

General Education Council
Minutes
11.23.09

Council Present:

R. Shanmugan-Health Professions
L. Lockhart-Health Professions
C. Hazlewood-Science
T. Hindson-Liberal Arts
E. Blunk-Applied Arts
R. Cook-McCoy Business Administration
C. McCall-Education
J. Walker-Education
B. Erhart-Liberal Arts
V. Luizzi-Chair Representative
K. Peirce-Fine Arts and Communication
G. Passty-Science
M. Keeffe-McCoy Business Administration
M. Houser-Fine Arts and Communication

Council Absent:

W. Stone-Applied Arts
J. Collard-Student Representative
D. Burrow-Student Representative

Meeting convened at 3:33 p.m.

Introduction of L. Lockhart and M. Houser

Motion:

R. Brown asks for a motion to approve the minutes from October 12th. R. Cook so moves. C. Hazlewood seconds the motion. The October 12th minutes are approved as prepared.

Report of the Natural Science Syllabus Review

Subcommittee Members: C. Hazlewood and B. Stone

Reviewed all syllabi in all sections of the Natural Science Component.

- a. General compliance
- b. Non-Compliance
 - a. Most did not have 7 Principles for Good Practices
 - b. Some did not have the link to the Honor Code
 - c. Listing of Lab Assistants or is that on TRACS?

Note: For agenda item at next meeting: Review and Re-evaluate the GE Checklist

Report of the Natural Science Subcommittee to the General Education Council

General Education Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Subcommittee Members: Michael Keeffe, Greg Passty

Anthropology (course: Physical Anthropology)

- a. Methods measure Outcomes 1 and 2. A percent scale is converted to exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, and failing to meet expectations.
- b. No changes are needed. (Changes previously suggested by the auditor have been made.) We are satisfied to recommend “compliance” rather than the auditor’s “partial compliance.”
- c. Measurements for both Outcomes use both embedded exam questions and laboratory exercises.
- d. Compared to previous years, standards in outcomes have been made more realistic, for example no longer requiring “100% of students...”.
- e. No comments.

Biology

- a. Method 1 is used to measure Outcome component 1, and Method 2 is used to measure Outcome component 2. The word “understanding” is appropriate for the outcomes, but is inconsistent with the statement of the Mission.
- b. In both Outcomes, the number of questions used to measure student learning is not specified.
- c. Measurements for both Outcomes are made through embedded exam questions. Are there any alternative methods (such as homework, labs, or others) that can be used to measure student learning?
- d. The development of the assessment process is appropriate.
- e. No comments.

Chemistry & Biochemistry

- a. Method 1 and Method 2 in each outcome rely only on exams (final exam for Method 1, sequential exams for Method 2).
- b. Outcome Number 1 must be changed. Remove the first sentence regarding the role of chemistry, and change the second to “After completion of Chemistry 1310, students will demonstrate a knowledge of basic chemical concepts such as stoichiometry, states of matter, atomic structure, bonding, and equilibria.”
- c. Measurements for both Outcomes are made through embedded exam questions. Are there any alternative methods (such as homework, labs, or others) that can be used to measure student learning? Even on the exams, the number of embedded exam questions has not been specified. We agree with the auditor’s comment on lowering the standards this year, and also on variation of standards among 50%, 55%, and 60%.
- d. It seems as if there is only one faculty member teaching each of the courses being assessed, so that assessment results resemble an evaluation of faculty teaching. If there is more than one instructor, even over time, pooling results will better measure overall learning.

- e. No comments.

Physics

- a. Methods measure Outcomes 1 and 2.
- b. In both Methods under Outcome 1, the phrase “proficiency with” might be changed to “understanding and use of.”
- c. Both Methods under both Outcomes do not specify the number of questions on exams or the number of homework assignments. We recommend changing the auditor’s “Partial Compliance” regarding the difference between 70% for exams and 75% for homework to “Compliance”—the different nature of homework assignments may justify different standards.
- d. The development of the assessment process is appropriate.
- e. No comments.

Geology

- a. The auditor’s comment that this assessment plan resembles that for Geography (under the social sciences) has merit, although from the point of view of improved departmental efficiency, it is not clear that this is a fault.
- b. For each Outcome, Method 1 assesses students’ knowledge while Method 2 assesses students’ ability. No change is needed.
- c. No comments.
- d. The development of the assessment process is appropriate.
- e. No comments.

