Call to Order/Introductions: Jane Creighton called the meeting to order. New members introduced themselves to the rest of the committee.

Approval of Minutes, 9/27 and 10/4: Minutes from 9/27 were approved. The Committee met on 10/4 however there was no quorum. Meeting notes were kept for that meeting and were also approved. Approve minutes and meeting notes are in Appendix A.

UCC Charge to the Committee: UCC provided the Committee with an updated charge:

We charge the GEC with exploring the possibility of making these competencies and their integration more transparent and prominent within the culture of UHD, taking action when possible or otherwise making recommendations to the faculty, provost, and others as to how they might promote this goal. The provost has expressed support for this initiative, and in some cases may be willing to provide monetary or staff support. While the GEC will determine the full scope and direction of the task, some elements might include the following:

- Creating an attractive website that schematizes UHD’s “integrative core curriculum”
- Creating symbols for each competency that are used on the website, around campus, at orientation, on syllabi, etc.
- Inviting faculty from different disciplines to discuss the importance of one or more of the competencies from their disciplinary perspective at events (e.g. orientation) or in video form,
- Creating a common format or template for the syllabi for core courses which identify competencies taught in individual courses to students

The complete charge can be found in Appendix B.
IV. **Gen Ed Committee Notes in Blackboard 2:** Dr. Creighton restructured the Gen Ed Committee notes in BB2 and provided a tour of the revised site. All members should have instructor-level access to add and edit content.

V. **Procedures for review of and feedback for Signature Assignments:** There is a need to establish a formal process for reviewing Signature Assignments. Dr. Creighton has created a rubric (see Appendix C for an example) for each of the outcomes to serve as a guide in the process. She will establish 3 groups of faculty to conduct reviews and develop a process for review and submission of results of the review to the Committee as a whole.

VI. **Assess-a-Fest:** Assess-a-Fest is scheduled for November 17 at 10am in the Milam/Travis rooms. Dr. Creighton requested copies of prior years’ program and activities.

VII. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned 4:00 pm.

VIII. **Next Meeting:** Next meeting of the General Education Committee will be November 1 at 2:30. Dr. Creighton will forward a meeting request and agenda.
IX. **Call to Order:** The General Education Committee (GEC) was convened for AY 2018 by Michelle Moosally, AY2018 Chair, University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

X. **Election of the General Education Committee Chair:** Dr. Moosally outlined the duties of the GEC Chair, including the following:

- Schedule/conduct meetings
- Communicate to UHD Faculty regarding all submission processes, assessment tasks, reports, etc.
- Respond to queries about General Education, assessment, etc.
- Ensure that the assessment tasks are carried out (evaluator groups, reporting, etc.)

Compensation for survey as chair: One course release in Spring 2018
Dr. Creighton was nominated and elected as chair for AY2018.

XI. **Committee Responsibilities:** Since there are a number of new members on the GEC, Dr. Moosally reviewed committee responsibilities (as per current policy draft that is up for discussion at AAC):

3.2.1 **The GEC has oversight in the following areas:**
• Education of the university community about the General Education Program (GEP).
• Assessment of the GEP, including recommendations based on assessment results and processes
• Curriculum and policy related to the GEP

3.2.2 The GEC makes recommendations to the UCC regarding any changes to the GEP and the courses therein.

3.2.3 The GEC ensures that the GEP website is up to date and contains all necessary forms and calendars for the program.
   Note: The General Education website is in draft form and can be found here: https://www.uhd.edu/academics/Pages/General-Education-Common-Core-Curriculum.aspx

3.2.4 The membership of the GEC includes the following:
   Voting members include the following:
   • one tenured/tenure-track faculty member from each academic degree-granting department,
   • one full-time faculty member from University College
   Non-Voting members may include the following:
   • 2 administrative representatives appointed by the Provost
   • A liaison from the University Curriculum Committee appointed by UCC.
   • Other participants as requested by the General Education Committee with notification to UCC.
   Note: The UCC representative will be identified at the next UCC meeting on October 6, 2017

XII. Update on Draft General Education Policy: The GEC completed a draft of the General Education Policy in Spring 2017. The policy have been approved by UCC, reviewed by the Faculty Senate and should be voted on by the Academic Affairs Council on Friday, September 29, 2017.

XIII. Core Curriculum and Assessment Process: UHD is in Year 3 of a three-year pilot of the General Education Core assessment process. During this cycle of the pilot, we will be collecting student artifacts relating to Oral Communication, Visual Communication, Personal Responsibility and Social Responsibility.
While each Component Area within the Core is assigned and responsible for including curriculum to support four of the six core objectives (with the exception of Mathematics which is responsible for three core objectives), each submits student artifacts for just two of those outcomes. An overview of which outcomes and assessment responsibilities are assigned to each Component Area within the Core can be found in Appendix A. The plan is to eventually require faculty to only submit assignments during the years each outcome is targeted. For now, we will retain the current process of collecting all artifacts for all outcomes from all courses in the core.

