**FHSU Liberal Education Committee**

**Minutes**

Meeting Called by

Shala Mills, Chair

Date: Tuesday 10/25/2016

Time: 3:00-4:00

Location: Rarick 312

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Bradley Will (AHSS)

Dmitry Gimon (BE)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

Kevin Splichal (Ed)

Teresa Woods (Ed)

Glen McNeil (HBS)

Tanya Smith (HBS)

William Weber (STM)

Tom Schafer (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

Megan Garcia (SGA)

Cody Scheck (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Kenton Russell (Provost)

Chapman Rackaway (Grad Sch)

3:07 Meeting began. All members present except for Scheck. Established that a quorum was met. Chair drew the committee’s attention to the bibliography of books and articles to be found on the committee’s BlackBoard site: go to “Supporting Documents,” then “Liberal Education Support Materials,” then “Gen Ed Library.” Especially recommended are (1) Paul Handstedt, *General Education Essentials: A Guide for College Faculty* (Jossey-Bass, 2012), and (2) Mary J. Allen, *Assessing General Education Programs* (Jossey-Bass, 2006).

3:14 Overview of Mary J. Allen, *Assessing General Education Programs* (46 minutes). Chair presented a PowerPoint-supplemented lecture on basic terms and distinctions used in the Allen book. These include three models for programs: the distribution model, the great books model, and the individual learner-centered model. Additional useful terminology: “alignment,” “authentic assessment,” “direct evidence,” “indirect evidence,” “embedded assessment,” “add-on assessment,” “summative evaluation,” “formative evaluation,” “absolute standards,” and “value added standards.” Allen notes the value of having relatively few learning outcomes. This makes the outcomes more memorable and assessment easier and more meaningful. Allen recommends that the curriculum be “cohesive.” Students shouldn’t get just one shot at acquiring important skills; things should be introduced early and developed over multiple semesters. Heronemus suggested that it might be valuable to keep e-portfolios of student work for assessment purposes. Chair suggested that it might be wise to conduct assessment on multiple level -- the course, the program, and the institution. [All the slides in the Chair’s presentation are available on the committee’s BlackBoard site; go to “Announcements,” and then “ppts for next week.”] Also, the Chair noted that she will lend any of the full text to committee members and/or look into acquiring additional copies if there is interest in doing so.

4:00 Remaining slides (1 minute). Chair briefly drew attention toward two very short sets of slides -- on “DQP Implications for Assessment” and “GEMs: General Education Maps and Markers.” [These are also available on the BlackBoard site, under “Announcements,” then “ppts for next week.”]

4:01 Focusing (4 minutes): Drabkin asked what is important in all this. Chair replied that thoughtful people have been doing research about as well as good work on general education assessment and curriculum development all across the country. The committee should become familiar not only with the literature around General Education and Assessment but also with models that have been deployed at other institutions. What can we learn about the successes and failures of those other efforts? She recommended some questions to think about as we go forward: What assessment are we already doing? What is already being done at the course level, at the program level, and at the institutional level that might inform how we develop learning outcomes? Which program models look best for us? And what direct measures should we consider implementing?

4:05 Meeting ended. The November 3 meeting is cancelled. In place of the meeting, the Chair urged committee members to read the extensive handouts that were distributed at last week’s meeting. The next scheduled meeting is for 3:00 PM on Tuesday, November 8.

**Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary**