

**University Assessment Council,  
General Education Advisory Council, and  
General Education Assessment Committee**

**Joint Meeting to Review General Education Assessment**

Friday, March 3, 2006

1:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Case Study 1, Student Union

Present: P. Bowers, J. Comer, G. Gates, F. Griffin, J. Hattey, C. Hawkins, N. Jones, G. Lage, B. Masters, K. Neurohr, S. Ownbey, J. Schatzer, D. Thompson, E. Walkiewicz, S. Weir, T. Weir, and G. Wilber

This purpose of this joint meeting was to review the general education assessment process and recommend action for improvement. In advance of the meeting, participants received several policy documents and reports that provided some chronology and description of the development of the assessment process.

Documents that were briefly reviewed at the meeting include: Oklahoma State Regents' Policy Statement on the Assessment of Students for Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability, Higher Learning Commission Statement on General Education, and several reports on the work of the General Education Task Force, as it was originally known, and General Education Assessment Committee, as it is currently known.

Wilber reviewed the process currently used for assessment, describing the role of assessment committee members and faculty reviewers, rubric development, artifact selection, artifact scoring, and reporting of results. An "organizational chart" of general education assessment was provided for discussion, as a way to clarify the roles of the three groups involved in this process.

It was suggested that clarification of the roles of the three groups - Assessment Council, General Education Advisory Council (GEAC), and General Education Assessment Committee – would identify the mechanism for appropriate resolution of any process concerns and for "closing the loop" of assessment.

Some participants who had been involved in the development of the process in 2000 indicated that the intentions for "closing the loop" and group responsibilities were expressed only in general terms because the group knew it would take several years to collect sufficient data to draw conclusions and implement change for improvement.

There was general agreement on the following guidelines:

- The general education assessment process originated from the work of the Assessment Council, in conjunction with GEAC. Both groups have significant

- responsibility for interpreting general education assessment results and developing recommendations for improvement based on assessment results.
- Although the assessment committee worked to re-state the learning goals for general education in assessable terms, the content of those goals is clearly the purview of the GEAC.
  - The assessment committee is responsible for conducting the assessments and reporting the results, using the process approved by AC and GEAC.
  - Although there is some disagreement about the extent to which the assessment committee should interpret the results of the assessment and develop recommendations for improvement, there is general agreement that the committee should be involved in both of those steps, since they are most familiar with the artifacts evaluated and the scoring process.
  - There is general agreement that AC and GEAC share primary responsibility for developing recommendations for improvement. GEAC has more responsibility for any changes made to the general education curriculum; AC has more responsibility for recommendations that are broader in scope than general education.
  - Instruction Council has a role in this process also; curriculum changes beyond general education must be approved by this group, (*Resources are the responsibility of dept heads and Deans*). GEAC and AC should involve this group in interpretation of results and developing recommendations for improvement.
  - The Academic Standards and Policies Committee of Faculty Council may have a role also (*this was a suggestion by Brenda, I didn't hear a lot of support for this. Perhaps say changes in academic policies must be approved by this group. It certainly wouldn't hurt to share results with them, but this wording sounds too strong*).
  - (*covered above*)An annual Fall meeting of the three primary groups should be planned to consider annual and cumulative results of assessment and to begin interpretation of results and recommendations for action, which would be taken to Instruction Council and Faculty Council for additional input and development.
  - There was general agreement that it would be helpful for the general education assessment committee to establish clearer expectations regarding the level of achievement for each learning goal. Some felt the expectations should be clearly expressed in terms of percentages achieving each score level; some believed expectations should be stated in terms of improvement over the college experience; others stated that results should be considered within the context of data from multiple sources each year; other suggested creating benchmarks to provide indicators of the need for action.

A summary of results of this discussion will be sent to participants for clarification of next steps.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Brenda Brown.