

**The Minutes of
THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OF
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY**

The General Education Committee met Monday, February 28, 2011 at 10:00 am in the McEver Conference Room. The following were present:

Dr. Jackie Bowman	Dr. Robin Lasey
Dr. Peter Dykema	Dr. Johnette Moody
Dr. Ruth Enoch	Ms. Karen Riddell
Mr. Travis Flower	Dr. Kim Troboy
	Dr. Jason Warnick

Absent were: Dr. Annette Holeyfield, Ms. Pat McCreary, and Ms. Annette Stuckey. Ms. Danielle Jolie, Dr. Carey Roberts, and Mr. Wyatt Watson were guests.

Call to Order: Dr. Bowman called the meeting to order and turned the meeting over to Dr. Roberts to discuss the upcoming Higher Learning Commission accreditation visit.

HLC Visit Dr. Roberts informed the committee that the team from the Higher Learning Commission has requested to meet with them during their visit and that he would like to go over some potential questions that could be asked by the team. Dr Roberts commented that these consultations are something that we want so that we can get feedback from them and that the committee needs to be honest and factual in their answers to the questions asked. However, he did caution to avoid “red flag” answers such as “What is assessment?”

The questions Dr. Roberts thought might be asked were:

What does the General Education Committee do? The committee’s response was that they look at the University’s general education goals, develop assessment measures, collect data, and analyze the data collected to determine if we are meeting those goals.

Where do the goals come from? The committee’s response was that the new goals were developed through collaboration between the Curriculum Committee and the Assessment Committee and was then approved by the Faculty Senate, but that there was also a lot of input and development from faculty.

Could they be any kind of goals? The committee’s response was that they looked at the University’s mission statement and also

considered what the students should be learning to prepare them for their future and then set the goals accordingly.

Summarize the widespread vision of general education. The committee's response was that there was some frustration with how the goals are being met. It was mentioned that since there is a big turnover of people on the committees over the years, it is hard to keep everyone informed. Also, there are a lot of the general education courses taught by adjunct professors and it is hard to communicate to them that they need to be teaching with the general education goals in mind.

What is the relationship between the goals and general education curriculum? How is this assessed? The committee's response was that the courses are mapped to the goals by a system designed by the General Education sub-committee. For example, science has 5 individual common questions throughout the courses in physical and life science that can be compared to the science and quantitative reasoning goals. Ethics will be assessed by administering questions to a random sampling of students within the general education courses. Some of the system is still being worked out.

Who is in charge of gathering the data and how is the data analyzed? The committee's response was that it is a factorial analysis, but is in the beginning stages. The faculty teaching the courses collect and put the data in to Banner. Some of the faculty have administrative help inputting the data.

Who looks at the data once it is entered into Banner? The committee responded that they have looked at the data, but have not started analyzing it yet.

When was the last time there was an evaluation of the curriculum? The committee's response was that it had been a long time, but that one of their responsibilities is to approve changes to the general education courses once the proposals have gone through the curriculum committee.

What measure are you using to evaluate those proposals? The committee's response was that there is an assessment section on the proposals that they use for their evaluation, but in the future they will use the data that they have collected. Is there a review cycle? In the proposal it called for every 5 years, but we need to have the data all collected and analyzed in order to review them properly.

What kind of measures were used in the past? The committee responded that we used the state mandated CAAP (Rising Junior) exam, but the students never took the test seriously.

What kind of administrative support and resources are being devoted to this committee? The committee responded that there is release time for the chair, funding for exams, and help from Institutional Research collecting data. They felt that they received lots of support from the administration. They felt they could use more staff support for entering data and analyzing, but they had received pretty much everything they had asked for.

Did you receive training in assessment? Some of the committee members were on other committees such as the Assessment Committee or were trained in Curriculum and Instruction and had experience through that, but there was not specific training for the General Education Committee.

Dr. Roberts asked Mr. Flower (member from SGA) how widely the students understood how the general education courses link to the general education goals. Mr. Flower responded that he didn't think the students necessarily knew or desired to know about the general education goals. He thought they mostly just wanted to do what they had to do to get their degree and move on.

Dr. Roberts told the committee that he didn't know if the team would ask these specific questions or if everyone would have to attend these meetings, but he felt Dr. Bowman, as chair, and Dr. Lasey, as former chair, would have to be there. He also suggested that the committee read over the handout that was distributed before the meeting, 2010-2011 Re-Accreditation News, and the Self Study Report which can be found at www.atu.edu/hlc/ and meet again to discuss these before the team arrives.

Dr. Roberts told the committee that he thinks we have made great strides and that they have done a good job in connecting the goals and curriculum. He feels that we are as advanced as anyone else in this area.