The GEC needs to emphasize that the underlying skills for each outcome must be taught if students are expected to develop any degree of proficiency.

**Signature Assignments** Assignments which are to be submitted for assessment of the Core are called Signature Assignments (SA). Faculty are asked to submit their SA prompts to the GEC for review. Rubrics for each Core outcome are used to review the SA and provide feedback.

Disciplines within the Core have adopted several ways of creating the SA’s. Some disciplines have developed a common assignment that all faculty teaching a particular course use. Other disciplines have developed a common assignment for adjuncts while full-time faculty create their own. Still other disciplines have allowed all faculty to create individual SA’s.

**Collection Process** Once the SA is approved, the faculty assigns it to students. Students submit their work in Blackboard. Prior to grading, faculty download the SA student work from their Blackboard class and upload it into special folders in BB2. Instructors are available to guide faculty through the process of setting up the SA in their Blackboard course and completing the batch download and batch upload to BB2. Special instructors are also available for faculty who want to use TurnItIn and for Oral Communications SA.

Additional information on the Core Assessment Process can be found in the Gen Ed Basics Doc in Appendix B.

**XIV. Identification of Tasks for the Semester:**

a. **Select a Date for Assess-a-Fest** This is a workshop to get feedback on the prior year’s assessment. Of the three available dates (October 6, November 17, or December or December 15, 2017), the November date was the most feasible. Dr. Campbell will finalize reservations for Friday, November 17 and release the other dates.

b. **Finalize improvements for 15/16 and implement** The 15/16 Core Assessment report has been reviewed by the GEC and the faculty in the Assess-a-fest. It has also been shared with all the faculty. It is now time to finalize improvement strategies and implement. The GEC will take up the 15/16 Core Assessment report at its October 4th meeting.

c. **Review the 16/17 Report** Data have been collected and summarized in a draft report but have not been reviewed by the General Education Committee or by faculty. The November 17 Assess-a-Fest will focus on data in this report.
d. **General Education Timeline**  The group reviewed the General Education Timeline (see Appendix C). The committee needs to publish the timeline for the AY2018, with minor adjustments due to Hurricane Harvey.

It’s particularly important that the committee remind faculty that they need to begin planning any revisions of courses or addition of courses to the Core now. UHD is only able to make submissions to the THECB once per year and that submission must be made in time for any approved courses to be added to the catalog. The process for adding a course to the Core begins with a course proposal or change form to the Course Management system. UCC forwards any changes to the Core to the GEC. The GEC reviews and makes recommendations to UCC on those changes with UCC making the final decision to accept or reject the GEC’s recommendations. Faculty need to be notified as soon as possible since changes to the Core takes additional time.

e. **Review and Provide Feedback on Signature Assignments** Dr. Campbell has been providing preliminary feedback on the few SA’s she has received. Dr. Kaser, AY17 GEC Chair, and/or Dr. Moosally were copied on all feedback. The GEC will review that information at the October 4 meeting.

f. **General Education Committee BB2 Folder** The GEC has a shared folder in BB2. Dr. Campbell will contact the Blackboard Helpdesk and have all committee members added to the site.

g. **Visibility of the Core and the General Education Committee** Last year, a group of faculty developed a grant that would have provided funding to promote the Core to students. A system of symbols representing each of the core objectives would have been adopted and used throughout the institution and on syllabi to show students how the core is woven throughout the curriculum.

The grant application was revised to focus on other areas however, there is still interest in developing a strategy to promote the Core. Examples of how other institutions promote their Core curriculum can be found in the links below:

- [https://www.bc.edu/sites/core.html](https://www.bc.edu/sites/core.html) (check out the video)
- [https://www.ithaca.edu/icc/](https://www.ithaca.edu/icc/) (check out their “themes”, which have their own symbols)
- [https://cla.mercer.edu/distinctives/integrative/](https://cla.mercer.edu/distinctives/integrative/)
- [http://sites.jcu.edu/core/](http://sites.jcu.edu/core/)
- [http://www.mountunion.edu/integrative-core](http://www.mountunion.edu/integrative-core)
- [https://www.bu.edu/core/](https://www.bu.edu/core/)

XV. **AY2017 Minutes**: Dr. Kaser will work with Dr. Campbell to update all the AY2017 minutes and have them posted to the General Education Committee website ([https://www.uhd.edu/administration/committees/Pages/committees-generalized.aspx](https://www.uhd.edu/administration/committees/Pages/committees-generalized.aspx))

XVI. The meeting was adjourned.
XVII. Next meeting of the General Education Committee will be October 4, 2017 at 2:30. Dr. Creighton will forward a meeting request and agenda.

General Education Committee (Meeting Notes)

Date: October 4, 2017  Time: 2:30-4:30  Room N449  Note taker: Jane Creighton
Approved: October 18, 2017

Committee Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Allaire</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Maria Benavides</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Lea Campbell</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>Jane Creighton (Chair)</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Ensor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>David Epstein</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Melissa Hovsepian</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Katherine Jager</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoja, Faiza</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Sergiy Koshkin</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>Michelle Moosally (Chair, UCC)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Ruth Robbins</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jace Valcore</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:40. We lacked a quorum therefore all discussion is informal.

