

**University General Education Council
February 27, 2019, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Adams Center Classroom**

Present: K. Witemeyer, J. Smith, M. Ice, C. Flanagan, K. Wick, D. Kneip, R. Green, D. Mendenhall, L. McCurley, M. Rogers, S. Talley, K. Tippens,

Absent: B. Rix, G. Brooks

Ex-officios: C. Riley, V. McCracken (S. McDowell was absent)

Guests: Janine Morgan, Rodney Ashlock, Eric Gumm, Jon Camp

The meeting began at 3:31 p.m.

I. Call to order by J. Smith.

II. Prayer by C. Flanagan.

III. Minutes from 4/25/18 – There are no minutes for this meeting. It was an electronic vote to approve the addition of HIST 332 to the Cultural Awareness, Social Science, and Historical Literacy menus. All motions and comments can be found on the UGEC blog.

Motion to approve minutes as recorded on UGEC blog on 4.25.18 by C. Flanagan; seconded by S. Talley; all in favor; motion passes.

Action Items

IV. Add BIBH 380 – Survey of Church History to the Historical Literacy Menu

D. Kneip - We have a variety of criteria for the historical literacy menu. People have asked about including this course on that menu. When we looked at it, we saw that this class is a really good fit. It is an upper-level course, but the approach is introductory in nature. Church history and secular history are very tied together in Western history. It seems to be a natural fit. It is a class a lot of our majors take, but it benefits students from all majors since many have the option for a Bible minor. With the 15 hours of Bible required for University Requirements, if you take this course for historical literacy, you are only one class short of the minor requirements of 21 hours. J. Smith - The proposal does a great job of showing how the course meets the historical literacy criteria. R. Green - Criteria #4 mentions a means of measurement. What is your method for measurement? D. Kneip - We worked with Ron Morgan in History and Global Studies in developing this proposal. Page three shows this. The course is measuring the criteria, but the assessment falls into the general education competencies. J. Smith - We have seen some expansion of this menu in the last year or so. It is our newest menu. Can you speak to the history of this course? D. Kneip - It used to be a two-semester sequence, but that was probably twenty years ago. J. Smith - There is a stipulation about general

education courses being lower-level and free of prerequisites, but you have done a good job explaining why this course still fits. The prerequisites are general education requirements, and it is a broad, introductory course. E. Gumm - And this can't double-dip. It cannot count both as an upper-level Bible and historical literacy.

Motion to approve by K. Tippens; seconded by D. Mendenhall; 9 in favor; 1 abstention; motion passes.

V. BMIS 245 – Upgrade to BMIS 345 and Retain on Cultural Awareness Menu

J. Smith - This course is already on the cultural awareness menu. J. Morgan - This course is a 200-level course. Originally, this was a 300-level course when there was a missions minor. It was moved to a 200-level course to assist missions majors. Now that mission is a track, we would like to move it back to a 300-level course to fill the gap for a junior-level missions course, which we don't currently have. It appeals to many majors as a way to get their upper-level hours. Anyone contemplating missions would be interested in this course. It is an applied cultural anthropology class. It is an embodiment of cultural competence in our estimation. Prerequisites are required, but only for Bible courses already required for the University Requirements. J. Smith - This council will not address the course number change. What we look at is whether or not the course remains appropriate for the menu with the new number. Any decision will be contingent on UUAC approval of the number change. Can you speak how the course best demonstrates the cultural awareness criteria? J. Morgan - The learning outcomes directly tie in to the criteria through exams, reading reports, analyzing a world city, anthropological case studies, the pairing of students in the course with international students for cultural exchanges, and an ethnographic method project including observing a culture that is not their own.

Motion to approve retaining BMIS 345 on the cultural awareness menu contingent on UUAC approval of number change from 245 to 345 by S. Talley; seconded by K. Tippens; all in favor; motion passes.

