**Monday, April 8, 2019, 2:30-4:00, HUB 119**

**Members Present:** Botao An, Joey Rino, Wendy Palmquist, Sarah Parrish (Minutes), Cathie LeBlanc (General Education Coordinator), Brandon Haas (Co-Chair, late)

**Members Absent:** Kate Elvey (Chair), John Lappie (New Faculty Observer; Teaching Conflict)

**Approval of Minutes:**

March 25, 2019 minutes approved as written.

**Preapprovals (Sunset Renewals and Initial Proposals):**

List:

* N/A

**New Business (Sunset Renewals and Initial Proposals):**

List:

* N/A

**Key points from Discussion about proposals reviewed at the meeting:**

* N/A

**Discussion Items:**

* Bylaws update- removing dept. membership restriction (Document in Moodle)
  + Botao raises pros and cons, says this model doesn’t represent all fields: but that isn’t guaranteed in the current model either. Changing this requirement to clusters or AUs isn’t accomplishing the same thing as the department would because these new bodies are interdisciplinary anyway.
  + Because curriculum committee reviewed the requirement, we’re trying to be parallel to them.
  + Faculty elections also provides checks and balances.
  + Vote: 5 approve, 2 absent.
  + Kate and Brandon will reach out to present the vote to full faculty meeting.
* AACU Report-Cathie (Report in Moodle)
  + Cathie and Brigid O’Donnell provided report and recommendations. Report also sent to Robin and Gail. Last time they went to the conference these were very actionable, but this year they are more guiding ideas. Discussion?
    - Botao: This document can help us explain rationale behind Gen Ed to students during advising.
    - Sometimes in our programs we point to the wrong learning objectives or professionalization goals, and the ones we overlook happen in Gen Ed.
  + Joey: This document can help guide us as a committee, especially on days like today when we have less formal business.
  + Cathie: Educating faculty about Gen Ed is top priority, but often gets put on the back burner because of everyday experiences. How can we spread the word?
    - Wendy: Money will draw people who are not the “regulars”
  + Challenge is that full-time faculty teach less Gen Ed. How to get TLs on board in spreading the mission of Gen Ed importance?
    - Joey: Let’s identify some obstacles:
      * Time developing the course.
      * Expectations for the load within the department/major.
* Cathie: We’re starting to conflate a couple issues. Cluster pedagogy learning community isn’t the same as Gen Ed…
* Problem: Thinking about whether there should be crossover between Gen Ed and intro to the major courses (ie allow students to take intro to the major courses as Gen Ed and vice-versa).
  + Joey: if we have an assessment that’s assessing these courses, they won’t do well if it’s too focused on major content.
  + Joey would want to see really specific parameters for a course: if we were too allow an intro to the major course, it needs to meet the goals of Gen Ed (project-based, habits of mind) people will have to demonstrate that courses will do all of these things.
* Joey: we may face a similar challenge with the INCAP
* Cathie hopes students who are required to take INCAP will put pressure on other programs to do the same.
* Joey: However we do this, the more we can get faculty teaching cluster pedagogy, the better it will be in the long run. Some of this will come down to resourcing.
* Cathie: We’re talking about things as problems without really knowing that they’re problems. Assessment will help us recognize what are real problems vs anecdotal problems.
* Cluster semester – may be difficult with business and other tight programs.
  + Some programs are bigger and more proscribed than they need to be…
* Cathie: What percentage of Gen Ed is taught by adjuncts?
* Botao: Can we observe TLs more often? A problem is getting chairs to value and recognize high-quality cluster pedagogy.
* Updated Forms review/discussion (Moodle)
  + Cathie saw more changes than she thought there might be. Changes to one form prompted changes to the other.
  + One recommendation of ACMU was to create a rubric (they changed to checklist)
    - * Cathie didn’t change anything, just put it in checklist form.
      * Joey: Lets add anchor examples, incorporate Habits of Mind. Forms first need to be approved, then we’ll add examples etc.
      * TABLED - Vote (all those in favor using forms as revised and checklists as added): 6 in favor, 1 absent (forms and checklist will go out on governance blog).
      * How to add examples? Annotate, or just cut and paste the line from the checklist.