II. Walk through Gen Ed Bb2 page which includes:
- Template for minutes
- Core objective rubrics folder
- 5 rubrics specifically for Core Signature Assignments, looked particularly at:
  -- written communication rubric
  -- oral communication rubric
  -- examined sample signature assignments
  -- evaluative rubrics designed to norm process across all users

III. Jane asked: "how do we develop our own committee voice in this process? Rubrics can be difficult to deal with/receive; should we tweak them? Should we also include a clear, tailored cover page that presents committee comments when we provide faculty with feedback on their proposed Core Signature Assignments?"

IV. We agreed that as Dr. Scharold's assignment had been thoroughly assessed by Dr. Campbell, Dr. Scharold should proceed forward with her revision on the assignment.

V. Jane and Lea proposed that they meet between now and our next Committee meeting to assess what the Committee has already received, in terms of Core Signature Assignments.

VI. For our next meeting, develop a committee process for reviewing new signature assignments
VII. For our next meeting, the Committee are charged with reading the Annual Assessment Reports for AY 2015 and AY 2016 (located on the GenEd Bb2 page), which specifically reveal that UHD students lack strong writing skills. We must consider what the university might do to address this issue.

VIII. We adjourned at 4 pm.
APPENDIX B: UPDATED UCC CHARGE TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

UCC Charge to General Education Committee

October 6, 2017

For a variety of reasons, we see many benefits in making the six mandated core competencies and their integration within the core curriculum more transparent to UHD students, faculty, staff and administrators. It will (among other benefits):

- Provide a foundation in competencies upon which all degrees can then map their own outcomes
- Help students understand the integration of competencies they are learning as they move through their respective degrees (as opposed to mere content, the checking-off of required courses, etc.)
- Help advisors convey the importance of alternative educational pathways (e.g. those who aren’t accepted into BUS or STEM)
- Provide UHD a more substantive justification for the marketability of its degrees, since employers frequently list these competencies as essential to their evaluation of applicants
- Help faculty teaching in the core (especially part-time faculty) orient themselves to the integrative goals of the courses and the core as a whole

We charge the GEC with exploring the possibility of making these competencies and their integration more transparent and prominent within the culture of UHD, taking action when possible or otherwise making recommendations to the faculty, provost, and others as to how they might promote this goal. The provost has expressed support for this initiative, and in some cases may be willing to provide monetary or staff support.

While the GEC will determine the full scope and direction of the task, some elements might include the following:

- Creating an attractive website that schematizes UHD’s “integrative core curriculum”
- Creating symbols for each competency that are used on the website, around campus, at orientation, on syllabi, etc.
- Inviting faculty from different disciplines to discuss the importance of one or more of the competencies from their disciplinary perspective at events (e.g. orientation) or in video form,
- Creating a common format or template for the syllabi for core courses which identify competencies taught in individual courses to students.
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENT REVIEW RUBRIC

Evaluation of Personal Responsibility Signature Assignment

*Introduced/Practiced in: Communication; Language, Philosophy & Culture; History; and Government/Political Science.*

*Assessed in: Written Communication; Language, Philosophy & Culture; and Government/Political Science courses.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Assignment Considerations</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Assignment does/does not effectively meet expectations</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aligned with definition of personal responsibility:</strong> The ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making</td>
<td>Related reading/research and the assignment requires students grapple with ethical dimensions of choices, actions, and consequences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rubric Dimension:</strong> Awareness of own ethical principles/positions</td>
<td>Assignment appears to require the student to articulate his/her personal core beliefs and the origin of those beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rubric Dimension:</strong> Understanding of Different Ethical Perspectives</td>
<td>Assignment appears to require students to articulate ethical perspectives or theories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rubric Dimension:</strong> Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td>Assignment appears to require students to apply ethical perspectives or concepts in analyzing potential actions, consequences or ethical options or in justifying a specific ethical stance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rubric Dimension:</strong> Evaluation of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td>Assignment appears to require students to identify a specific course of action or position based upon an analysis of choices, actions, and consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Personal Responsibility Signature Assignments should be aligned to the AAC&U Personal Responsibility Rubric.
and ethical perspectives and to articulate the objections to or limitations of that position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Assignment appears to require students to produce a response of appropriate length for the average student to fully address the four rubric dimensions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Structure Allows Students to Demonstrate their Best Work</td>
<td>The assignment appears to allow students adequate opportunity to conduct research and to refine and polish their final responses. The assignment requires a typed response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Assignment Allows for Individual Work</td>
<td>The final work product is the work of an individual student (i.e., not the response from a group of students.) in which the student must address all rubric dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Assignment grade makes up a percentage of the students’ grade sufficient to ensure significant effort is put forth in completing the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>