Discussion Items:

VI. General Education Annual Outcomes Reporting

J. Smith - Our data is from 2016-17. We define our outcomes and our measures. We place a target outcome as well as our ideal goal. You can see those results in the report. There is a lot of transition in the personnel who oversee general education. It used to be centralized and now it is parcelled out to different areas of the university. That has created a challenge for tracking some of our outcomes. We are exceeding goals in writing and communication. The quantitative section is falling a little short. Information skills has a goal based on CORE 210. That course is no longer required. We have another piece in Cornerstone. I looked at the 2017-18 results for Cornerstone. We met only one of three targets, but we have a history of meeting those in the recent past. D. Kneip -

Some of our assessments look at the entire n and some use random samples, right? J. Smith - That is correct. E. Gumm - Cornerstone is one of those areas that uses a random sample, so it is possible the dip this year is due to the sample having less honors students included, for example.

J. Smith - It is more difficult to pull together reports for the menu sections of the general education. Much of the data exists in the departments' reports. We need to pull them out and that is challenging. We might need to look at changing our measures. We also need to do a better job of including capstone data in these annual reports. In the capstone report, the data shows us exceeding our ideal goals. M. Rogers - How did we come up with those percentages? E. Gumm - They have not been adjusted since we put them in place. Whether or not those are still appropriate is a good question. We still need to improve in our reporting of data for our menu items. We need a better system to gather that data. As part of our work - as we look at criteria for approving courses for general education menus, there is a disconnect between that and assessing those criteria. D. Kneip - I was happy to see how many different ways we assess things for most of these areas, but for some of the items, we have narrow competencies including courses that no longer exist. J. Smith - Yes. We need to reexamine those items.

VII. General Education Assessment Plan

J. Smith - I want to give you a big picture about where we are right now and leave you with a couple questions to look at moving forward. We assess our students and look at what other institutions are doing. R. Ashlock - The conference I attended was very helpful. I felt a tinge of regret since CORE was not terribly successful for us. Many universities are starting to go that direction now. We were ahead of the curve with this. It took many universities 6 years to develop their core. We did that much more quickly, but maybe we jumped a little too quickly to implement. Perhaps it's valuable to take time to put these pieces together. It is so important to have well-crafted assignments within general education. The assignments must be equitable, especially for first-generation students. There is value in working on one SLO, getting university buy-in, then moving to more. If something fails, it doesn't mean you have to give up. Come back at it from a new angle. J. Smith - We've tweaked our university requirements several times during the last decade, and I think that is a strength for us. The ability to look at how we're doing internally and listen to what other institutions are doing is very important.

J. Smith - We have worked with C. Riley to look at the surveys we send out to students. There are some assessments that we are no longer conducting. What we need to look at is what do we want students to know and how do we assess that? I would like for us to look at our assessment plan and compare it to other institutions. Many of our goals are common to other universities as well. Are they measuring these within the courses? Is it full populations or samples? I would like for us to look at ideas for how to improve this assessment plan. D. Mendenhall - Intercultural knowledge, do we assess that on a co-curricular level or is it all in-classroom? C. Riley - There is a section on some of our surveys that addresses this. D. Mendenhall - It seems like it is more important to assess this from the student body as a whole as we continue to expand diversity on campus

instead of just in the classroom. J. Smith - Yes, we want students to have a consistent experience throughout their entire experience here, not just for accreditation purposes but for what is best for our students. E. Gumm - It is interesting to look at this grid and see that there are places where there is direct assessment, others are indirect/experiential, and our competencies relate to learning. R. Green - Can we see this assessment plan with all the things that don't exist any longer struck out? J. Smith - Sure. We can post a version of that to the blog. E. Gumm - We stopped using some assessments because of financial cost and insufficient return on investment. J. Smith - We have to prioritize.

J. Smith - General Education Assessment Plan - particularly related to outcomes 2 & 3, when you look at the courses and components involved there, I would like the committee members to look at your individual disciplines and ask what does good assessment of inquiry and knowledge look like in your area. Exams, performance, written analysis, etc.? That will be a helpful piece of the discussion. Then - do you have examples or thoughts/suggestions about applying general criteria across a menu through broadly applied assignments, rubrics, etc.? It will be good for us to try to standardize the process a bit.

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.