

GEAC Meeting Minutes December 13, 2023 | 1:00 PM Google Meet

Call to Order at 1:00 PM

Attendance - Amanda, Rebecca, Scott, Tim, Jean, Brian, and Kyle

1. Approval of past meeting minutes (October Meeting, also found in additional docs folder linked below) - The October minutes were approved with Scott making a motion, Jean making a second, and everyone voted in favor.
2. Fall 2023 collection update - Kyle updated everyone about his outreach efforts for artifacts for Fall 2023. Kyle reached out with an introductory email in August, a tools and rubrics reminder email in October, and the first of three calls for artifacts at the end of November.
3. Approval of Fall 2023 Improvement Plans C2, D2, and E4 (found in additional docs folder) and ANTH 1004 Assessment Tool and Rubric

12.13.23 Meeting Additional Docs:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/15_ZssehtdNUSQifty90TGP7A2H3BOPvX?usp=sharing -

The group began by looking at E4 and the individual courses therein. We began with PHIL 2130, and it was noted that there could be a problem with the phrase “will continue to.” Tim and Jean made these observations, and Amanda suggested that we finesse and reword that part due to GEAC’s ability to offer friendly amendments to Improvement Plans. Tim suggested we change the wording to “two or more” and said that we could likely delete the first part.

Next we looked at XIDS 2300. The committee said overall that the IP looked good, but Tim noted that it might be prudent to have the case studies specified and or the time spent on them in the classroom. Kyle offered to reach out to Dr. Noori to gather these details.

Next we looked at SOCI 1101 and 1160, and Tim noted that the wording to him sounded more like a promise of determining an IP as opposed to the actual plans for one. Rebecca noted that there was little time for faculty to create these plans and asked if there were specific friendly amendments we could make to fix the issue. Jean suggested that we change the wording to “fix curricular issues by assigning common course components,” and then send it back to the SOCI faculty for approval and specifics about the assignment.

At this time, the committee began a protracted discussion about how we should be analyzing these based on “met” vs. “not met,” “past IPs” vs. “no past IPs,” and “major” vs. “minor” changes. Rebecca noted that in the future, we can request records of assignments used as part of IPs. At this time, Tim introduced a motion to approve all IPs for E4, C2 and D2 where the course had “met” its assessment criteria, and Scott seconded that motion. The motion was then voted on and approved. Specifically, the courses that “met” would be reviewed still for friendly amendments. Courses that did “not meet” would need to be approved individually.

We then looked at POLS 2201 (met overwhelmingly), and we determined that we would reach out to Dr. Mbaye for some specifics.

We then looked at ANTH 1102 (met), and we determined to reach out for specifics about the changes mentioned in the IP.

We then looked at PSYC 1101 (met), and we made an edit on the excel file to show the prior IP from 2021. Sykes, Jean, and Tim noted that we should strike item 3 in the IP because faculty do not have the ability to make it happen. We agreed that the other items were sufficient.

Next we looked at area D2, and we looked at CS 1300 and CS 1030 first. The CS 1300 IP was noted to be sufficient, and the CS 1030 required some rearranging of the analysis and the actual IP. Once the shifting of words was done, the committee was happy with it.

Next we looked at Math 1401, 1413, 2644, and 1634, and they were all sufficient in the eyes of the committee, denoted by specific adjustments and pedagogical changes in the courses.

Next we advanced to C2, and we started with the ENGL IPs. Jean said the language was notable and worthy of being shared with other faculty in other courses who need help writing IPs. The committee voted to approve these IPs with Tim making the motion and Jean providing the second.

Next we looked at the SPAN IPs. SPAN 2001 and 2002 met, so we only had to vote on SPAN 1001 and 1002. Each of the Spanish IPs were sufficient. The committee voted to approve SPAN 1002 (Tim motion and Jean second) and SPAN 1001 (Jean motion and Tim second).

We then moved to PHIL 2010 and 2030, and these IPs were also approved (Jean made the motion and Scott seconded).

We then reviewed FREN 1001, 1002, 2001, and 2002. The committee said that FREN 2001 (met) looked good. The committee noted that more specifics were needed for FREN 1001, 1002, and 2002 however. Tim, Jean, and Scott noted the need for more answers, and Kyle offered to reach out to Dr. Anderson for those details.

Next we reviewed the IP for XIDS 2100, and Tim noted that we should strike the last sentence as a friendly amendment. Kyle made the edit, and the committee said the IP looked good otherwise.

Next we looked at COMM 1154, and Scott noted that the first line was not necessary. He and Jean said that we should ask for a specific change and try to determine how COMM faculty will “reinforce the concept.”

Next we reviewed the GRMN courses, and they were voted on and approved (Scott motion and Jean second).

This wrapped up the IPs that we needed to review and vote on, so we next moved to looking at the new ANTH 1004 course rubric and tool. ANTH 1004 was added as a GenEd class, and the faculty put together the rubrics and tools that could be used as early as SP24. Jean opened discussion by wanting us to make sure it aligned with the SLO for the core area, and we double checked that it did. Jean then suggested that we place the SLO at the top of the rubric. With that suggestion, GEAC voted to approve the rubric and tool (Scott motion and Jean second).

4. SACSCOC feedback update/discussion - Kyle began discussion about the feedback from the SACSCOC off-site review. We were dinged slightly for a lack of evidence in C2 and D2, and direct references were made to some of the IPs and to whether they directly would impact student learning or not. It was also suggested that we showcase strong IPs and make a visual of how many times courses/areas have gone through the entire assessment cycle. Dr. Akins asked for a focus report on these items by 1/15. Tim then noted that no one seems to have seen the SACSCOC feedback in written form, and it was noted that we do not have access to the

original feedback from SACSCOC. Tim then offered a couple of items of advice about how we could compile the necessary data for the focus report. Amanda finished this discussion by saying that there was little critique and that the issues were mostly about the presentation.

5. Discussion about Core IMPACTS and new Learning Outcomes and GEAC's role in the process for SP24 - Kyle updated everyone about the outcome and plans from a meeting with Dr. Newton. In order to convert the core areas into IMPACTS, we plan to hold workshops where representatives from each course/area could attend and make sure the tools and rubrics align with IMPACTS. If any changes were needed, the representative faculty could make those changes at that time. The suggested timeline for these workshops was the middle of February. There was then some various discussion about how everything must be linked back to the mission of the university and how the IMPACTS will be implemented. It was suggested that we have several workshops, perhaps one for each core area, and that we invite the representatives to those times and offer assistance with draft language and provide clear goals.

Adjournment - 3:30