Motion: Recommendation to approve the Learning Outcomes for Natural Science with the minor wording changes mentioned for Physics. **Physics**

- a. Methods measure Outcomes 1 and 2.
- b. In both Methods under Outcome 1, the phrase “proficiency with” might be changed to “understanding and use of.”

Motion passed unanimously.

Report of the Communication Subcommittee Review to the General Education Council

General Education Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
Subcommittee Members: Beth Erhart and Marian Houser

4a. Description of the effectiveness of the assessment process
English Communication GE: The 2009-10 mission statement, learning outcomes and methods are clearly written. The methods clearly test the outcomes.

Communication Studies GE: The 2009-10 mission statement, learning outcomes and methods are clearly written. The methods clearly test the outcomes.

4b. Things that must be changed

English Communication GE: We see nothing that needs to be changed. Contrary to Associate Dean Nelson's concern regarding the need for a rubric, we find the methods to be easily applied and compiled. For example, a thesis statement is either included or it is not (Outcome 1, Method 1), or standard procedures for in-text citations are done correctly or incorrectly (Outcome 2, Method 1).

Communication Studies GE: We see nothing that needs to be changed.

4c. Guidance for planning for 2010-11. English Communication GE: We feel there is no need for guidance. Communication Studies GE: We feel there is no need for guidance.

4d. Development of the assessment process. English Communication GE: The 2009-10 learning outcomes and methods are the same as those from 2008-09; therefore, results from these years will be comparable. This also means that the action plans of 2008-09 (i.e., instructional development) can be evaluated and refined with the 2009-10 data.

Communication Studies GE: The 2009-10 learning outcomes and methods are the same as those from 2008-09; therefore, results from these years will be comparable.

4e. Consistency across components. Although the learning outcomes found in the mission for communication are not consistent between English Communication GE and Communication Studies GE, they are clearly assessed between the two courses. The learning outcomes for English Communication GE assess the reading and writing portion of the mission for communication, while Communication Studies GE focuses on the speaking and listening portion of the mission. Communication Studies Method 2 for both Outcome 1 and 2 also includes a writing portion with outline assessment including source support and bibliography.

Communication looks good.

Motion: Recommendation for R. Brown, Dean, to endorse the Communication Components Learning Outcomes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Report of the Mathematics Subcommittee Review to the General Education Council

General Education Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Subcommittee Members: Elizabeth Blunk and James R. (Randy) Cook

a. Effectiveness of the Assessment Process:

- In regards to the overall effectiveness of the assessment process, the outcomes were clearly stated and the methods identified.
- The 07-08 outcomes and methods were changed to be more detailed and specific for 08-09, and remained the same for 09-10.

- Why were the outcomes created so that Outcome 1 is specific to Math 1315 and Math 1319, and Outcome 2 to Math 1316? Therefore, no common mathematical outcomes are being identified for all students. However, it is recognized that the mathematical skills and knowledge for Math 1315/1319 are much more demanding than for Math 1316. Can any common ground be found?
 - The audit for the 08-09 outcomes reflected a concern with the term “**understand**,” and it was suggested that a term more measurable be used. It is recommended that *Bloom’s Taxonomy* be utilized in order to come up with more descriptive and specific action verbs, e.g. “**solve** problems pertaining to: linear, exponential, and logarithmic functions, and systems of equations.”
 - The 08-09 report also questioned whether multiple-choice questions accurately demonstrate understanding of mathematical concepts/principles, or the ability to solve problems. This has not been changed in the outcome for 09-10. It is possible that in a problem-oriented course, the use of multiple-choice questions, is a quick way to accomplish assessment, but for a student to fully demonstrate their proficiency, actually working problems might be a more effective technique?
 - Other concerns from the 08-09 audit, were in regards to results and action plans. Thus, these are not available for the 09-10 assessment cycle.
 - The 08-09 audit questioned using the same two methods for each outcome, but this seems to make the methods consistent. The non-compliance in regards to whether there are questions for each topic does not seem valid as the methods were clearly created to reflect the proposed outcome items. The reason for no changes in the outcomes and methods may be to comply with the university request that these not be changed, so that comparisons can be made for evidence of improvement.
 - It is recommended that formal rubrics be developed for each course, utilizing the assessment levels of EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS, MEETS EXPECTATIONS, and DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS, which are being used university-wide. Breaking the assessment out using these three levels will make departmental analysis more precise, and help determine the actions that need to be taken for improvement of student learning.
- b. Information that must be changed (errors, misspellings, and logical inconsistencies):
- Outcomes, methods, results, action plans, and evidence of improvement are brief, but complete, and free from errors.
- c. Guidance for Departmental Assessment Planning and Reporting for 2010-2011:
- Suggestions from the 08-09 audit for the results section were non-compliance in regards to “**reflection upon and discussion of the findings.**” This should be addressed in the 09-10 report.

