

University General Education Council
September 28, 2022, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

Present: K. Witemeyer, J. Smith, R. Brown, K. Carroll, S. Talley, T. Naldoza, J. Jones, S. Sanders, L. Sharp-Penya, R. Ashlock, M. Atkinson

Absent: R. Rama

Ex-officio: B. Reeves, G. Mihills, E. Gumm, C. Riley (M. Allen was absent)

Guests: D. Flanagan, S. Jones, G. Straughn, D. Counts, K. Elliott, J. Camp, D. Kennamer, A. Sutherlin, J. Carpenter, K. Jernigan, R. Beck, J. Huddleston

The meeting began at 3:30 p.m.

- Call to order by J. Smith
- Minutes from 9/14/22

Motion to approve the minutes by J. Jones; seconded by S. Talley. All in favor. Minutes approved.

Question from J. Smith – Arts & Humanities selection menu – should HIST 100-299 and ENGL 200- 299 be accepted automatically to the menu or should those be addressed individually through council? My recommendation is to accept those courses on the menu automatically. We will address the assessment piece in the spring.

Council agreed.

J. Jones moves to include HIST 100-299, ENGL 200-299, and Foreign Language literature automatically on the Arts & Humanities selection menu. S. Sanders seconds. All in favor. Motion passes.

Action Items

1. Add PHP/NURS 308 to Cultural Literacy Menu

R. Brown – I feel like the assessment artifacts chosen are very specific and might be difficult to assess year after years if there is faculty change. Perhaps change the wording to be a little more generic to give more room for future development. D. Flanagan – I can make a note of that. J. Smith – We might want to set up a process to check back in the future to address specific artifacts. D. Flanagan – We wanted to be detailed and clear so that it would be approved for this menu. J. Jones – The content is one thing, and the assessment is separate. I like that you drew a line between the two so well.

Motion to approve by S. Talley, seconded by T. Naldoza. All in favor; motion passes.

2. Add HIST 117 to Cultural Literacy Menu

No discussion.

3. Add HIST 131 to Cultural Literacy Menu

No discussion.

4. Add HIST 221 to Cultural Literacy Menu

R. Brown – I have an issue with the assessment artifacts. There are too many moving parts. I would like to see these changed for HIST 221 and 222. J. Smith – We are looking for specificity to make it manageable. S. Talley – It looks like they've included every assessment, not the summative assessments. J. Jones – I would agree. J. Smith – Perhaps an exam or one discussion board. K. Elliott – As we have previously assessed program outcomes, we've had flexibility within the department to determine what assessment we are looking at each year. I would like clarity from the council about the approach we need to take. Things might change as different faculty teach a course. R. Brown – I would like to know which artifact will be looked at ahead of time so we can see continuity through the years. J. Jones – Changing artifacts will happen, but we need some kind of reliability from course to course across semesters. R. Brown – We need just enough specificity to know what we are looking at each year. J. Smith – So would you be satisfied if the outcome specified a particular exam or an essay? S. Talley – I don't know how you are going to quantify class discussion, so that might be an artifact to remove. L. Sharp-Penya – I don't see a problem with multiple methods of assessment. It could be difficult to be too specific. J. Smith – Including something about the threshold in the rubric will be helpful. K. Carroll – There are some issues with courses that are cross-listed with ACU Dallas when it comes to specificity as well. J. Smith – If we approve a course to a menu that is cross-listed, we will work with Dallas to ensure we have assessment for them in working toward those outcomes. We will not need to review those separately.

5. Add HIST 222 to Cultural Literacy Menu

See discussion above.

6. Add HIST 250 to Cultural Literacy Menu

No discussion.

7. Add HIST 270 to Cultural Literacy Menu

No discussion.

8. Add HIST 330 to Cultural Literacy Menu

No discussion.

9. Add HIST 332 to Cultural Literacy Menu

No discussion.

10. Add HIST 334 to Cultural Literacy Menu

No discussion.

Motion to approve items 2-10 by Lynette Sharp-Penya, seconded by J. Jones. 8 in favor; 1 opposed; motion passes.

11. Add PSYC 120 to Social & Behavioral Sciences Menu

L. Sharp-Penya – Using a single artifact to assess multiple competencies concerns me a little. Are there different aspects of the exam, or just the overall score? R. Beck – There is a unit on research and critical thinking. There will be separate questions. L. Sharp-Penya – So there will be different questions for each assessment piece? R. Beck – Yes.

12. Add PSYC 232 to Social & Behavioral Sciences Menu

See discussion above.

Motion to approve items 11-12 by S. Talley, seconded by K. Carroll. All in favor; motion passes.

13. Add BIOL 101 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

J. Jones – I don't see that the menu items are assessing the same things across the entire LPS menu. They look different from subject to subject. That might prove difficult to assess.