The committee decided to meet again on Wednesday, March 9th at 10:00 am in the McEver Conference room.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.

**The Minutes of
THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OF
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY**

The General Education Committee met Wednesday, March 9 at 10:00 am in the McEver Conference Room. The following were present:

Dr. Jackie Bowman	Dr. Johnette Moody
Dr. Peter Dykema	Ms. Karen Riddell
Dr. Ruth Enoch	Ms. Annette Stuckey
Mr. Travis Flower	Dr. Kim Troboy
Dr. Annette Holeyfield	Dr. Jason Warnick
Dr. Robin Lasey	

Absent:

Ms. Pat McCreary

Mr. Wyatt Watson was a guest at the meeting.

Call to Order: Dr. Bowman called the meeting to order and turned it over to Mr. Watson to demonstrate inputting general education assessment data into the Course Assessment Report.

Course Assessment Mr. Watson explained that though this tool started out as a general education assessment tool, it has proved to be more beneficial at the course assessment level, with general education assessment as a side effect. The biggest challenge is tying the data back to the student. The data is assessed using a pass/fail rating with that determination being up to the faculty or department. The methods used to gather the data can be as standardized as the department wants. Each course has five objectives, most of which tie to one of the general education goals. As far as Mr. Watson knows, we are the only public institution collecting data per student like this. Oral Roberts University actually awards scholarships tied to such data.

Mr. Watson mentioned that this page is similar to the "Final Grades" page and that it is audited so that the University is aware of who makes what changes to it. The University does not have to get the student's permission since this is not reported per student.

Mr. Watson then demonstrated actually putting the data into the system. The columns can be set to "P" to mark all students as pass or "F" to mark all as fail. You can manipulate dimensions on the Course Assessment Report to look at different data. Dr. Lasey cautioned the committee to be careful when analyzing the data since different standards are used.

On the General Education Assessment Report, only include students with at least 37 lower division hours at Tech. It includes all available scores once the student hits 37 hours.

The committee wanted to know who had access to run these reports. Mr. Watson told them that to date all types of access depend on your position at the university. This report depends on the committee you are on. It was discussed as to which members of the General Education Committee needed or wanted access to run this report. It was suggested that the chair send a list to Academic Affairs, who would then forward it to Mr. Watson, of the members that need access. The list would need to be changed each time members of the committee change.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.

**The Minutes of
THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OF
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY**

The General Education Committee met Wednesday, August 31, 2011 in Rothwell 308.
The following were present:

Dr. Erin Clair	Ms. Karen Riddell
Dr. Ruth Enoch	Ms. Jennifer Saxton
Dr. Annette Holeyfield	Dr. Joseph Swain
Ms. Samantha Maestas	Dr. Kim Troboy
Dr. Johnette Moody	Dr. Jason Warnick

Ms. Gwen Faulkenberry and Dr. Jackie Bowman were absent.
Dr. John Watson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, was a visitor at the meeting.

Call to Order: Dr. Enoch called the meeting to order and turned it over to Dr. Watson to speak to the committee about ACT 747 and the need for Arkansas Tech to adopt the state minimum core.

ACT 747 Dr. Watson told the committee that his charge to them was to have a recommendation to adopt the state minimum core, or an acceptable alternative, to the Curriculum Committee at the September 6 Faculty Senate/Curriculum Committee meeting. The General Education Committee is also invited to that meeting.

Dr. Watson explained to the committee that representatives of ADHE had met with Legislators and determined that existing programs of study would be included in the 120 hour requirement set forth in ACT 747. Dr. Watson expressed to the committee that in order for the proposal to get through all the channels in time to go to the late January or early February AHECB meeting and therefore be completed in time for the 2012-13 catalog, that we must act quickly.

Dr. Watson distributed a draft of what our general education curriculum might look like in the catalog if the state minimum core was adopted. The committee then discussed ways for the programs to cut hours. The simplest solution discussed was cutting free electives. Also, those that require a speech course could use those three hours toward their reduction, since speech would now be part of the general education curriculum. It was also pointed out that the state minimum core requires 8 hours of science, but does not specify that they have to be both physical science and biological science, so some programs that have 8 hours of science

incorporated in to their program (whether it be physical or biological) could cut hours that way.

Another 2 hours would be cut from all programs with the elimination of the activity courses from the general education core. Dr. Watson assured the committee that cutting these activities from the general education curriculum did not mean that they would go away. Many students use these courses as electives. Dr. Holeyfield encouraged the committee members to ask their departments to recommend the activities as electives.

Dr. Watson also mentioned that the elimination of the PE activities from the general education curriculum might mean modifying how we assess wellness, which is part of our General Education Goals at Arkansas Tech. This is something that the General Education Committee would need to look at sometime in the near future.