- The 08-09 audit also noted a partial compliance for the action plan as it was “too general” in stating that the students should complete the homework assignment, and this might have an impact on the achievement of the outcomes. This should be addressed in the 09-10 report.
- d. Comments Pertaining to the Development of the Assessment Process:
- The mathematics general education outcomes were developed as the university requested in relation to a specific outcome, with methods and results being measurable and clearly stated.
 - The action plan is based on findings from the assessment results in order to improve student learning. Evidence of improvement can be addressed in the 09-10 cycle, in that the same outcomes are being assessed as in the previous cycle.

Some questions on terminology

Motion: Recommendation for approval of Mathematics Learning Outcomes as long as Mathematics takes into consideration Dave Nelsons audit comments and they make those revisions.

Motion passed unanimously.

Report of the Humanities and Visual and Performing Arts Subcommittee Review to the General Education Council

General Education Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
Subcommittee Members: Kate Peirce and Ram Shanmugan

Music

Outcome one incorporates a lot. Outcome two is a little vague. What is a critical understanding? And how does one measure it?

Outcome one, method one: what kinds of questions?

Methods: how many students will be able to answer 75% of the questions?

Results: should be by department and not aggregated over all departments

Not sure if it is really all right to have an outcome with two parts and methods that cover one part of the outcome each.

Under both results: discipline needs an S (one or more disciplines)

Agree with Dave Nelson about: 1) how understanding is being measured. What is the difference between understanding and knowledge? 2) Outcomes aren't really being measured in two different ways and 3) results should be specific to each discipline and 4) action plan for outcome 1 needs more specifics

Dance

Outcomes are almost identical to music's, which is good, but they have the same problems. Also, they need to start with “students will be able to” or something similar.

Results are for specific to the dance section but do not identify which areas the students had trouble with. Music does identify theatre as the problem area and targets its action plan to that. Other departments should do the same.

See music for other comments.

Art

Outcomes are almost identical to music's, which is good, but they have the same problems. Also, they need to start with "students will be able to" or something similar.

Results are specific to the art courses.

See music for other comments.

Outcome 1, method 1, result 1: 294 undergraduateS. Also, they didn't respond to a questionnaire; they took an exam.

Action plan outcome 1: students exceeded expectations so why modify the course to improve students' knowledge?

Action plan outcome 2: students exceeded expectations under method one but didn't under method 2. Action plan should focus on the part that needs improving and be specific about what will be done.

Theatre

Does a good job of describing results.

Relates action plan to results.

Outcomes are not written as outcomes.

See music for other comments.

Philosophy

Outcome one, result one: entrance and exit surveys are not pre- and post-tests. Also portfolios are mentioned here; where did they come from?

Under results, you really don't need speculate on the whys and wherefores or include the action plan.

Outcome one, method two: does not address improvement, which is specifically mentioned in the outcome.

Result 2 mentions Philosophy 1320 but the outcome and method do not.

English

Outcome 1, method 1: where did the target come from?

Two outcomes in one, with method one measuring half the outcome and method two measuring the other half. Don't know if this works for SACS.

Question for all concerned

Should the expected result be uniformly the same percentage like 75% or 80% across and within disciplines?

