

General Education Committee Meeting Minutes

November 26, 2018

Chair Mindi Clark called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in Jesse Dunn 113. Members in attendance were Matt Adair, James Bell, Brooke Fuller, Kaylynn Hansen, Jennifer Mahieu, David Hawkins, Leigh Kirby, Roxie James representing Kathryn Lane, Kyle Larson, Tim Maharry, Chandler mead, Kirk Rogers, Jason Wickham, and student member J.C. Wells.

Clark discussed the review process and the need to review course embedded general education data and ETS data annually, and have a large review with the NSSE data every three years for the purpose of triangulation. Discussion was held and all agreed this would be an effective process.

Findings from the most recent cycle of data were discussed. Representatives from departments offering course embedded assessments were asked to report on findings. The following list provides information regarding data:

General Education Data Observations – 11/26/18 (Highlighted text addresses unacceptable data)

- **General Education Course Data Snapshot**
 - **L1 – 57.7% unacceptable**
 - Business department representative informed the committee they found students did not have an adequate opportunity to achieve at higher levels due to a faulty instrument and misunderstanding of the question. The department submitted a modification to their assessment to address this issue.
 - **L2 – 34% unacceptable**
 - English department representative plans to speak to the instructor(s) of the course with this assessment and report back to the committee.
 - L3 – 71.7% acceptable
 - This was considered an acceptable level of performance but focus should be maintained in helping students understand financial planning and money management.
 - L4 – pre-test/post-test showed good gains with 76.5% at acceptable or target
 - The Health and Sports Science representative felt the assessment showed an acceptable level of student growth and understanding and the committee agreed.
 - L5 – **Questions 1 and 2 were at 75% and 67.9% unacceptable**
 - Science department representative reported students did not understand the first two questions and plan to submit a modification. The third question with three parts was better understood by the students; therefore, they performed better.
 - L6 – 87% target or acceptable
 - The Fine Arts representative was pleased with the results and the committee agreed. This achievement also speaks to the NSSE results. By the end of the NWOSU experience, students fall among peer institutions in regard to diversity engagement.

- **L7 – 35.5% unacceptable**
 - Fine Arts representative plans to speak to the instructor(s) of the course with this assessment and report back to the committee.
- **C1 – 72.6% unacceptable**
 - Business department representative informed the committee they found students did not have an adequate opportunity to achieve at higher levels due to a faulty instrument and misunderstanding of the question. The department submitted a modification to their assessment to address this issue.
- **C2 – 30% unacceptable**
 - English department representative plans to speak to the instructor(s) of the course with this assessment and report back to the committee.
- **C3 – 50.1% unacceptable**
 - Business department representative informed the committee they found students did not have an adequate opportunity to achieve at higher levels due to a faulty instrument and misunderstanding of the question. The department submitted a modification to their assessment to address this issue.
- E1 85% and 98.1% target or acceptable
 - Leadership class instructors were pleased with the performance and the committee agreed.
- **E2 83% target or acceptable / Highest rate of unacceptable at 15.3%**
 - Although the leadership instructors and committee agreed this was an acceptable level of performance, discussion was held about how this could be improved. Leadership instructors agreed to meet and consider a modification to the assessment.
- E3 Very high at 94.5% and 96.3% target or acceptable
 - Leadership class instructors were pleased with the performance and the committee agreed.
- **NSSE**
 - Discussion was held about the following:
 - Speaks to engagement. Are students participating in learning activities that relate to SLOs?
 - Significantly lower than SW Public in Reflective and Integrative Learning, Learning Strategies, Discussions with Diverse Others, and Quality of Interactions
 - Students do not spend as much time preparing for class or reading and writing in the first year as SW Public
 - Lowest performing relative to SW Public in areas related to L6 and C1 for first year.
 - Gains made among seniors, improving data.
- **ETS**
 - Discussion was held about the following:
 - Not proficient in Critical Thinking, Writing Level 3, and Mathematics Level 3. Reading Level 2 is low also. Although low in these areas, data are similar to the Carnegie Class for comparison.
 - 2018 showed gains from previous years in writing and level 1 math.

- We need a larger N to have better data.

Business presented their assessment modification for L1, L3, C1, and C3. Tim Maharry moved to approve the modification, Jason Wickham seconded, and the motion passed.

The group discussed strategies to increase participation for the ETS. Ideas included:

- Incentives (pizza, fee waivers, gift cards, etc.)
- Capturing students at the department level instead of system-wide
- Random sampling
- Taking the assessment in specific courses

Clark challenged the committee to continue to brainstorm ideas and communicate with the group via email.

The group discussed ways to improve critical thinking scores. The idea of a professional development workshop was mentioned. Clark agreed to follow up with the Faculty Development Advisory Board. The committee will continue to brainstorm ideas in this area, also, and communicate through email.

Clark encouraged department representatives to return to their departments and (1) report the information discussed from the meeting, (2) request any modifications to assessments if they offer a course with an embedded assessment, and (3) ensure SLOs that are reinforced in a course be identified in the course syllabus.

Clark asked if co-curricular assessment affected the current format for general education assessment, and the committee discussed and agreed no changes were needed.

To wrap up the meeting, Clark asked, "What is one single action we need to take as a result of this committee meeting?" Committee members agreed the following were priority issues:

- Increasing participation for ETS
- Re-visiting modification submissions
- Ensuring SLO reinforcement is documented in course syllabi
- An additional question to the data reporting form focused on implication from the data. Brooke Fuller offered to share the same questions asked on other reporting forms through Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness.
- Strategies to improve critical thinking

With no further business, Chandler Mead moved to adjourn the meeting, Kirk Rogers seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Submitted by:

Mindi Clark, Ph.D.
General Education Committee Chair

General Education Data Observations – 11/26/18

General Education Course Data Snapshot

L1 – 57.7% unacceptable

L2 – 34% unacceptable

L3 – 71.7% acceptable

L4 – pre-test/post-test showed good gains with 76.5% at acceptable or target

L5 – Questions 1 and 2 were at 75% and 67.9% unacceptable

L6 – 87% target or acceptable

L7 – 35.5% unacceptable

C1 – 72.6% unacceptable

C2 – 30% unacceptable with 36 students not submitting

C3 – 50.1% unacceptable

C4: Not measured

E1 85% and 98.1% target or acceptable

E2 83% target or acceptable / Highest rate of unacceptable at 15.3%

E3 Very high at 94.5% and 96.3% target or acceptable

NSSE

Speaks to engagement. Are students participating in learning activities that relate to SLOs?

Significantly lower than SW Public in Reflective and Integrative Learning, Learning Strategies, Discussions with Diverse Others, and Quality of Interactions

Students do not spend as much time preparing for class or reading and writing in the first year as SW Public

Lowest performing relative to SW Public in areas related to L6 and C1 for first year.

Gains made among seniors, improving data.

ETS

Not proficient in Critical Thinking, Writing Level 3, and Mathematics Level 3. Reading Level 2 is low also. Although low in these areas, data are similar to the Carnegie Class for comparison.

2018 showed gains from previous years in writing and level 1 math.

We need a larger N to have better data.