

# GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL

## NOVEMBER 8, 2013

---

**In Attendance:** Dora Ahmadi, Karla Aleman (for David Gregory), Kelly Collinsworth, Cyndi Gibbs, Wilson Gonzalez-Espada, Mark Graves, Timothy Hare, Sara Lindsey, Bev McCormick, Kerry Murphy, Clarenda Phillips, Robert Royar, Paula Serra, Tom Williams, Carol Wymer.

**Guests:** Ann Rathbun, Christi Emrich, Beverly Klecker, David Butz, Mike Fultz (Faculty Senate Executive Council), Sharri Jones (recorder)

Meeting called to order at: 1:02 p.m.

### I. OCTOBER 25, 2013 MINUTES

*MINUTES AS POSTED (CAROL WYMER HAD EMAILED CORRECTIONS TO THE ORIGINAL VERSION POSTED ON BLACKBOARD. THE REVISIONS WERE MADE AND THE DOCUMENT WAS RE-POSTED TO BLACKBOARD PRIOR TO THE MEETING).* **MOTION TO APPROVE: TIMOTHY HARE – MOTION CARRIED**

### II. COURSE PROPOSALS – REQUIRES ACTION

a. ENG 211 PROPOSAL APPROVED 09/13/13 PENDING RECEIPT OF SYLLABUS & 70 % LANGUAGE  
**THE REVISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, AND THE COURSE IS FULLY APPROVED.**

b. IET 104 – (RENAMED IET 102) – TABLED FROM 10/25/13 MEETING

i. THERE ARE SOME TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS THAT NEED CORRECTED:

1. THE LANGUAGE IN THE RUBRICS AND THE TOP OF THE PROPOSAL HAS CONFLICTING VERSIONS OF THE SLO LANGUAGE. THIS SHOULD BE REVISED TO BE CONSISTENT.
2. THE RUBRICS NEED TO BE REVIEWED FOR LANGUAGE AND CUTTING/PASTING ERRORS. SOME APPEAR TO HAVE MISSING OR INACCURATE WORDS AND INCOMPLETE SENTENCES.
3. 5B – LANGUAGE SHOULD BE CHANGED FROM “A BUNCH OF GRAPHS” TO GRAPHS.

ii. IN THE APPENDIX THERE DOES NOT SEEM TO BE A CONNECTION SHOWING HOW THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ARE RELATED TO THE DESCRIPTORS. THERE IS NOTHING SHOWING HOW THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ARE BEING MET.

iii. IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT THE BEST THING WOULD BE FOR THE INITIATOR TO WORK DIRECTLY WITH PAULA SERRA TO REVISE THE ASSESSMENT ISSUES IN THE PROPOSAL – BUT TO GO AHEAD AND APPROVE THE COURSE.

**MOTION TO APPROVE: DORA AHMADI.** BEV MCCORMICK CLARIFIED THAT THE APPROVAL WOULD INCLUDE THE NEED TO MAKE THE TYPOGRAPHICAL REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSAL.

**MOTION CARRIED**

### III. REPORTS

- a. TIMOTHY HARE – FYS - NO NEW BUSINESS.
- b. REGISTRAR – NO REPORT
- c. ASSESSMENT – PAULA SERRA

### IV. COMMON MEASURES

- a. PAULA SERRA – COMMON MEASURES, INCLUDING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

PAULA SHARED A “DEVELOPING COMMON MEASURES” REPORT. THIS REPORT INCLUDED A LIST OF ALL THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR ALL THE SLO’S. THESE PERFORMANCE INDICATOR LISTS ARE NOT NECESSARILY COMPREHENSIVE, MAY NOT BE CONSISTENT, AND THEY DO HAVE OVERLAPS. THERE ARE TWO APPROACHES TO NARROWING DOWN THE LISTS. ONE WOULD BE FOR GEC TO REVIEW THE LIST AND NARROW DOWN THE LIST AND THEN LET FACULTY DO THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT. THE SECOND WAY WOULD BE FOR FACULTY GROUPS TO COMPLETE THE ENTIRE PROCESS.

- i. GEC DECIDED TO APPOINT A GEC MEMBER TO SERVE AS FACILITATOR FOR INDIVIDUAL GROUPS OF VOLUNTEER FACULTY WHO TEACH GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES TO REVIEW INDIVIDUAL SLO’S. THE DEANS WILL ALSO BE ASKED TO SEND A FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE FROM EACH COLLEGE TO SERVE ON EACH COMMITTEE. THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRS CAN ALSO SEND REPRESENTATIVES FROM EACH DEPARTMENT THAT HOUSES GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES.
- ii. PAULA CLARIFIED THAT “DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE ASSIGNMENTS” WOULD BE LEFT UP TO EACH FACULTY MEMBER TO COMPLETE.
- iii. AT A LATER DATE, THERE SHOULD ALSO BE A GROUP TO REVIEW THE ASSIGNMENTS FOR RELIABILITY IN ASSESSING.
- iv. IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT A TIMELINE BE PUT TOGETHER.
  1. CAROL WYMER **MADE A MOTION** THAT SPRING 2014 WOULD BE USED TO DEVELOP THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS; FALL 2014 WOULD SERVE AS A PILOT PERIOD, WITH FULL IMPLEMENTATION IN EFFECT FOR SPRING 2015.
  2. DURING DISCUSSION IT WAS DETERMINED THAT A PROCESS FOR THE PILOT PROGRAM WOULD NEED TO BE DEVELOPED. THERE WAS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT ACCEPTED TO USE THE WORD TEST INSTEAD OF PILOT. THE GROUPS WILL BE FORMED PRIOR TO SPRING 2014. IT WAS ALSO SUGGESTED THAT WE HAVE A HARD DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN THE SPRING, WITH A HARD ENDING DATE FOR THE TEST PERIOD.