Outcomes not Good—vague

1. Different methods/outcomes in one
 - a. Knowledge and understanding principles
 - b. Knowledge and understanding history
2. How many students answer?
3. Action Plans for student exceeding
4. Eng—2 outcomes in one

Motion: Recommendation to meet with the departments and recommend the modification. We recommend that these are not approved at this time. We do not accept the Arts as written and will meet and recommend modification.

For: 13 Abstained: 1
Motion Passed.

Report of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Review to the General Education Council

General Education Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Subcommittee Members: Sue Beebe and Carolyn McCall

Anthropology

a. Effectiveness of assessment process:

b. Information that must be changed:

c. Guidance for 2010-11 planning and reporting:

- Edit for clarity Outcome 1, Method 2; and Outcome 2, Method 2. In first sentence of each method, move the phrase “on 10 embedded final exam questions” to follow the verb “demonstrate.” For example, Outcome 1, Method 2 will now read, “Students will demonstrate on 10 embedded final exam questions their understanding. . . .”
- Similarly, edit Outcome 1, Method 1, by moving the phrase “on a 10-question, end of the semester quiz” to follow the verb “provide.” Outcome 1, Method 1 will now read, “Students will describe and provide on a 10-question, end of the semester quiz, examples of the four subfields. . . .”
- We agree with Dean Nelson that Outcome 1 is really two outcomes.
- For Outcome 1, Method 1; and Outcome 2, Method 1, the need to distinguish between “exceeds” and “meets” expectations is unclear. Only a single performance target is specified.
- Outcome 2, Method 1 should specify that the professors evaluating the writing assignment will use a rubric to determine “complete” and “adequate” student performance.
- Consider implementing a pretest for Outcome 1, Method 2; and Outcome 2, Method 2, to ensure that “embedded final exam questions” are measuring learning, not prior knowledge.

d. Development of the assessment process:

Finance and Economics

a. Effectiveness of assessment process:

b. Information that *must* be changed:

- On 2009-10 outcomes statement, Outcome 1 is not listed. The first item in the Outcome 1 box is labeled Outcome 1, but is really Method 1.

c. Guidance for 2010-11 planning and reporting:

- For Outcome 1, Method 1; and Outcome 2, Method 1, how many exam questions will be embedded?
- For both outcomes and all methods, the need to distinguish between “meets” and “exceeds” expectations is unclear. Only a single performance target is specified.
- Consider implementing a pretest for Outcome 1, Method 1; and Outcome 2, Method 1, to ensure that “embedded common final exam questions” are measuring learning, not prior knowledge.

d. Development of the assessment process:

Geography

a. Effectiveness of assessment process:

b. Information that *must* be changed:

c. Guidance for 2010-11 planning and reporting:

- For both outcomes and all methods, the need to distinguish between “meeting” and “exceeding” expectations is unclear. Only a single performance target is specified.
- Consider implementing a pretest for both outcomes and all methods, to ensure that “embedded test questions” are measuring learning, not prior knowledge.

d. Development of the assessment process:

History

a. Effectiveness of assessment process:

b. Information that *must* be changed:

c. Guidance for 2010-11 planning and reporting:

- The two outcomes are not clearly distinctive. To “describe a series of causal events leading to a major event in American history” (Outcome 1) appears to be one way in which students might “interpret historical evidence” (Outcome 2).
- Outcome 1, Methods 1 and 2 should specify that the instructors will use a rubric to determine whether students are “exceeding” or “meeting” expectations in their responses to embedded essay questions.
- Consider implementing a pretest for Outcome 1, Methods 1 and 2, to ensure that “embedded objective or essay” questions are measuring learning, not prior knowledge.
- Outcome 2, Method 2 describes two distinctive methods (“examination” and “specific class assignments”), rather than a single method.

d. Development of the assessment process:

Political Science

a. Effectiveness of assessment process:

b. Information that *must* be changed:

c. Guidance for 2010-11 planning and reporting:

- In both outcomes, specify (perhaps through the insertion of a “such as” statement) what might constitute “substantive knowledge.”
- In both outcomes, be more specific in defining the term “structure and functions.”
- For both outcomes and all methods, reconsider whether results from “two questions” in “twenty-five percent of the class sections” will yield sufficient data.
- Consider implementing a pretest for both outcomes and all methods, to ensure that the questions “embedded in the final examinations” are measuring learning, not prior knowledge.

d. Development of the assessment process:

- In the 2008-09 report, for both Outcome 1, Method 1; and Outcome 2, Method 1, there was a marked difference between the performance results of students in large lecture sections of POSI 2310 and the performance results of students in small POSI 2310 classes. In both cases, students in large lecture sections outperformed students in smaller classes. Investigate whether the differences could have been due to instructors in the large lecture sections being on the “faculty committee” that selected the assessment questions.

Psychology

a. Effectiveness of assessment process:

b. Information that *must* be changed:

c. Guidance for 2010-11 planning and reporting:

- Include in the 2009-10 report the results of only the two outcomes required and measured. Including the additional three outcomes not measured this year clutters the report.
- We agree with Dean Nelson’s comment that “Neither Outcome . . . specify what the ‘basic methods and research techniques’ or ‘different approaches and schools or thought’ or ‘different methodologies’ are.” We agree, too, with his recommendation to “See other social sciences which list generic followed by parenthetical list of alternatives.”
- For both outcomes and all methods, the need to distinguish between “meets” and “exceeds” expectations is unclear. Only a single performance target is specified.
- The rubric described in Outcome 2, Method 2, and Outcome 5, Method 2, is not in itself a rubric, just a rating scale. Edit the clause in which the rubric is described to read something like “using a rubric to determine whether students’ knowledge ‘exceeds,’ ‘meets’ or ‘does not meet’ expectations.”
- For Outcome 2, Method 1, and Outcome 5, Method 1, how many “objectively scored items” will be embedded in the final?
- Consider implementing a pretest for both outcomes and all methods, to ensure that both the objective items “embedded in

the final” and the essay question assigned “as part of the final” are measuring learning, not prior knowledge.

d. Development of the assessment process:

Sociology

a. Effectiveness of assessment process:

- Providing examples of “major sociological concepts” and “secondary sociological concepts” clarifies Outcome 1.

b. Information that *must* be changed:

c. Guidance for 2010-11 planning and reporting:

- For Outcome 2, Method 2, define “significantly higher.”
- For Outcome 1, both methods, consider implementing a pretest to ensure that the “common multiple-choice test items, embedded in all final exams” are measuring learning, not prior knowledge.

d. Development of the assessment process:

Recommendation for consistency across components:

- Course titles and numbers are used inconsistently. For example, Anthropology uses course title (Cultural Anthropology); Finance and Economics uses course numbers (ECO 2301 and ECO 2314); and Geography uses both course title and number (World Regional Geography [GEO 1310]). Standardize across GE reports.

Motion: Recommendation for approval with the consistency across Social and Behavioral Sciences Components and must change Finance and Economics item, On 2009-10 outcomes statement, Outcome 1 is not listed. The first item in the Outcome 1 box is labeled Outcome 1, but is really Method 1.

Motion passed unanimously.

Report of the Institutional Options Subcommittee Review to the General Education Council

General Education Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Subcommittee Members: Vince Luizzi and John Walker

Health and Wellness (PE)

- A. The change in the specific mission of the Health & Wellness component appears to be effective. The 08-09 version only mentioned the development of “an appreciation of personal fitness and wellness,” which has been changed to “develop skills in lifetime physical activities and an appreciation of personal fitness and wellness” in the 09-10 version. The development of skills seems to be appropriate for this component, especially since Outcome #1 includes the requirement to “identify and demonstrate key skills.”

There has also been a change in Outcome #1 that appears to be effective. The 08-09 version mentioned a demonstration of key skills “sufficient for recreational play in a sport/activity,” which has been changed to “sufficient for lifetime participation” in the 09-10 version. This appears to be appropriate since the specific mission for the Health & Wellness component has been changed to include “develop skills in lifetime physical activities.” Recreational play was not included in either version of the SLO assessment.

The new 09-10 Method 1 for Outcome #1 appears more generalizable to all PFW courses rather than the 08-09 Method 1, which required skills tests in PFW 1155A only. The level of proficiency required on these skills tests is stated to be a “beginning level of proficiency (average),” which seems unclear. If the test scales have already been created, there should be a particular level that represents a beginning level of proficiency. Also the use of an “average” seems unclear: whether this means an average of all skills tests for each student, or if the average of all students is used to determine the achievement of this outcome.

