

**Present:** John Allred, John Belk, Anne Diekema, Daniel Eves, Shak Gaisoa, Randy Johnson, Jon Karpel, Katya Konkle, Johnny MacLean, Krystal McCoy, Jim Mock, Michael Ostrowsky, James Sage, Paul Schneider, and Alison Adams

**I. Approval of Minutes**

- A. Minutes from April 23, 2018 GE Committee Meeting – in Canvas
  1. Approved unanimously
- B. Previous minutes showcase the influence and work of the committee, the discussion and decisions made affect almost every student at SUU and a majority of the faculty. It is important to continue to dialog with those we represent, and is important to remember that the Committee looks at the GE program from a University perspective.

**II. Announcements**

- A. Welcome new GE Committee members
  1. Members starting a new term are:
    - a) Shak Gaisoa – SUUSA Representative
    - b) Jim Mock – College of Education and Human Development
    - c) Randy Johnson – Academic Advising
    - d) Anne Diekema – Library (Starting a new 3-year term.)
    - e) John Belk – College of Humanities and Social Sciences (Starting a new 3-year term)
  2. Question regarding the process for replacing members at the end of their term.
    - Policy states that the GE Committee Chair works with the college dean and the Faculty Senate to fill the committee.
- B. Introduction to the Committee
  1. Committee breaks up into three work groups
    - a) This allows for the use of general meetings for committee wide work, summaries of group work, and voting on pertinent items.
    - b) Majority of the committee's work occurs in these groups
    - c) Work groups are: Assessment, Curriculum Management, and Resources
- C. Conferences
  1. There are two upcoming GE related conferences
    - a) What is an Educated Person?
      - i. November 1<sup>st</sup> – 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018
      - ii. Conference is in its 21<sup>st</sup> year and will be held at the Zermat Resort in Midway, UT
      - iii. James will support anyone from the Committee who would like to attend.
      - iv. There is a special session for new GE Committee Members that serves as an introduction to the state wide GE conversation. Johnny encourages all members, old and new, to attend this session.
      - v. If you would like to attend the conference, send Johnny and Katya an email.
        - The deadline to sign up is the end of September
    - b) AAC&U

- i. February 14<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup>, 2019 in San Francisco
- ii. Have funding for three committee members to attend. Will make the decision at a future meeting.

D. Goals for Work Groups

1. Assessment

- a) Collaboratively revise the ELO-to-KA map
  - i. Will work with the Faculty Senate
  - ii. Likely starting over with a clean slate (*see section III. B.*)
- b) Streamline the Canvas reporting process
  - i. This work will take place mostly with the help of Jennifer Hunter from the Office of Online Teaching & Learning (OTL).
- c) Create modules for ELOs
  - i. Jennifer Hunter has already begun this work; group will collaborate with her.

2. Curriculum Management

- a) Continue the review cycle
  - i. Fall 2018: Social and Behavioral Science
  - ii. Spring 2019: Fine Arts
- b) Manage new GE proposals
  - i. Includes courses with new, changes to, and removals of GE designations.
- c) Collaborate with First Year Experience
  - i. Includes the 6-credit GE courses
  - ii. Any other curriculum management needed

3. Resources

- a) Previous focus included things like the GE website. Previous workgroups have cleaned it up enough that the work can be managed in Johnny's office. The focus this year will be on larger campus wide issues.
- b) Consider future enrollment and faculty needs in GE courses
  - i. Make recommendations to the Provost's Office regarding how many faculty members we might need in a particular knowledge area.
  - ii. Will need to look at best practices in course scheduling, such as number of sections and maximum student enrollments.
- c) Consider GE bottlenecks and the online environment
  - i. Find ways to project needs to provide information to decision makers
  - ii. Consider how online GE offerings might contribute to SUU's growth scenarios
- d) Consider CSIS 1000 and LM 1010 needs
  - i. CSIS 1000 is being replaced and is currently in a transition period to SUU 1000. This new course is part of the first year experience and will not only be GE but also a University requirement.
  - ii. The decision was made last year to keep LM 1010 and pair it with English GE courses. Group will need to consider the Library faculty resources and how many faculty members will be

needed to meet the LM 1010 needs of a growing student population.

