

**Meeting Date:** November 1, 2021

**Assessment Committee**

Attended: Jennifer Bown, Elizabeth Carney, Jil Freeman, Shalee Hodgson, Jason Kovac, Kelly Mercer, Dave Mount, Lisa Nielson, Ashley Sears, Mary Jean Williams

Guests: Scot Pruyn, Derek Lougee, James Bryant-Trerise

**One Topic/Item was addressed at this meeting: Proposed revision of general education course approval process**

* We briefly went over the driving reasons behind the gen ed application revision process, and the progress to date. See the notes from the 10-18-21 meeting for more on that.
* We reviewed the current draft of the gen ed course application and discussed it.
* MaryJean asked if the results of the form are intended to be an example to other instructors teaching this course or will the assessment in the form become the required assessment?
* Elizabeth thinks the course outline is intended to serve as a guide. There are multiple ways to design toward the intended learning outcomes for a course. The answers to the form provide one example of how to do that. The outline sets the expectation that the course design should align to the outcomes in concrete intention ways.
* Dave: The form could be more transparent about the audience for the form responses and the resulting course outlines.
* Jil has consistently heard from new full-time faculty that course outlines are not particularly helpful to them and that often the existing course materials or other aspects of the course design are not aligned with the course outline.
* Who is responsible for the integrity of courses, such as whether courses are being taught in a way that is designed to serve the intended learning outcomes? The Curriculum Committee? What is the role of the faculty lead for the course in terms of accountability?
* MaryJean: Associate faculty commonly get a link to the course outline two weeks after the course has already begun. Not super helpful.
* Derek: The Social Sciences department has multiple subject areas with no full-time faculty lead. The department has discussed what it would mean for associate faculty to serve as lead and there is some concern about whether this is a fair ask of associate faculty. So, who would be the lead faculty submitting the gen ed course applications?
* Scot: Math also has multiple courses taught by associate faculty.
* Derek: Some Social Sciences courses have both Cultural Literacy designation and Arts & Letters designation. What would it look like to apply for both? Could the application process be combined—a single form for multiple areas?
* The group discussed some of the challenges gen ed assessment teams have faced trying to get useful student achievement data for gen ed outcomes. Challenges include identifying and sampling work from students who have taken the full number of courses required for the gen ed area (example: students are required to take 4 courses that are certified for Social Science for the AAOT). The Science assessment team targeted a course that is at the end of a course sequence, but that meant that the students were all science majors, so the sample was skewed for gen ed assessment purposes.
* Elizabeth noted that it would be helpful to have some sort of body representing general education, such as a gen ed committee. This is common in other colleges. The challenges of doing gen ed assessment in two-year colleges is a hot topic nationally in the assessment profession. Jennifer suggested a General Education Summit.
* Next steps?
	+ Jennifer: gen ed instructors should be engaged in this discussion – they should have a say in the new form.
	+ Derek said he thinks each gen ed group/department should be engaged individually to discuss what this would mean for their group.
	+ MaryJean: Could be helpful to associate faculty and others to have access to a library of the assignments referenced in the course outlines