Outcome 2 has been completely rewritten, and this seems to be effective, since the specific mission of the Health & Wellness component includes “an appreciation of personal fitness and wellness.” However, Outcome #2 includes “an appreciation for lifetime physical activity, personal fitness, and wellness.” It would seem appropriate for the specific mission statement of the Health & Wellness component to also include the “lifetime physical activity” wording in it, to be consistent with Outcome #2.

Both of the Methods for Outcome #2 relate to the affective domain and the appreciation of physical activity, fitness, and wellness, which is effective. Both methods appear to assess students’ satisfaction with the course, as well as future physical activity. While this is useful information, it is not necessarily consistent with the statement in Outcome #2 “appreciation for lifetime physical activity, personal fitness, and wellness.” The rating of essays by instructors described in Method 2 Outcome #2 appears to be very subjective.

B. Changes to consider are:

1. Include an appreciation of “lifetime physical activity” in the specific mission for the Health & Wellness component in order to be consistent with the wording in Outcome #2.
2. Clarify the level of proficiency required for success for Method 1, Outcome #1.
3. Clarify the nature of the assessments for Methods 1 and 2, Outcome #2. Are these assessments designed to determine the students’ “perception of the course and inclination to future physical activity” as stated in each method, or to determine the students’ “appreciation for lifetime physical activity, personal fitness, and wellness” as stated in Outcome #2?
4. In both Methods 1 and 2 for Outcome #2, the word “of” appears to have been omitted after the words “random sample.”

5. In each of the methods for both Outcomes #1 and #2, a “stratified” random sample of students will be drawn for conducting the assessment. It is unclear as to how the samples will be stratified: according to course, age, classification, gender, skill level, ethnic status, etc. Clarification is needed.
- C. Guidance for assessment planning and reporting: Method 2 for Outcome #2 appears to be rather subjective. If the instructors themselves assess each student’s essay to determine a positive perception, a rubric should probably need to be created for this purpose. Even so, it appears this method is measuring the same construct as Method 1: a positive perception “of the course and inclination to future physical activity.” That seems to be determined objectively in Method 1 sufficiently enough without the requirement of an essay. Essay answers might be open for any number of interpretations.
 - D. Development of the assessment process appears to be progressing. The changes made in the assessments for the Health & Wellness component from 08-09 to 09-10 appear to be appropriate and effective for supporting the mission of the General Education Student Learning Outcomes.
 - E. Consistency across components may not be applicable in this case. The specific missions and outcomes for Health & Wellness and University Seminar appear to be sufficiently independent as to justify some inconsistency.

University Seminar

- A. The change in Outcome #1 seems effective. The 08-09 version mentioned that students will be able to “articulate the value of the Common Experience theme,” which has been changed to “articulate concepts learned from the summer reading book related to the Common Experience theme” in the 09-10 version. This appears to be appropriate since articulating the value of the theme does not necessarily imply that they have read the book or learned any concepts.

It is unclear as to the relationship between the Common experience theme and the specific mission for the University Seminar. It can probably be argued that the Common Experience theme helps in the “indirect academic transition into Texas State, but this is not stated in Outcome #1.

Method 1 Outcome #1 has been changed from 50% of students discussing the Common Experience theme with other students outside of class, to 50% of students reading the Summer Reading book. This change may more accurately reflect the likelihood that students understand the concepts from the Common Experience theme, but neither are measuring articulation required in Outcome #1.

Method 1 Outcome #1 does not seem to be effective in measuring success on that outcome. From reading the Common Experience Summer Reading book, students are likely to be able to articulate the concepts learned, but this method does not measure any articulation.

Method 2 Outcome #1 appears to be effective because it does require some articulation; however, there is no mention of the number or percent of students completing this assignment that designates the level to which this outcome is successfully achieved.

Outcome #2 has been changed from “use Texas State resources to assist in completing academic assignments,” in the 08-09 version, to “utilize Texas State resources and apply the concepts taught in the course, as they navigate challenges in higher education” in the 09-10 version. This change appears to make the outcome more vague. If “navigating challenges in higher education” is similar to “direct and indirect academic transition into Texas State,” then this needs to be made clearer.

