

## UNIVERSITY GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

October 21, 2010

9:00 – 10:30 a.m., Mason Hall D3

**Attending:** Rick Davis (chair), Don Boileau, Rick Diecchio, Kim Eby, Doug Eyman, Marcy Glover (recording secretary), Frank Alan Philpot, Claire Snyder-Hall, Carol Urban

**Absent:** Kammy Sanghera, Hugh Sockett (on study leave this semester), Karen Studd, Cliff Sutton, Peter Winant

**Guests:** Ying Zhou and Karen Gentemann (Institutional Assessment)

### I. Call to Order

- The meeting started at 9:13 a.m. (technological difficulties caused delay)

### II. New Business

#### A. Review of Last Round of Assessment – Process (GU and SBS)

- Were there any questions that needed to be added, deleted, or modified?

The questionnaire question “would you recommend this course for a teaching award?” was not added because of concern that there was not enough information to answer that question – they are just looking for a list of potential nominees. It was decided that an informal comment would be made to Kim Eby if a course looked promising so she can follow up.

- Process related discussion

What happens to a poorly rated course? Should there be a box for “removing” the course from the inventory? IA and Rick will meet with the chairs of courses that had problems and then decide what should happen next: modification or removal of course.

Should review teams work toward the same conclusion or work independently? It was decided that the entire group should meet at the same time and place to review the process for assessing the portfolio, work through one portfolio together and then split up to work independently on the remaining portfolios. When they are finished, they should discuss their findings.

Why don't we average the data? Would miss results. Doesn't tell us anything or give us anything to work with. If one reviewer assigns a 1 and the other a 4, the result is 2.5 – which doesn't show the huge discrepancy between the reviewers assessment.

#### B. Future Plans

- Creation of modules to show how to meet learning outcomes in large classes.
- Need to schedule synthesis assessment – Marcy to send online poll to expedite scheduling.

### **C. Subcommittee Reports**

- **SBS/GU (Claire reporting)**

**PSYC 406 – SYNTHESIS** – recommend for approval – APPROVED

**RELI 317 – GLOBAL UNDERSTANDING** – RETURNED

Don B will speak with the author. There was disagreement within the committee; the syllabus does not explain the learning outcomes and needs to be answered more explicitly. There needs to be more information on the paper assignment; there is no evidence for the structure.

- **IT (Cliff reporting)**

**BENG 492/493 – SYNTHESIS** – RETURNED

This course proposal opened up the question if the courses needed to be approved as a package or independently? Most felt that the truly synthetic portion of the proposal was the second semester, 493. The committee has asked for the proposal to be rewritten to cover the interdisciplinary issue; it is not currently evident/explicit but can be inferred. They ask that the author rewrite the proposal using the new learning outcomes and form.

- **ARTS (Doug reporting)**

**GAME 101 – ARTS** – not ready to report at this time.

### **III. Adjournment**

- The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.