

## General Education Committee Minutes: 11/29/2018

**Present:** Victor Piercey (Director), Jimmie Johnson (COB, present for second half of meeting), Paul Zube (FNTFO), John Scott Gray (CAS), Emmanuel Jahev (COHP), Kathryn Wolfer (Senate Liaison), Angie Mishler (Academic Counselors and Student Affairs) and Leonard Johnson (Academic Affairs).

**Absent:**), Debbie Dawson-Gunther (CET), Clifton Franklund (Assessment Coordinator), Kristy Motz (FLITE), Dawn Schavey (EIO), and Jacob Pollock (COEHS),

### 1. Minutes

The minutes from November 13, 2018 were approved unanimously.

### 2. Discussion

The committee discussed whether we should provide ourselves and subcommittees the option to have a single decision form written by the chair for the majority together with individual decision forms for votes that aren't with the majority.

We decided against this option, as we want to make sure all voices are heard and reflected in the feedback.

We also decided to include a consent agenda for the general education committee for unanimous and non-controversial proposals and similar matters. We will start voting to approve the agenda in case we would like to move any items out of the consent agenda for more discussion.

### 3. Proposals

Problem Solving: ENGL 260. Approved unanimously.

Problem Solving: ENGL 416. Approved unanimously.

Problem Solving: CARE 102. Tabled to Dec. 11 to allow for proposer to provide a response.

Communication: CARE courses: Tabled to Dec. 11 to allow for proposer to provide a response.

There was a comment regarding the clarity of the text in the decision forms. Some of the committee members' comments were difficult to decipher.

### 4. Externally Validated Assessment

The committee voted to approve the General Education Assessment Coordinator's proposed Spring 2019 pilot study of the use of the CLA+ instrument for the problem solving competency, **pending** consultation with and approval from the problem solving subcommittee. The vote was 6 in favor and 1 abstention.

In discussion, the following questions were raised and we would like the assessment coordinator to respond to these questions when reporting on the results of the pilot:

- Please provide evidence that CLA+ has itself been validated and is reliable.
- How will we use the CLA+ data in the future moving forward?

- What plans are there for externally validated assessment of other competencies?
- Who will assess and score the student work?
- The other institutions referenced in the CLA+ website perform a pre/post test and examine growth. Will running just a post-test give us useful information?
- How are the results of the CLA+ going to be compared to our assessment information, which is scored on a scale from 0 to 4. In other words, how are the scoring systems going to be compared?