**THE MOTION READS: IN THE SPRING 2014 SEMESTER BY THE FIRST FRIDAY OF APRIL 2014, GEC WILL DEVELOP THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND COMMON MEASURES; IN FALL 2014 THE TEST WILL BE COMPLETED BY THE FIRST FRIDAY IN NOVEMBER; WITH FULL IMPLEMENTATION IN SPRING 2015. MOTION CARRIED**
- v. GROUP FACILITATORS WILL BE IDENTIFIED AND PROVIDED A LIST OF CURRENT INSTRUCTORS IN THAT AREA.
- vi. WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN WITH THE ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR POSITION COME JANUARY 1, 2014, AFTER PAULA RETIRES? THERE WAS CONCERN THAT A NEW ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR AND A NEW PROVOST COMING ON BOARD WOULD CHANGE EVERYTHING THAT WAS BEING DEVELOPED.
- vii. THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMON MEASURES BELONGS TO THE GEC AND FACULTY. GEC IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SHEPHERDING AND WATCHING OVER THE PROGRAM. IF GEC HAS A GOOD PLAN IN PLACE, THERE WOULD BE LESS LIKELIHOOD OF A NEW PERSON QUESTIONING WHAT WAS BEING DONE.
  1. GEC REQUESTED TO BE KEPT IN THE LOOP ON THE PROCESS OF HIRING A NEW ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR.

- a. THE POSITION DESCRIPTION IS BEING REVIEWED TO DETERMINE WHERE IT SHOULD BE HOUSED. THERE IS A DESIRE TO DO A NATIONAL SEARCH – WITH INTERNAL CANDIDATES BEING ELIGIBLE TO APPLY.
- b. TIMOTHY HARE **MADE A MOTION** THAT EMMA PERKINS, THE POSITION’S SUPERVISOR, ATTEND THE NEXT MEETING TO UPDATE GEC ON THE STATUS OF FILLING THE POSITION. AFTER DISCUSSION, THE GEC VOTED AND THE **MOTION CARRIED**.
- c. THE HIRING SUPERVISOR IS THE PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR THE JOB AD. HOWEVER, IF GEC WOULD LIKE TO REVIEW THE CURRENT JOB DESCRIPTION AND AS A GROUP OFFER SUGGESTIONS TO THE HIRING SUPERVISOR, IT COULD DO SO. THESE WOULD BE SUGGESTIONS ONLY; GEC CANNOT MANDATE ANYTHING. THE POSITION’S HIRING SUPERVISOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE POSITION.
- d. A POINT OF CLARIFICATION, THE HIRING SUPERVISOR’S ATTENDANCE AT THE GEC MEETING WILL NOT DELAY THE HIRING PROCESS.

**V. FYS EVALUATION DOCUMENTS UPDATE**

THIS TOPIC IS ON THE 11/14/13 DEANS COUNCIL AGENDA. CLARENDA WILL BE ATTENDING THE MEETING AND WILL PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION AT THE NEXT GEC MEETING.

**VI. FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

- a. FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MET WITH THE GEC TO DISCUSS THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.
  - i. 1. FACULTY ARE APPRECIATIVE OF THE NUMBER OF THINGS THE GEC HAS BEEN ABLE TO DO TO LIGHTEN OUR LOADS IN TERMS OF ASSESSMENTS. WHAT IS NEXT ON THE AGENDA FOR THE COUNCIL IN TERMS OF INITIATIVES THAT ARE FORTHCOMING?
  - ii. 2. WHAT IS THE LONG TERM PLAN FOR THE GEC?
  - iii. 3. HISTORICALLY, CAN YOU GIVE US A PICTURE OF WHERE THE FGEAC STARTED AND WHERE WE ARE NOW?
  - iv. 4. WE UNDERSTAND THAT PAULA SERRA HAS ANNOUNCED HER RETIREMENT. THIS IS WILL A GREAT LOSS FOR THE FACULTY AND THE UNIVERSITY IN TERMS OF QUALITY ASSESSMENTS AND KNOWLEDGE THAT EXTENDS TO TEACHING AND CURRICULUM SCOPE, SEQUENCE AND DEVELOPMENT IS THERE A PLAN IN PLACE TO REPLACE PAULA? IF SO, WHAT DOES THAT PLAN ENTAIL? THE REASON PAULA WAS SUCH AN ASSET WAS HER DEEP KNOWLEDGE OF TEACHING AND LEARNING COUPLED WITH HER SKILLS IN TERMS OF ASSESSMENT.
  - v. 5. WHAT IS YOUR PREDICTION IN TERMS OF CONTINUITY OF OUR CURRENT GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT WE ARE HIRING A NEW PROVOST?
  - vi. 6. WE’D LIKE TO CLARIFY THE “30% RULE.” HAVING 3 SLOs, IS IT STILL ACCURATE TO COUNT THE GEN ED SLOs AS 30% OF THE OVERALL GRADE. ANOTHER PIECE OF THIS IS WHERE DID THE 30% RULE COME FROM?
  - vii. 7. WHAT PLANS ARE IN PLACE TO IMPROVE THE PERFORMANCE ON SLOs THAT ARE BELOW TARGET?

**VII. NEXT MEETING: NOVEMBER 22, 2013**