently in the process of recruiting peer leaders for

the fall. She asked that if any member knew of good candidates to send them her way.

Dr. Couch reminded the council that First Year Seminar was moving from the Office of the Student Affairs to Academic Affairs. Dr. Couch expressed her appreciation for Lora efforts during transition. Dr. Couch explained budget expenses and funding sources. She stated that she recently requested additional funds for the FYS budget beginning next fiscal year to cover necessary personnel and other types of expenses.

VII. New Business - None

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: March 30, 2022 9:00 a.m.