      * Joey will go back and look for examples of annotated syllabi that were easy to approve and post them as high quality examples. This can be a bank we build: start with a few, then ask for permission to place more in the bank. May not be a perfect resource to begin with. (Some examples may belong to John Krueckeberg, Chris Chabot).
    - Habits of mind: Does every course need to cover ALL Habits of Mind? INCAP and Wicked Problem should, but is it okay to emphasize just one in a Connection or Direction?
      * Cathie: this will need to be an evolving answer.
      * Joey: they need to specify one or more. But Cathie says this implies all sections of the course will hit the same habit, but instructors may teach differently.
      * Joey: this is a place to start, then data can lead to better conversations.
      * Cathie: This is easy for new courses, but how do we handle sunsets?
        + We’ll assess the *syllabus* for Habits of Mind but not the *past* evaluations.
      * Is one enough right out the gate? How do we scale it up?
      * You might address things to different levels. Add language that clarifies that you may not hit all of them?
      * Cathie expects all classes will do all the signposts, even a 2000 vs 4000 level. The quality/progress of each signpost depends on the level of individual students.
        + Joey: Maybe make sure they’re hitting one really well, then people can build on that.
        + Us starting to do this means we should revisit course evaluations to address Habits of Mind. See what in evaluationss overlaps with checklist and what doesn’t. Should checklist and evaluation list match? We should make sure before we approve checklists (Cathie will do)
    - Changed discipline/cluster/council.
    - Added signature for whoever is in charge of discipline/cluster/council so that people can follow up (before there was just a vote recorded).
* Creation of Gen Ed Advisory Group (people external to PSU).
  + Brandon remembers Gail wanted us to approve mission statement (Dec. 10) but Academic Affairs was actually going to compose the committee.
* *Creation of Gen Ed Assessment Advisory Group (people internal to PSU)*
  + Joey will ask if people from task force(s) may be interested in continuing on.
    - Proposed Council composition: Gen Ed Coordinator, Member of Gen Ed Committee, Director of Academic Assessment and accreditation (may need to rephrase for Cheryl Baker’s retirement), 3-5 and additional people
      * We need someone in Cheryl’s role who can assist with both tech AND philosophical aspects of assessment.
    - Joey’s group recommended starting this summer, but who is able to plan it? That’s not what we get paid for/trained for. Joey thinks we have enough expertise to do a pilot this year, but we need to create the council and are running out of time.
    - Next steps: Draft a call for volunteers to show we’re doing our part, maybe even go forward with it, but Cathie will also confirm with Gail. Sarah and Brandon will draft. Or should we cherry pick? How many do we need? Joey says 5-10; smaller number means better stipend.
      * We also need FYS and INCAP data: About 70 INCAPs, 30 FYS. More we can look at, the better.
      * Brandon asks: are these materials actually going to help the group do what it needs to do? Some of the “really good” ones were because of writing rather than learning. Should we just look at the INCAP for norming because FYS was all over the place?
      * Maybe they could make recs on how to improve the docs.
      * Committee said reflective writing was most efficient way of demonstrating proficiency/habits of mind – the very thing that is most accessible to a group of assessors has flaws (eg conflating writing skills with learning).
      * Rather have more data that isn’t useful just so we can say “this is not useful *because…*” (this is the approach we decided upon)
    - This is separate from the advisory council, which Brandon and Sarah will also draft.
  + Norming experiences will be hard to start from scratch, a bit boring.
  + Compensation? Some universities offered stipends, dinner.
  + We don’t have time to plan a “day” even if other pieces were in place
  + Joey: Volunteers to map out how he would do the pilot.
* Meeting May 6. Let’s invite newly elected member Emma Wright to both, since she may not be able to attend one.
* Assessment Day Planning (Outcomes Assessment Taskforce report in Moodle)
  + Discussion TABLED.

Adjourned 4:12pm.

**Next meeting:**

* April 22, 2018, 2:30pm
* Vote on updated forms; if approved, should go in report to faculty and added to the governance blog.
* Approve calls for assessors and advisory council