11/04/14 Meeting Minutes

Present: Ed Crowther, Jenna Neilsen, Rosanna Ensley Backen, Liz Thomas Hensley, Ken Marquez, Beth Bonnstetter,
Absent: Beth Apodaca Rubal, Michelle Romero, Debbie Chapman, Mark Pittman

The group reviewed the minutes from the last meeting and discussed some of the tasks that had been identified in relation to the various criterion.

In particular some time was spent discussing how GECC could approach a discussion of Gen Ed goals and whether revisions to the Gen Ed curriculum are required. It was agreed that GECC should review the Gen Ed goals and ensure that they can be assessed and translated into measurable SLOs. Only after establishing goals should a discussion of the Ge Ed curriculum occur at which time it may or may not be revised. The Goals and associated outcomes should drive the curriculum, rather than the other way around.

Margaret will draft a document that proposes how program goals, assessment measures, and rubrics could be added to undergraduate Institutional Syllabi in a manner that is similar to the process used by Grad Council. This component has significant overlap with Criterion 4. If positively received by AC and endorsed by HLC Criterion 3 committee processes for implementation will be discussed with GECC and CRC.

Some discussion as held regarding the evaluation process for adjuncts and instructors. There is very little formal process which doesn’t really address HLC requirements. This may require discussion at AC.

CMU used 3 categories to evaluate qualifications: Terminal, Qualified (1 level above that being taught) and non-qualified. It was agreed that these 3 terms capture the likely educational qualifications for instructors, and that we hope everyone is qualified. It was suggested that while we might use these terms to identify categories that we focus on why the ‘non-qualified’ instructors are qualified via exceptions and experience and that we focus on articulating that aspect.

Many sections of the tasks identified in the last meeting can be addressed with a survey or questionnaire for academic departments. Margaret will compile those questions for review at the next meeting.

Margaret suggested that since the previous working documents have some formatting issues, individuals responsible for a particular section copy those sections from the last meeting minutes and then add lists of relevant information and/or tasks that need to be undertaken in relation to each area prior to the next meeting.

Margaret will contact those not at the meeting with their assignments/areas of responsiblity.