<div align="center">

Council on General Education Minutes
October 3, 2023
10-11:00 a.m., STV 140

</div>

Presiding: Gregory Ferrence

Present: Brian Aitken, Gregory Braswell, Linda Clemmons, Gregory Ferrence, Amy Hurd, Katie Krcmarik, Joshua Newport, Brian Rejack, Rocio Rivadeneyra, Chris Worland, and Haiyan Xie

Guests:
Dr. Peter Kaufman, Professor, Department of Marketing

Ferrence called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

Action Items:

1. Introductions
Introductions were made. The Council welcomed new members, Krcmarik and Rejack.

2. IDS 310 Innovation Consulting Community (new IDS course)
The course was proposed by Dr. Peter Kaufman, Professor, Department of Marketing.

Ferrence reminded Council members of the previous meetings' discussions regarding the course. During the first discussion, Council members noted a syllabus had not been submitted as part of the proposal. Kaufman revised the proposal to include the syllabus. During the second discussion, Council members believe the framework of the course looked good but had questions regarding the requirement for students to complete graded pre-work modules prior to the course start date.

Ferrence thanked Kaufman for his quick response to the Council's request for a syllabus and to the Council's initial questions. He added the Council wanted to ensure the course not only met Kaufman's needs, but those of the students and asked what Kaufman's preference was regarding the timing of module completion.

Kaufman responded he would prefer students complete the pre-work modules prior to the start of class but added students could complete them in parallel with their projects once the course began. Kaufman was open to suggestions and suggested the modules be available through the course's Canvas site in the fall prior to the spring course start date so that those students who wished to complete the self-paced modules prior to spring could still do so. Kaufman then would assign the module grade as part of the spring course grade.

Ferrence asked if it is necessary for the modules to be graded and instead, offered as either a pass/fail or split course option. He asked how students were informed of the modules. Kaufman responded he was in direct contact with students as it was a customized experience. He added he would prefer not to have a split course option if possible.

Aitken thought if students had the option to complete the pre-work after the course had begun and could still receive full credit, there should not be an issue. Kaufman agreed there would not be an issue

with students opting to complete the pre-work modules once the spring semester began. Ferrence asked how soon a course is available in Canvas thinking of those students who may want to complete the modules in the fall. Worland and Hurd confirmed a course was available once an instructor published the course information. Kaufman thought the proposal of making the modules available in Canvas in fall for those students who wished to complete them early would work. He added he has about 20 students currently interested in the course for spring. Council members asked Kaufman to provide an updated syllabus that clearly notes students would still be allowed to complete the modules once the course began for full credit. Kaufman will revise the syllabus.

Worland made a motion to approve IDS 310 as a new IDS course upon receipt of an updated syllabus. Clemmons seconded.

10 in favor, none opposed, one abstained.

The motion passed.

Ferrence will approve the course upon confirmation of the receipt of the updated syllabus from Hurd or Simmons.

3. **General Education Assessment Plan Recommendation**
At the Council's previous meeting, Ryan Smith, University Assessment Services (UAS) Director presented a proposed assessment plan for General Education. He asked that the Council review, provide feedback, and hoped the Council would formally approve the plan.

Hurd explained to the Council that General Education assessment has been a sticking point with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) for many years. During the last accreditation visit, the University was told it needed to make progress in having a plan in place. Hurd added that while Smith reviews the data, she could see the Council taking on a heavier role in the process as General Education assessment is part of the Council's charge. Currently UAS works with faculty to collect course data, but Hurd thought UAS would like to have more help from the Council going forward. With a new General Education program proposal under discussion, it will cause changes on how assessment is handled. For example, going forward, participation in assessment activities may no longer be voluntary as it is now.

Worland thought the plan works but had concerns about the implementation and how the Council as a group could handle it. Hurd thought utilizing Canvas would help. Faculty could use pre-populated rubrics so it would not cause additional work. UAS will be piloting using Canvas this spring with courses in the Math and Sciences designations.

Ferrence appreciated UAS had a flexible attitude in that they seemed prepared to see how the plan goes. He noted there is a lot of hard copy work, especially in science courses, which would not be available in Canvas. Rivadeneyra agreed it would work for faculty who taught those courses and suggested they would need to identify and grade certain questions associated with rubric items. Ferrence responded he would be happy to show UAS staff the platform he uses to see if it could also be integrated as a collection tool. Ferrence added he liked the base proposal but had concerns with UAS' communication plan targeting only department chairs/directors. While he agreed chairs/directors need to be involved, many of the General Education courses are taught by NTT who as a group, are harder to reach.

Krcmarik noted that her previous institution used Canvas in this way for assessment and that it was easy for the faculty members to use. She suggested students with hard copy work could scan in their documents and asked if the University had reached out to others utilizing Canvas to see how they addressed these issues. Hurd responded the University was working with tech support from Kansas State and that it was good to have the perspective from a faculty member who is familiar with the process. Ferrence added he appreciated that Smith approaches assessment from a more wholistic perspective.

Rejack asked if the purpose of using Canvas was to allow UAS to produce evidence of assessment to learning objects in General Education. Worland explained the current process. Rejack was concerned the new process may cause additional labor on individual instructors and noted ENG 101 is taught by graduate students. He worried this would cause more work for those who are already overworked. Worland agreed that there needed to be best practices that would need to be communicated to chairs and that the process may not work well for some programs. Ferrence added the hope was that it would not create more work, but it would be difficult to determine until the process was rolled out.

Rivadeneyra added that in reality we need to assess regardless of the process. Rejack asked who is the "we" and thought the assessment onus was being placed on individual instructors. Rivadeneyra responded it was important to assess General Education at the classroom level. Rejack thought it may be difficult at the classroom level and suggested offering a course release may help alleviate some of the frustration faculty may feel with the added work. He added if the Council were to endorse the plan, there are important questions that need to be thought about.

Ferrence thought the plan was a good starting point and did not feel the plan needed to be overly prescriptive at this stage. He acknowledged the process was experimental and it would take time and back and forth between all parties to fine tune the details.

A motion was made by Worland to endorse the assessment plan as presented. Braswell seconded.

10 in favor, none opposed, one abstained.

The motion passed.

Information Items:

4. General Education Revision Process
Ferrence asked when the Council could expect to see the proposed General Education revision proposal on the agenda. Hurd told Council members the deadline to submit feedback online was tomorrow, October 4. The General Education Executive Committee will meet later this week to go through the feedback. She hoped the Council would see it as an agenda item yet this fall.

Ferrence noted the working document currently available on the General Education website for members to review but that it could be subject to change depending upon the feedback received. He envisioned the Council giving an up/down vote. If the Council approved it, the proposal would then go to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) and then from there, the Academic Senate. Rejack asked if the council would vote on a revised proposal. Ferrence confirmed the Council would review and vote on the revised proposal sent to the group by the General Education Executive Committee. He

added even if the Council approved the proposal, it could be voted down by UCC or challenged while in circulation prior to going before the Academic Senate.

Rivadeneyra made a motion to adjourn. Hurd seconded.

Meeting adjourned: 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Soemer Simmons