

General Education Committee
WH D-442
Monday, Sept 26, 2011
10:00am – 12pm
Minutes

Present: Sheela Pawar, Merry Eyman, Elena Kulikov, E. Carol Dales, Emily Magruder, Marek Suchenek, LaTanya Skiffer, Kenneth Ganezer, Lorna Fitzsimmons (proxy for Dana Belu)

Excused: Debra Best, Lisa Hutton, Pamela Krochalk, Angel Pu, Ivonne Heinze-Balcazar, Janna Bersi, Cynthia Turner, Brandy McLelland

1. **Call to order:** 10:18am
2. Introduction and welcome to committee by Lorna Fitzsimmons.
3. **Approval of Agenda:**
 1. L. Skiffer moved to approve. C. Dales seconded. M/S/P
 - i. Approved
4. **Approval of Minutes**
 1. Remove Mark Carrier's name from "Absent" list. He was not a GE member.
 2. M. Suchenek moved to approve as amended. E. Kulikov seconded. M/S/P
 - i. Approved as amended.
5. **New Business**

HIS 120 Hybrid Proposal

 - a. Course proposal to offer existing course as a hybrid course. The syllabus does reflect requirements for a hybrid course delivery as approved by Academic Senate including online communication; attendance; minimum hardware/software requirements.
 - a. EPC 09-02-Guidelines on Academic Technology and Distance Learning Classes
 - b. C. Dales- The justification addresses the hybrid component of the course which is not reflected in the syllabus.
 - a. Consider working some language from the justification into the syllabus to clarify the mode of instruction.
 - c. M. Suchenek- The committee should indicate what components are missing and ask the department to resubmit a syllabus that addresses them.

Clarification of Class Meeting Schedule

 - a. E. Kulikov- Percentage of online vs. in class instruction is not stated in the syllabus.
 - b. L. Fitzsimmons – No more than 2/3 of instruction can be online according to Senate.

- c. M. Suchenek – One of the committee’s duties is to make sure the syllabus follows university policy.
- d. L. Skiffer- Course schedule does not clearly identify which activities or class meetings are online or in class. There should be a section in the syllabus to explain online participation.
- e. S. Pawar- As a 100 level course, the more direction in the syllabus the better for the students and professor.

Online Participation:

- f. M. Suchenek - Specify how students will interact online.
- g. L. Fitzsimmons- discussion board is usually expected should be on syllabus.

Class Lectures:

- h. S. Pawar- Syllabus should include more detail about online lectures; if they will be tracked, when and how.

Student Learning Outcomes:

- i. E. Magruder- Concerned about the SLO’s. Articulate how the two class portions are going to be integrated. Need to state what students will learn/communicate orally and written.

L. Fitzsimmons - Conference call with Jim Jeffers to discuss HIS 120.

- a. J. Jeffers presented an overview of the course to offer different modes of instruction. Hybrid course offering was presented at this time.
 - a. Video lectures have been prepared for the course to be posted on Blackboard and viewed by students online.
 - i. The online course offering had some issues regarding academic integrity and tracking. The hybrid course addresses those issues.
 - b. The on campus time is set for focused small and large group discussion of the video lectures. Testing is also done in class.
- b. L. Fitzsimmons – Expressed the committee’s concern regarding the guidelines following EPC 09-02-Guidelines on Academic Technology and Distance Learning Classes.
 - a. She recommends he look at that document and try to bring the syllabus more into line with some of the items on the document.
 - b. Information is offered in the course justification, but should be explained in the syllabus.
- c. L. Fitzsimmons - Syllabus should include more specifics of requirements for the hybrid course offering. Examples of information to include to be consistent with guidelines of EPC 09-02:
 - a. More specificity on minimum computer requirements; clarification of specific percentage of online class time; online communication with students; facilitate a discussion board.

- d. J. Jeffers- Students are tested on their knowledge of lecture and text. Exams cover textbook readings and online lecture material which is not included in the text. He can make the syllabus clearer about what will be required.
- e. L. Fitzsimmons- Concern of possible issues of not restricting student communication.
 - a. L. Skiffer- Suggestion to open a Blackboard discussion board. Discussion board can be an informal component made available to students that is not a requirement. Discussion board participation could also contribute to participation grade. There are opportunities to facilitate and monitor communication.
- f. L. Fitzsimmons –GE Committee is requesting the department resubmit the HIS 120 syllabus with their recommendations. She will send J. Jeffers a summary as documentation of recommendations and Academic Senate documents for reference.
- g. M. Suchenek moved to request a revised HIS 120 syllabus which includes the requirements of EPC 09-02. E. Magruder seconded. M/S/P

GE Area Review

- a. Assessment of all the GE areas will begin again this academic year. The schedule of assessment reports has been modified. It has been suggested to follow the Program Review schedule and include a GE area report with the programs that are under review.
 - a. Assessment will begin with Area A this year. All programs under this area will submit their GE documents.
- b. M. Eyman – GE committee only has to review the learning outcomes that are in line with GE. GE does not have to review all course/program outcomes.
- c. Cathy Jacobs will come in to review the assessment of learning outcomes.
- d. L. Fitzsimmons- departments are going to be given the flexibility of reviewing some or all of the outcomes. Not all learning outcomes have to be assessed in each round of review. Programs need to identify which learning outcomes are being addressed in the assessments.
- e. S. Pawar- one of the issues in last cycle of review was that departments were asked to review all learning outcomes pertaining to GE. Academic Affairs wants to streamline the process and not overburden department chairs and coordinators. The assessment of 1-2 learning outcomes are going to be requested.
- f. The university is trying to build a culture of assessment so that departments get into a habit of continuous assessment of learning outcomes.
 - a. We can ask programs to assess certain learning outcomes or they pick which ones to address in each cycle of review.
- g. L. Fitzsimmons – GE will request an initial plan of assessment from the programs.
 - a. M. Eyman- GE can then ask for different outcomes if GE wants something more broad. L. Fitzsimmons agrees.
- h. Deadline- responding by end of October? Give them 2 weeks to tell us what they're gonna measure. October deadline to request their plan. Reasonable deadline.

- i. L. Fitzsimmons - Motion to proceed with area reviews determining those units under review this year, plus Area A for this year minus those not involved in GE and those that have been reviewed in the past 5 years.
 - a. Programs must first submit a conditional plan that lists which learning outcomes will be assessed by GE by the end of October. The deadline for submission of the final portfolio will be February 13, 2012 with a promise that other outcomes will be reviewed in the next cycle.
 - a. L. Skiffer seconded the motion. M/S/P Approved

Adjournment: 11:27am