Method 1 Outcome #2 appears to more effectively reflect the specific mission for the University Seminar than the way Outcome #2 is stated. “Helping to make adjustments to the challenges of life and learning at Texas State and beyond” seems to be closer to “direct and indirect academic transition into Texas State.”

Method 2 Outcome #2 has not been revised from 08-09, and requires students to identify skills and concepts that they perceive to be beneficial; however, it is also worded differently than the specific mission for the University Seminar. “Helping to navigate academic and career learning experiences,” is a worthy goal, but not entirely consistent with “direct and indirect academic transition into Texas State.”

B. Changes to consider are:

1. Outcome #1 requires articulation and Method 1 only requires reading. If Outcome #1 was revised to include reading comprehension of the summer reading, book, then Method 1 might be revised to actually measure reading comprehension.
2. Method 2 should include the percent of students that would be required to successfully complete this assignment in order determine improvement.
3. The wording of Outcome #2 might be revised to be more consistent with the specific mission of the University Seminar and reduce ambiguity.
4. Method 1 should be consistent with the wording in Outcome #2, whether it is “helping in academic transition,” (specific mission of the University Seminar), or “navigate challenges in higher education,” (current wording of Outcome #2). This method is a measure of whether the students perceive the US 1100 course to be helpful.
5. Method 2 requires students to identify the specific learning experiences in US 1100 that they may have felt were helpful, and should also be consistent with the wording in Outcome #2, whether it is “helping in academic transition,” (specific mission of the University Seminar), or “navigate challenges in higher education,” (current wording of Outcome #2).

- C. Guidance for assessment planning and reporting: Include the Common Experience theme in the specific mission for the University Seminar. It should be made clear that the Common Experience theme is an important component in US 1100. One of the current outcomes deals entirely with students' learning experience from the Summer Reading book, but as currently written, it is unclear that the Common Experience is a key component of University Seminar.
- D. Development of the assessment process appears to be progressing. The changes made in the assessments for the University Seminar component from 08-09 to 09-10 appear to be appropriate for supporting the mission of the General Education Student Learning Outcomes, but are vague relative to the specific mission of the University Seminar.
- E. Consistency across components may not be applicable in this case. The specific missions and outcomes for University Seminar and Health & Wellness appear to be sufficiently independent as to justify some inconsistency.

Motion: Recommendation for approval of the Institutional Option with the following recommendations for the department to consider:

For Health and Wellness:

1. Include an appreciation of "lifetime physical activity" in the specific mission for the Health & Wellness component in order to be consistent with the wording in Outcome #2.
2. Clarify the level of proficiency required for success for Method 1, Outcome #1.
3. Clarify the nature of the assessments for Methods 1 and 2, Outcome #2. Are these assessments designed to determine the students' "perception of the course and inclination to future physical activity" as stated in each method, or to determine the students' "appreciation for lifetime physical activity, personal fitness, and wellness" as stated in Outcome #2?
4. In both Methods 1 and 2 for Outcome #2, the word "of" appears to have been omitted after the words "random sample."
5. In each of the methods for both Outcomes #1 and #2, a "stratified" random sample of students will be drawn for conducting the assessment. It is unclear as to how the samples will be stratified: according to course, age, classification, gender, skill level, ethnic status, etc. Clarification is needed.

For University Seminar:

1. Outcome #1 requires articulation and Method 1 only requires reading. If Outcome #1 was revised to include reading comprehension of the summer reading, book, then Method 1 might be revised to actually measure reading comprehension.
2. Method 2 should include the percent of students that would be required to successfully complete this assignment in order determine improvement.
3. The wording of Outcome #2 might be revised to be more consistent with the specific mission of the University Seminar and reduce ambiguity.
4. Method 1 should be consistent with the wording in Outcome #2, whether it is "helping in academic transition," (specific mission of the University

Seminar), or “navigate challenges in higher education,” (current wording of Outcome #2). This method is a measure of whether the students perceive the US 1100 course to be helpful.

5. Method 2 requires students to identify the specific learning experiences in US 1100 that they may have felt were helpful, and should also be consistent with the wording in Outcome #2, whether it is “helping in academic transition,” (specific mission of the University Seminar), or “navigate challenges in higher education,” (current wording of Outcome #2).

