Meeting called to order at 11:05am.

1. Develop a plan to encourage new submissions

   Plan for New Submissions:
   A list of approved classes for the coming fall was circulated. The list includes a tally of the number of courses that meet the different areas in GE. Todd reports working with Brendan to calculate student demands/needs for areas such as quantitative analysis so that the offerings correspond to the classes being offered. Last year, the Committee undertook a major push to get Language Arts and GCC courses certified. This year will be focused on fine-tuning the offerings. A second handout was distributed showing that since 1/3 of required credits must come from GE, it is suggested that departments make sure their offerings offers a similar ratio while balancing the needs of their majors.

   Members who served on the previous committee were asked how they approached the push for wider coverage; Norm Arancon and Vera Parham noted that they looked over many syllabi to see how some classes submitted for one area could also serve in other GE areas. Todd asked committee members for feedback on the current list of certified courses.

2. Developing a process for evaluation of new submissions

   The Committee’s Dropbox page has been established and new applications have been placed in it. Todd asked how committee members handled the application process from before. Jon Price noted that much of it was done verbally. Vera Parham suggested that there should be some way to add comments about strengths and weaknesses. Todd indicated he will create such a tool in the drop box to facilitate course evaluation vis-à-vis GE certification. Jon Price noted that more work still needs to be done in soliciting new courses to fill out the offerings.

3. Developing a re-certification process that involves assessment.

   Todd introduced the idea of “portfolios” to fast-track recertification. He also brought up the issue of the lack of assessment as well as the lack of oversight of courses that serve as WI (not that he wants to serve in a police function but that there needs to be some “quality control”). Jon Price suggested that sample assignment and a few sample student work to be included in the portfolio. Students names, once removed, could enable faster recertification and satisfy the need to verify courses are meeting target skills.
Todd noted such “demands” as WASC recertification, program review, the new strategic plan, etc., but the whole point is that the faculty take control of the process. Todd noted the point is to make assessment workable and easier to manage for faculty themselves.

Seri mentioned the existence of rubrics and that we all need to start using them individually before we start driving assessment. She also mentioned the challenge for GE assessment, which is to build an alignment of “criteria” across disciplines (i.e. what successful work in information literacy looks like to faculty from different programs). The point is to use a standard tool to help us gauge skills regardless of the content. Todd then noted that the whole point is to build faculty consensus to allow us to generate data on how well our students are doing, how they may not be, and what we can do to improve. Todd and Seri also mentioned upcoming AACU and WASC work—which is being supported by the Congress, to enable faculty to take control of the process.

4. Dealing with the COM 270 Issue
   It was originally approved as Language Arts and Humanities. Randy does not teach it as a Humanities, but rather a Social Sciences course, and that is what he requested. He did not request Language Arts. He also said that other faculty members teach it from a Humanities approach. Cathy Zenz suggests that we approve it in all three areas for the current 5 year cycle, allowing students to choose which area req. (Humanities or Soc Sci) it counts towards their degree. Then, during recertification, we get a more stable approach. Todd moved to go ahead and certify the course as it but help the department possibly create two different courses to help alleviate this issue. Jon Price also noted that such an approach would be beneficial for what the committee does in overseeing the purpose of GE.

   Also – Todd was notified that WS 252 is being renumbered as 352. This doesn’t really affect us, except listing it as such on web page.

5. Discussion of upcoming WASC assessment training workshop and visit by Jill Ferguson
   She will visit on Feb. 27 from 9-4. Two sessions, one morning, one afternoon for assessment training.

6. Examples of successful submissions for the website
   We will post some of the better ones from this year to help people preparing applications.

7. Lab Requirements for GE Applications
   Todd then brought up the problem of no lab requirements for GE certification. Jene Michaud’s comments were mentioned about how these really should be evaluated differently. Susan noted that yes, there are differences in that some classes have major writing involved, others not. Rachel also noted that those labs required more writing than is feasible for a 1 credit course. Jon then added that the way credit hours are calculated is
a little confusing (hours in class versus homework versus writing assignment). Everyone agreed there was no way to evaluate labs because courses and labs were certified together. Jon noticed BIOL 275 is listed as GCC and the lab is not. So in this instance, they may have been certified differently. Todd remarked that some labs are taught by lecturers independent of the course and certification may fall on the individual for the lab. Rachel said it was unclear how the class and the labs relate in terms of writing. Susan and Jon volunteered to draft criteria for lab evaluation/certification.

8. New Meetings
   Setting of next meeting: February 23, 11:00.