Ms. Saxton asked if the hours cut had to be an elective or if the department could cut a required class from the program to get to the 120 hours. He responded that all “program changes” would still have to go through the proper channels.

Dr. Watson told the committee that he realized that some of the programs that did not have electives would have to make program changes which might necessitate an extension for those programs, but he would know more about this after his Chief Academic Officers meeting with ADHE on September 13.

Dr. Swain asked Dr. Watson if the three options within the social sciences were something that could be changed to require one specific option. Dr. Watson said, and the committee agreed, that this would be better to do within the program, not as a modification to the core.

With there being no other questions for Dr. Watson, he then left the meeting for the committee to come to a decision.

Motion by Dr. Troboy, seconded by Dr. Moody, to make the recommendation to the Curriculum Committee to adopt the state minimum core. Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

**The Minutes of
THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
OF
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY**

The General Education Committee met Wednesday, September 14, 2011 in Rothwell 308. The following were present:

Dr. Erin Clair	Ms. Karen Riddell
Dr. Ruth Enoch	Ms. Jennifer Saxton
Ms. Gwen Faulkenberry	Dr. Joseph Swain
Dr. Annette Holeyfield	Dr. Kim Troboy
Ms. Samantha Maestas	Dr. Jason Warnick
Dr. Johnette Moody	

Dr. Jackie Bowman was absent.

Call to Order: Dr. Enoch called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the October 28, 2010, February 28, 2011, March 9, 2011 and August 31, 2011 minutes. Motion by Dr. Holeyfield, seconded by Dr. Moody to approve the minutes as distributed. Motion carried.

Elections Dr. Enoch asked for nominations for chair-elect. Dr. Warnick nominated Dr. Moody. Dr. Clair seconded the motion. There being no other nominations, motion carried for Dr. Moody to serve as chair-elect. Dr. Enoch then asked for nominations for Secretary. Ms. Saxton volunteered to serve. Dr. Moody seconded. There being no other nominations, motion carried for Ms. Saxton to serve as Secretary.

Regular Meeting The committee discussed a time that would be convenient for all members to meet and decided on alternating Tuesday afternoons at 4:00 pm and Wednesday afternoons at 2:00 pm. The committee decided to meet once a month on the second week of the month beginning with Tuesday, October 11 at 4:00 pm. The committee agreed to continue using Rothwell 308 contingent upon its availability.

Goals for Year Dr. Enoch went over the goals that she would like to accomplish for this year beginning with the analysis of the data that has been gathered so far by the committee. Dr. Enoch informed the committee that she would get with Mr. Wyatt Watson for help with doing this analysis.

Dr. Enoch then asked the committee to consider the validity and reliability of the current procedures used to gather the data. The committee agreed that this is something that needs to be reassessed and felt that the data collected might not be in-depth enough for a good assessment.

Dr. Enoch then told the committee that she would check with Dr. Carey Roberts, chair of the Assessment Committee, about the DIT software that the committee would like to use and the possibility of the Assessment Committee funding that purchase.

Dr. Enoch asked the committee if, with the adoption of the state minimum core, they thought that the committee should discuss a revision of the general education goals to recommend to the Assessment Committee. The committee agreed that needed to be looked at since the state minimum core does not include Physical Education and one of the goals deals with understanding wellness concepts.

Dr. Enoch asked the committee to continue gathering data and consider how things are being assessed. Some of the new members requested a copy of the “Report on General Education Assessment” so that they could get a better idea of what they need to be doing. Karen Riddell agreed to send this to them electronically.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

General Education Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 11, 2011 at 4 p.m.

1. Discuss DIT. Do we plan to use a random sample of students? Testing the whole student body would be quite expensive, and above the maximum amount of a grant.

Dr. Enoch has spoken to Dr. Roberts about the possibility of getting an Assessment Grant to pay for the DIT exams and was told that the most that can be granted is \$5,000. The DIT exams are \$25 per student. Dr. Troboy volunteered to get Dr. Enoch a copy of the grant application form that the College of Business has used in the past.

It would probably be best to do a random sample separating by college and using the student's T numbers.

2. Look at an ARGOS report for one of the General Education Goals. (I have not run it yet. I'll probably do either writing or health and wellness)

Dr. Enoch will bring an ARGOS report to the next meeting.

3. Report on my meeting with Wyatt Watson and Dr Carey Roberts.

Dr. Roberts has told Dr. Enoch that the committee should probably run a monthly ARGOS report working on one goal at a time. The report should then be sent to the Assessment Committee. It is Dr. Enoch's understanding that once the committee collects the data, that the Assessment Committee would do the assessments.

In formal minutes.
Only a few people
in attendance