Motion passed unanimously.

General Education Competencies

- Types of Rubrics
- Guidance from departments
- Departments reinforce
- Some method of access at department level

GE –Introduction, Reinforce and Master

- Hope reinforce throughout and in some specific courses
- Demonstrate Competencies

General Education Competencies Texas State University – San Marcos

1. Texas State’s General Education adopted the following competencies based upon the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board’s list of exemplary objectives and distinctive Texas State expectations for students completing our general education core curriculum: reading, writing, oral communication, ethics, critical thinking, mathematics and computer/information literacy. These competencies are often introduced, always reinforced, and mastered in the general education requirements. SACS, however, expects that Texas State graduates will demonstrate the competencies at graduation, which means that academic departments reinforce, as appropriate to each discipline, these competencies in subsequent courses. Each undergraduate major reported courses in which these competencies were reinforced. Drawing upon expectations for the competencies in general education, the General Education Council reports the definitions of the General Education Competencies refined in 2008 and provides the following suggestions for possible rubric items based upon the competencies developed in the general education courses.

2. Definitions of the General Education Competencies:

Reading:

Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend, analyze, and synthesize a variety of texts and genres.

Writing

Students will demonstrate the ability to draft, revise and edit focused, organized, and appropriately developed documents for specified purposes and audiences.

Oral Communication

Students will demonstrate the ability to clearly communicate information orally while using communication techniques and strategies that are appropriate for their audience.

Mathematics

Students will demonstrate the ability to express mathematical relationships in numeric, graphical, and symbolic form and collect, analyze, and interpret data effectively in a variety of settings.

Computer/Information Technology

Students will demonstrate the ability to create, manipulate, and disseminate documents, spreadsheets, databases and presentations containing multi-media contents appropriate to their fields of study.

Critical Thinking

Students will demonstrate the ability to identify and apply the principles of good argumentation that govern the evaluation of evidence and reasons that support a conclusion.

Ethics

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply ethical frameworks to various ethical dilemmas/situations that are appropriate to their respective fields of study.

3. Competency skills evaluated in a rubric appropriate for use with graduates in your discipline:

- a. Reading: Products identify: key question, author's main purpose, key concepts in reading, implications/consequences, main conclusion, possible inferences, distinction between facts & opinions, and summary of point of view;
- b. Written communications: Products define the idea or problem, collect & analyzes information, uses appropriate sources, citation & documentation, content, structure, and mechanics;
- c. Oral communication: Products develop appropriate topic & focus, communicate thesis/purpose, use supporting documentation, introduction & conclusion, language usage, vocal variety, articulation/pronunciation/grammar, mechanics of presentation--posture/gestures/body movement/eye contact/attire;
- d. Mathematics: Products express mathematical relationships in numeric, graphic & symbolic form, collect data, analyze data, interpret data.

e. Computer literacy/information technology: Products create college-level research project using appropriate software (word processing, spreadsheet, graphics, data base), discusses, presents and preserves research findings using variety of media & presentation software, publish the final product of a research project on the internet or appropriate medium with appropriate software, multimedia, presentation software;

f. Critical thinking: Products analyze questions, assess bias, critique content, examine inconsistencies, evaluate values information, examine conclusions, demonstrate judgment, discriminate rationally, synthesize data, view information critically, argue succinctly, discuss issues, demonstrates intellectual honesty, justify decisions, assimilates information; and

g. Ethics: Products creates a scenario based upon a set of ethical principles, demonstrates use of an ethical framework, creates a scenario that demonstrates application of ethical theories; correctly applies ethical constructs; may offer more than one alternative resolution; cites analogous cases with appropriate rationale; thorough evaluation of competence and responsibility of key actors; considers elements of risk for each alternative.

4. The following rubrics for reading and oral communication are attached as possible models for rubrics. These are simply examples for your review as you develop your own rubrics.

With the Council approval R. Brown will share with the academic chairs.

Ask chairs to review courses identified for compliance and how they plan to obtain compliance by end of the year.

Issues for Spring:

1. SACS Visit
2. QEP-PACE
3. Syllabi Checklist

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.