R. Brown – These Biology courses are assessing lecture and lab separately. Can they be assessed together? J. Smith – Some approach them more integrated and others are separate. The variation might make combining them difficult. G. Straughn – I would say the gen ed requirement is 6 hours, so it makes sense to manage it through the lectures. It might be helpful to understand more clearly what Jody was mentioning. J. Jones – BIOL 101 is assessing all three outcomes on a comprehensive final. Then in ANSC 360, part of the learning outcome is riding a horse. Those are very different. They might need to simplify. J. Smith – If there is an outlier, we can decide if it does not fit on the menu. R. Brown – We have many courses with labs, but we only need 6 hours, is it worthwhile to separately assess the lab sections? We could simply have the lecture sections on the menu so we wouldn't need to assess the labs. G. Straughn – There was a split thought on that. If we are going to assess a 1-credit lab, there is a chance a student changes majors who didn't pass the lecture but passed the lab, so it could be used, but I think that is rare. J. Huddleston – When I filled out the paperwork, I just included the labs because they had been included in the past, but I would be fine not including the labs. A.

Sutherlin – We didn't submit our lab courses for inclusion because I didn't want to assess courses that were likely not going to count toward a student's gen ed requirement. Most students don't need the lab for gen ed credit. I was being pragmatic. K. Carroll – Aren't the lab corequisites? I don't think a student will be taking labs on their own very often. L. Sharp-Penya – It seems like it won't really help students to have the labs on the menu, unless perhaps it helps transfer students. A. Sutherlin – I don't think I've ever seen a lab transfer in alone. E. Gumm – It is no more likely to help transfer students than ACU students. L. Sharp-Penya – What about for the free elective? J. Smith – We no longer have a general education selection, so it doesn't need to be on a menu to count. Any free elective not required for the major would count.

R. Brown – I would prefer to see more detail on the assessment artifacts. J. Huddleston – The relevant outcomes are very broad. Almost every question on the final exams is going to hit those outcomes. Those questions change every year and we have hundreds of students who take these courses every year. I don't know that specific questions would tell us more than the final exam score overall would. A. Sutherlin – I agree that most questions address these to some extent. We have to make assessment doable. Pulling individual exam questions from multiple sections is a lot of work for not much payoff. S. Talley – I did not have a concern because of the breadth of the outcomes. Since this is a survey-type course, there is more room for general competencies. D. Kennamer – I would not have an issue with this from an educational standpoint. R. Brown – I worry about us perpetuating a cycle to check a box instead of collecting good data. It does require more effort on the front end. S. Talley – So what measures would make you more comfortable? R. Brown – I can imagine a set of questions targeted to a specific outcome without making all faculty use the exact same question. G. Straughn – I would worry about the burden on department chairs and interrater reliability. Broad assessment for broad courses can be appropriate. T. Naldoza – The application itself mentions exams or assignments, not specific questions. J. Smith – We are trying to reduce the burden on faculty. J. Jones – In my experience, accreditors are going to care more about the parent outcomes than the individual subsets. L. Sharp-Penya – If we are interested in the overall C – then one exam will suffice instead of needing specifics on C2, C3, C4.

14. Add BIOL 121 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

15. Add BIOL 122 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

16. Add BIOL 123 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

17. Add BIOL 124 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

18. Add BIOL 203 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

19. Add BIOL 291 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

20. Add BIOL 292 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

21. Add BIOL 293 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

22. Add BIOL 294 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

Motion to approve items 13-22 by J. Jones, seconded by L. Sharp-Penya. All in favor; motion passes.

23. Add ANSC 111 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

See discussion below.

24. Add ANSC 360 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

J. Jones – They seem to have too many assessment artifacts. I would suggest decreasing the number of assessment items in both ANSC courses. J. Carpenter - I think we had a slight misunderstanding about what was required. We can reduce the number of assessments. R. Ashlock – One of the criteria is a breadth of knowledge, and this one seems to have a more specific, narrower focus. J. Carpenter – We discussed that within the department as well. It is more specialized, but the skills are applicable across a wide range of animal husbandry. We want to give students a chance to take courses in sequence within animal science. R. Ashlock – I see the logic for some students, but I'm still concerned about the narrow focus. J. Carpenter – We are removing two of our courses from the science menu. J. Smith – AENV 130 is the only other course proposed from this department. We do need to keep our accreditation in mind as well. It is a bit narrower and a bit more applied in nature.

J. Smith – We can look at revised artifacts as an information item at a future meeting.

Motion to approve items 23-24 by R. Brown, seconded by R. Ashlock. All in favor; motion passes.

25. Add NUTR 120 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

J. Jones – I'm having trouble mapping the assessment to the outcomes. It might be helpful to map them clearly in the syllabus. S. Jones – We can map that in the syllabus and show the connection.

Motion to approve by L. Sharp-Penya, seconded by S. Talley. All in favor; motion passes.

26. Add CHEM 101 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

J. Jones – The assessment rubric looks consistent with Biology, and that is appreciated.

27. Add CHEM 113 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu'

No specific discussion.

28. Add CHEM 114 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

29. Add CHEM 133 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

30. Add CHEM 134 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

31. Add GEOL 111 to Life & Physical Sciences Menu

No specific discussion.

Motion to approve items 26-31 by K. Carroll, seconded by J. Jones. All in favor; motion passes.

J. Smith – We can clarify some of our expectations regarding number of artifacts and clarifying mapping. J. Jones – I think we need to focus on summative assignments not formative ones. S. Sanders – If there is a course new to the gen ed menus, it would be helpful to have the department chair give additional rationale. E. Gumm – We have had a two different subject requirement for sciences in the past, but we don't anymore, so the sequence availability is a relevant change.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.