

**GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES SUMMARY
Friday, November 9, 2001
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
101 Whitehurst Conference Room**

Present: J. Comer, J. Hattey, W. Ivy, N. Jones, T. Krehbiel, B. Masters, C. Moder, J. Nelson, R. Nolan, R. Rohrs, S. Thompson, J. Vitek, J. Wallin

Meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

**1. General Education Assessment Annual Report
Paul Bischoff and Julie Wallin**

Dr. Vitek introduced Nigel Jones, who substituted for Paul Bischoff in presenting an overview of the General Education Task Force 2000-2001 report. Paul Bischoff chaired the Task Force while members included John Gelder, Frances Griffin, Jeff Hattey, Nigel Jones, Brenda Masters, Julie Wallin (ex-officio), and one graduate assistant, Matthew Portillo.

The North Central Association (now the Higher Learning Commission) requires general education assessment, as well as the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The Higher Learning Commission has been clear in stating general education assessment will be evaluated during OSU's accreditation review in 2005. A series of priorities were established for 2001. The GE program description was rewritten for OSU to create assessable GE goals for the program as a whole and for individual general GE areas. After formal approval was obtained, the final document became official university policy in February 2001.

The Task Force determined that assessment of GE should be carried out through the use of institutional portfolios and that writing should be the first GE goal to be assessed. Writing artifacts were collected from courses across the University curriculum and from as many colleges as possible. No attempt was made in the first collection of student work to match collection to the general student demographic profile. The process remained invisible to students.

Specific procedures for evaluation of student artifacts for writing, oral and graphic communication were determined by establishing three subcommittees: (1) to create a rubric for the evaluation of student writing samples, (2) to begin creation of a demographic data base for interpretation of assessment results, and (3) to consider the feasibility of assessing oral presentations and graphic representations.

The committee determined to follow the Johnson County model, with modifications, to assess writing artifacts. This process proved that consistency was being maintained in the groups' evaluations and that the rubric and process yielded scores with minimal variation among reviewers. A final version was then developed which reflected the committee's actual system of evaluation.

The Task Force created an agenda and a series of recommendations for the 2001-2002 committee.

1. Membership on the Task Force should consist of six members serving staggered terms of three years. Two members should rotate off each year.
2. Committee should continue to assess written, oral, and graphic communication to produce a series of assessments over time.
3. Assessment of the use of scientific and mathematical tools to solve problems and interpret results will be undertaken by the Task Force.
4. The number of faculty involved should be increased according to expansion of all areas of general education. In addition to the six, twelve faculty members should be appointed to assess student work artifacts in the summer.
5. The Task Force will continue in partnership with the Assessment Office to modify and rationalize the assessment database.
6. The Task Force recommends that a regional conference for Big XII schools be held on the topic of general education assessment hosted by OSU at OSU-Tulsa.

For details of the General Education Task Force's findings, please refer to the tables and appendices referenced in the report.

R. Rohrs moved that the GE Task Force Annual Report be accepted. Motion was seconded by C. Moder and approved unanimously by the Council.

Dr. Vitek distributed a copy of the General Education Index noting that the Web version is not current, but in the process of being updated. Several items were mentioned – lower and upper division courses are no longer listed separately; a notation shown to the right of the course title indicates the effective date and/or the termination period for the designation; and a line drawn through the course indicates that either the course does not currently carry GE credit or the course has been dropped.

2. AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES AND NATURAL RESOURCES

RLEM 2913 - Ecology of Natural Resources – CAF – The request for “N” designation was **approved by the GEAC effective Fall 2002.**

3. ARTS AND SCIENCES

HIST 2333 - American Thought and Culture: Survey – CAF – The request for “H” designation was **approved by the GEAC effective Fall 2002**. It was suggested that the abbreviated title for this course be edited.

MATH 2163 - Calculus III – CAF - The request for “A” designation **denied by the GEAC** because of excessive prerequisites and the fact that the requirements for the “A” designation have already been met prior to taking this course.

SOC 3213 - American Society and Culture – CAF – The request for “S” designation **denied by the GEAC**. Council indicated the course content appeared to contain more history than sociology, and therefore, an “H” may be more appropriate. Council did not believe the answers for “Goals” were sufficient for an “S.” Members would consider an “H” designation if requested.

AMST 3950 - Special Topics in American Studies: American Popular Culture – The request for “H” designation was **approved by the GEAC effective Spring 2002 ONLY**.

4. BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

ACCT 4703 - International Accounting – The request for an “I” designation was **tabled by the GEAC**. Council believes the request did not adequately address the culture aspect necessary to carry credit for the international dimension. A statement from the School of Accounting proving the contemporary international cultures of the course could warrant a second review of the request.

5. ENGINEERING, ARCHITECTURE AND TECHNOLOGY

CHE 4090 - Special Problems – Intellectual Property Law – The Request for an “S” designation was **denied by the GEAC**. Council believes the course is too specialized and unrelated to society. Members were uncertain as to the prerequisites for the course. Council denied the request with one abstention.

6. Setup Review of “A,” “N,” and “L” Courses

Because a new set of Criteria and Goals are in place, and also because all courses are due for an evaluation review, plans were originally to begin an evaluation review of all “A,” “N,” and “L” designated courses. Because of the amount of planning and structuring involved in establishing the process electronically, the decision was made to begin with developing a test pilot review process involving the “A” designated courses only.

B. Masters, as a member of the General Education Task Force, drafted a “Proposal for a Database of General Education Courses.” Masters provided

copies of the proposal to Council Members explaining the GenEd database would collect, organize, store, and provide access to the information from a previously developed questionnaire. The pertinent data would be available to GEAC subcommittees, etc., to review whichever courses were being evaluated. Masters indicated costs associated with the proposal involve personnel – one or more individuals to develop the database and user interfaces. Server space would be needed to house the database, and personnel would be needed to generate periodic summary tables and other information.

7. Other Business

- A. Calculus Sequence and General Education Requirements – N. Jones reported that the Department of Mathematics has chosen to break down the sequence from 5 and 5 to 4, 3, and 3. Previously, the “A” designation (6 credits) could be met by successfully completing a five-hour calculus course. With the course now four credits, the question is—should the “A” designation be satisfied with four credits? Following a lengthy discussion, a vote was taken **not** to accept the four-credit Calculus I class as fulfilling the six-credit general education requirement. Five members voted to deny acceptance, and four opposed. It was later determined that a count of majors would be helpful because members believe there may be only a small number of students impacted by the change. Exceptions among colleges may be necessary or the policy reconsidered by various programs. The topic is considered tabled until the next meeting of the General Education Advisory Council. A review of exceptions will be made before informing everyone that the six-hour requirement cannot be met with a four-credit course.
- B. N. Jones informed members that the assessment of General Education is a critical factor relating to Engineering accreditation, in particular, ABET. The problem is in identifying qualifying Engineering courses for this purpose. Jones will distribute copies of the requirements of ABET for review by Council.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Copies to:	Dr. Marvin Keener	Dr. William Bryans
	Dr. Randall Dahl	Dr. Charles Edgley
	GEAC Members	Dr. Benny Evans
	Instruction Council Members	Dr. Russell Rhinehart
	Dr. Wes Holley	Dr. Shahrokh Saudagaran
	Ms. Joan Payne	Dr. James Steigler
	Ms. Linda Bentley	Ms. Missy Hitch
	Ms. Linda Sanders	
	Student Academic Services Directors	