UCCGE Official Meeting Minutes
February 3, 2016, 2:30-3:45
Newman Library 207


Absent: John Brozovsky (submitted vote by proxy), Don Orth

Guests: Stephen Biscotte, Molly Hall

Call to Order: Ann-Marie Knoblauch at 2:30pm

- Motion to approve Implementation of Pathways General Education Curriculum, seconded
- Discussion
  1. From Michel Pleimling based on feedback from COS Curriculum Committee
    - Issued concern that collected assessment data could be used at some point for faculty evaluations as well as in P&T decisions for faculty or in retention and promotion decisions for instructors
    - Plan was sufficiently detailed and clear to vote ‘yes’
  
  2. From Jim Spotila based on feedback from Faculty Senate
    - Faculty Senate appreciates the additional detail provided in this version, enough to support a ‘yes’ vote based on the implementation of the educational goals that are spelled out in the Pathways curriculum. However, the following concerns were voiced:
      - Lack of specificity regarding resources necessary for effective implementation, regarding: faculty and staff time related to advising and curriculum planning, faculty time and coordination related to assessment (particularly over multiple sections and years), faculty and instructor training for assessment and new outcomes, faculty time spent revising courses and new reporting requirements, overall coordination of available courses in Pathways that will meet needs of individual majors, allocation and reallocation of fiscal resources necessary for increased staff time as well as GTA support necessary to implement active learning strategies.
      - A robust implementation plan should include impact statements from each department, so that departments can create work plans with specific statement of needs for resources across all levels, which can
then be assessed across all units to ensure needs are met and the Pathways implementation is successful.

- If adequate resources are not made available, implementation may rely on efforts of individual faculty who are already over committed, in which case major educational goals may be neglected and the Pathways revision to general education may be overall ineffective.

- The positive vote on the proposed plan is based on faith that these needs will be met by various initiatives in the near future, although the faith and confidence that Pathways will be successful are dwindling as a result of what is missing from the implementation plan.

3. From Aarnes Gudmestad representing CLAHS

- Feedback from CLAHS Curriculum Committee
  o Recognizes changes made since first draft but remain concerned with assessment section: a) what do we actually learn that makes it worth the effort, b) need clarity on approval of courses or minors that postpone integrative outcomes, c) how do we meet needs of faculty who were handed course right before teaching it, d) concern about faculty representation on various committees (certain colleges should have higher representation based on relative involvement in gen ed), e) how do faculty get ‘credit’ for this work, f) share concerns about assessment and how it could be used against faculty members
  o Recommended a ‘no’ vote

- Feedback from CLAHS Faculty Council:
  Recommend friendly amendment:
  *For courses with multiple sections per academic year, data on indicators will be collected from a single section for that year, and that section must be taught by a full time 9 or 12 month faculty member.*

  o For multi-section courses, it’s recommended that data should be selected from one section only
  o Concern about burden with data collection, particularly on GAs
  o Recommended ‘yes’ vote if this amendment is added

Discussion about amendment

- Michel Pleimling: Wouldn’t this impact data validity? = From Steve Culver in OAE... if every section is taught the exact same way (same teacher, same syllabus, same activities, same classroom, same everything) then yes, only one section needs to be pulled
- Michel Pleimling = what about working with a common program like in physics?
- Steve Culver = how about one year where everyone submits data but then after that can make the rational choice
- Marlene Preston: Is the intention here that GTA’s are intentionally excluded? In a course like Public Speaking, I would want all GTA’s included.
- Sheila Carter-Tod: With this amendment, any course with a GA wouldn’t be assessed so for courses like Engl 1105, as much as 95% of the sections would not be included in the assessment data
- Martha Glass: If we are doing course-embedded assessment, how is this going to be additionally burdensome?
  - Jill: the document only requires one lesson to capture the learning
  - Aarnes: Concern lies in the practicalities of data collection, like how people will receive the proper training (software, logistics of course-embedded assessment, etc.) to extract specific data from an assignment or series of assignments that pertain to a particular indicator
- Sheila Carter-Tod: Concern if amendment included: Pulling one section out might reflect on the whole group
- Steve Culver = FYI: we are avoiding any standardized assessment... we would use a common rubric/criterion but not any standardized assessment

4. From Donna Riley based on feedback from COE Curriculum Committee
   - This college supports it as written to support their data collection
   - Would not support it with this amendment
   - Would love to use the integrative outcomes (particularly ethics) to pull data from and need valid data to do this

- Motion to accept the amendment proposed by CLAHS Faculty Council was made by Aarnes Gudmestad, but was not seconded

- Vote on Implementation of Pathways General Education Curriculum document: motion carries by vote of 17 – 1

- Review of the Resolution to Adopt the Implementation of the Pathways General Education Curriculum document to go forward to CUSP

**Meeting Adjourned:** 3:20pm by Ann-Marie Knoblauch

*Minutes compiled by Stephen Biscotte*