AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Approval of Minutes from September 25, 2015. No quorum, Chair advised minutes will be reviewed at the October 23, 2015 meeting.

II. Old Business
   A. LLC 120 Global Crossings: Images, Media, and Texts – requesting GN marker. Subcommittee advised GN SLOs used are not the current GN SLOs. Discussion concerning language of SLOs, General Education related outcomes. Motion to approve pending resubmission of revised syllabus including updated GN SLOs, remove language “GED Related Outcomes” and add “Goals specific to GLT SLOs” GN SLOs should be explicitly stated. (Vines, Terranova) Motion approved (9/25/15 meeting). Chair advised revised LLC 120 syllabus received. LLC 120 approved for GN marker.
   B. SPA 302 Advanced Spanish for Heritage Speakers – requesting GL marker. Subcommittee advised GL SLOs are not clearly indicated on the syllabus. Motion to approve pending resubmission of revised syllabus stating GL SLOs clearly and explicitly. (Terranova, Vines) Motion approved (9/25/15 meeting). Chair advised revised SPA 302 syllabus received. SPA 302 approved for GL marker.
   C. Chair advised the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures withdrew the LLC 250 Global Cultures through Film: Angles of Vision proposal for GLT category designation.

III. Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies (BLS) and General Education

Chair introduced Jay Parr, BLS Program, and provided a brief update of the BLS requests for general education designations. Jay advised, last year, the BLS program submitted eight course proposals – two GLT, one GFA, one GPR and three Global markers (GL/GN). All courses are 300 level courses, online classes, and restricted to junior and senior standing. There are some changes on the BLS side that may affect the courses. Restricting to online students is less of an issue now, due to the priority registration for online degree completion students. A Gen Ed course prerequisite could also be added. Question regarding faculty and credentialing process of BLS faculty. Jay advised all instructors are UNCG faculty and are properly credentialed. Discussion followed concerning the interpretation of SACSCOC requirements of “narrowly focused”. It appears as if this has been interpreted as “open to everyone” and that may not be the SACSCOC intent. However, UNCG faculty have affirmed that Gen Ed courses should be open to all students. Question as to why BLS is requesting Gen Ed designation for 300 level courses. Transfer students do not always come in with all of their general education courses. If they are unable to get them here, they will go to Community Colleges for these
credits. These courses do not serve just BLS students, they are open to all online students and serve all online degree completion students. Various departments are being encouraged to offer additional online General Education courses. BLS would like to focus their courses, first, on online degree completion students. The need is less about 300 and 400 level courses, more about access for online students. Chair thanked Jay for his time.

Discussion continued concerning BLS faculty, courses, and FTE. If you teach an online course in BLS, then do they have the proprietary right to the course material? What is the differentiation between shell courses (Honors) and BLS courses? Should these courses be 200 level? Gen Ed courses should introduce students to other departments and faculty on campus, possibly double major or add as a minor. GEC should be a gateway to other departments.

IV. Assessment and Recertification

Chair advised Power Point slides from the August 2015 General Education Program Assessment Forum are available on the Blackboard site, as well as the Gen Ed and Office of Assessment and Accreditation websites. Terry Brumfield advised this pilot project was different from what’s been done in the past. In the past, assessment was done with faculty using a three point rating scale. This past academic year, we piloted the Value Rubrics, which is in line with the UNC system competencies. Chair advised this data should be reviewed at a future meeting, and asked council members to review the slides.

Chair advised Recertification is underway. The Gen Ed Request form has been revised and now includes a question asking faculty recertifying or proposing a new course, to draw upon relevant assessment results. In terms of Recertification, existing Assessment reports have been reviewed and relevant data pulled out for faculty. We are trying to make assessment data more accessible to faculty. Terry developed slides for faculty review. Discussion followed concerning 2012-2013 Summary Assessment Results (handout). Data has been condensed to tables / pie diagrams. GLT data is not in these results – courses are recertifying for new SLOs. If looking at data from old SLOs, then faculty will need to translate to new SLOs. Question concerning Assessment language – course instructor / peer instructor. Both are important, note the discrepancy between results. Typically, the biggest problem with peer faculty not being able to rate something is an assignment is not explicitly aligned or aligned at all with the SLOs. Discussion continued, could the slides containing Comments from Workshop Faculty, be moved to the front or to each data table slide; could we add a list of FAQs to Council web pages? can we pull out the “unrated” data and put this on the side of the charts to make data comparison easier?. Concern about the assessment question on the form for the Recertification process, is there enough time to explain to faculty and answer all of the questions regarding the interpretation of data for all of the categories? If we had data that included just the new SLOs, this would be easier. The point of revising SLOs was to have this data prior to the new SLOs. What is the purpose of gathering this information? Is this a way to have faculty begin to analyze the data? To some extent, this is a pilot- this is what we know, this is what we can offer you, part of this is to have faculty look at the data, think through it and respond in some way. Should the form state - recognizing the Assessment is from the last round of SLOs (could list), recognizing the SLOs have been revised, is there anything from the last SLOs that informs your decision about what to do with the course in the future? We could provide a range of examples. If we could get the courses that have been involved in the assessment process before, this would be helpful.
Ideally, faculty who have taught the course both before and after assessment, would participate. Percentages in the Summary Assessment Results should be clearer. Ask a general question – if this course has been part of the General Education Program before, what evidence do you have that it has been successful in teaching the Learning Outcomes and any improvements that you’ve made based on the evidence? 

Amy asked to have question #14 rewritten, as well as a list of possible examples / responses, this should also include GLT data. If we can cut down on the deciphering a little by providing examples, this would be helpful.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Next meeting is October 23, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.