- The same considerations need to be made in regards to SIEL faculty for SUU 1000

E. New Curriculum Forms

1. Katya wanted to give everyone a head's up that the new Curriculog from doesn't have a specific form for GE approval. The approval is now incorporated into the new course or course modification form.
2. The forms the committee sees will look different than last year.
3. New forms can be found on the Provost's website.

**III. Discussion Items**

A. Establish Work Group Memberships

1. Assessment Work Group
  - a) Lindsay Fullerton – Chair
  - b) Emma Schafer
  - c) Jim Mock
  - d) Paul Schneider
2. Curriculum Management Work Group
  - a) Jon Karpel – Chair
  - b) Michael Ostrowsky
  - c) Shak Gaisoa
  - d) Randy Johnson
3. Resources Work Group
  - a) Krystal McCoy – Chair
  - b) Anne Diekema
  - c) Daniel Eves
  - d) John Allred
  - e) John Belk
4. Chairs will schedule workgroup meetings; groups should meet between regularly scheduled Committee meetings.

B. GE Assessment Strategy Discussion

1. Brief history of current assessment strategy:
  - a) At the last accreditation review in Spring 2014 the lack of assessment in the GE program was noted. The GE Committee at the time quickly put together an assessment strategy that became our current assessment strategy.
  - b) Through the current strategy a lot of data has been collected. However, problems have arisen, such as faculty being unhappy with the assigned ELO's, ability to utilize the data, and questions and inconsistencies of assessment and reporting.
2. Last year the committee began to assess the strategy and realized that the approach wasn't the most appropriate and it is time for a revised strategy.
  - a) Question regarding if the idea to revise the assessment strategy has been run by North West.
    - a. James is meeting with a reviewer and colleague in mid-September and will run the idea past her for initial reactions, he will report back.

- b. Christian Reiner has also give the revision a thumbs-up.
- 3. Draft of new strategy discussion
  - a) Handout - This is still a working document and not for decimation.
  - b) Part C is the new strategy that needs to be discussed in the Assessment workgroup, within the Committee as a whole, and the Faculty Senate.
    - Commitment was made to the Senate to run any revisions by them.
  - c) Previous assessment had the “jelly bean diagram” that assigned ELO’s to knowledge and core areas. The new strategy would allow faculty the freedom to choose the two ELO’s they feel best fist into their course.
    - a. Allows us to collect authentic information.
    - b. Sacrifices complete coverage, all student might not get all ELO’s. However, assessment data that is collected will be more robust and more meaningful.
    - c. The committee can than identify the ELO’s the GE program isn’t focusing on.
  - d) Question regarding faculty who teach the same course. Do all faculty have to cover the same ELO’s for the same class?
    - a. Current discussion is to just open it up and see what happens
    - b. Once we know what is actually happening, we can make more informed decisions.
  - e) Whatever strategy is adopted; it will need to be used for multiple semesters.
  - f) Question about the challenges that were encounter in the previous assessment strategy.
    - a. Using Canvas was regarding as an issue, however the new strategy keeps reporting in Canvas.
    - b. Will work with Jennifer Hunter from OTL to streamline the process.
  - g) Question regarding how much of a role the department should play in curricular consistency.
    - Depends on the program, maybe consistency with one ELO and variation with the other. Would like to leave flexibility with faculty to see what happens.
  - h) Would like to see standardizing what ratings mean on the rubric
    - Current assessment strategy is based on the level of class and faculty expectations.
  - i) Last four years of assessment were not a waste of time, and were an essential step to get to where we are now. We can continue to use that information as we move forward. Previous data has shown strengths and weaknesses that have allowed us to move in a different direction.
  - j) This is a healthy example of the University evolving and trying something new.

#### IV. Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned 5:15 pm