
MEETING MINUTES FOR NOV. 3, 2017

In Attendance: Eric Bullis, Cheryl Cardoza, Melissa Deadmond, Anne Flesher (chair), Tanya Farnung-Morrison, Meeghan Gray, Mark Maynard, Joylin Namie, Sharif Rumjahn, Karen Wikander

Absent: Natalie Brown, Sam Byington, Lori McDonald, Cheryl Scott

Guests: Julie Ellsworth

Call to order: 10:05 a.m.

Approval of October 6, 2017 Minutes

Sharif Rumjahn requested a correction to the spelling of his last name from Rumjhan to Rumjahn.

A motion was made, seconded and the October 6, 2017 meeting minutes were approved as amended.

General Education Rubric Discussion

Chair Anne Flesher presented changes she received from the committee members prior to today's meeting. The committee discussed how to adjust each rubric: Communications, Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, People and Cultural Awareness, and Quantitative Reasoning.

- **The Communications Rubric:** Rick Bullis added a couple more and/or statements to further clarify the objectives.
- **The Critical Thinking Rubric:** Rick Bullis brought up the marginal statement for the fifth learning outcome which was discussed by the ASA Committee as needing clarification and changed to: Identifies other points of view but is limited to majority/popular points of view or reflects a superficial evaluation that takes into account either relevance or validity, but not both.

Anne proposed a new learning Outcome Eight. Students will develop a logical conclusion based on a solution to a problem or an outcome of an experiment.

- Exemplary: Uses well-reasoned logic that is consistent with the problem or outcome of an experiment and explains the conclusion in context of the problem or experiment.
- Proficient: Formulates a general conclusion but does not explain the conclusion in context, or does not clearly communicate or demonstrate the conclusion and the problem or experiment.
- Marginal: Oversimplifies the conclusion which may include inconsistent solutions to the problem or experiment, or unclear explanations and/or descriptions. Fails to identify the valid conclusion or the conclusion is not logical and lacks reasoning.

Meeghan asked whether Outcome Six is not needed. The committee decided that Outcome Six fits better with liberal arts like writing, and Outcome Eight best fits with math and sciences. They both address the same idea, and both are needed.

- **The Information Literacy Rubric:** Joylin Namie suggested that Outcome Three now read: Students will use information sources to accomplish a specific task or to achieve a specific purpose.

- **The People and Cultural Awareness Rubric:** Joylin asked if Outcomes One and Four are needed. Discussion ensued among the committee members. The rationales for each outcome were: One seems to be about standards of evidence, four seems to be about positions. Mark Maynard suggested changing Outcome One to say: Students will use evidence and/or explain responsibilities of ethical contributing members living in diverse societies.
- **The Quantitative Reasoning Rubric:** Rick (Eric) Bullis asked that we eliminate the extra bar on top of the rubric. Melissa Deadmond explained that it was designed to help faculty using the Hake system. The consensus was to include the Hake indicators at the top of every rubric. A committee member questioned how Outcomes One and Four differ. Anne proposed we eliminate Outcome Four and write a combined statement for Outcome One: Students will use appropriate calculations to solve an application and/or particular problem to obtain a correct solution. This created changes to the measures.
 - Exemplary: Calculations are without error and comprehensive to solve an application or obtain a correct solution. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clear and concise).
 - Proficient: Calculations have minor errors and are sufficiently comprehensive to obtain the correct solutions.
 - Marginal: Calculations may contain major errors or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.
 - Unacceptable: The student either does not use the appropriate calculations or uses them incorrectly. As a result, the student is unable to solve the application or problem.

Anne will update these outcomes for the December Faculty Senate Agenda. Once approved in Faculty Senate, the revised outcomes will go to Melissa Deadmond, Associate Dean Assessment and Planning.

WICHE Passport Discussion

Melissa reported that UNR is inclined to adopt the WICHE Passport and TMCC will likely follow UNR's decision. Concerns expressed from UNR were the two types of sciences and formalizing how we teach oral communications and teamwork. They will likely present this at the December meeting. Core Objectives 1–8 align with the passport. Core Objectives 9–14 do not. Other issues that will have to be addressed are: matching disciplinary categories for GE instead of skills/competencies. TMCC will have to clarify in syllabi and course descriptors to match Silver Core objectives. It was noted that the wording in the WICHE materials seems to lack the meticulousness of our own work on wording. Melissa responded that as long as we have the components, we can add more to our own wording as long as we comply with WICHE requirements. The discussion continued and it was questioned if it would make sense if we created a hierarchy for learning outcomes at the institution level, passport level, program level and course level. Melissa said ELumen will force the hierarchy, but is a task we do need to address. Melissa also noted GE will also need a more holistic review. The commonalities she has found in her research are: program level assessment has become more central. We review course-level assessment, but not program level. Are we assessing students who are graduating with the skills the courses should be teaching them? Melissa also questioned meta-analysis needs. Do we have all the elements we need for these reports? Do progress reports have assessment/action plans? We need to assess our assessment plans.

A suggestion received was to look at CAR samples to see how that assessment is working. It was also suggested that we make the assessment question on the PUR more robust so that it addresses how programs are evaluating their outcomes beyond the course level. Bigger annual reviews might make the five-year PUR might improve the process and make it less onerous. Checking to evaluate what data we are using for PURs is an important key to this. Rick (Eric) expressed his opinion about our Strategic Master Plan noting that we do not have institutional outcomes listed. They could be made more prominent. Rick (Eric) was unsure how we can incorporate WICHE outcomes with what we have now when we still need more. He advocated discussing how to hierarchize the outcomes so it is clearly mapped. Faculty will need to sit down and discuss connections between course and program outcomes. Committee members voiced concern about what constitutes a program. A suggestion, as a next step, was noted to better incorporate program outcomes in the PUR process. It was agreed, at the next meeting, to look at the content of the PUR and how we can include and encourage discussions of program outcomes and stronger ties to resource allocation. Institutional Research (IR) will need time to adjust their

approach to data for any decisions we make revising the PUR. What questions do we want to ask about these issues and how demographics and enrollment data pieces work to help us show how efficient programs are or how well programs meet their outcomes? How can we make budget allocation connections clearer? Melissa expressed concerns that the current template is too structured. We may need to be a little clearer about expectations and still allow programs to ask their own questions. What purpose does the current data set serve? Can we define needed data and eliminate unneeded data? Can we allow for different data sets depending on program needs?

During the next meeting, we will read DH PUR and go through it with questions in mind. Anne will send it out for review. We should restructure our forms to clarify resource needs in the PUR. Rick (Eric) proposed a thought map/flow chart for a model of how we evaluate PURs. He will send to Anne for committee distribution. Cheryl proposed wrap-up discussions for all Spring PUR meetings.

Baseline Indicators for Strategic Master Plan (SMP) Discussion

Melissa reported she did not receive a lot of participation at the forums she hosted. She will hold this committee's recommendation of 70% as a target start in high esteem. Anne presented some targets based on mathematically adjusted numbers. The final decision is to aim for 70% while keeping the sample size indicators and adjustments. We can later re-evaluate what works. Melissa discussed how we are assessing information for the first two years of our student's college careers.

Program Outcomes Discussion

This discussion was covered in agenda item four.

Old Business

Joylin is leaving the committee. Anne will now be the Captain of Communication and Foreign Languages. Captains should reach out to their PUR chairs.

New Business

None

Meeting Adjourned: 11:59 p.m.

Next Meeting: December 8, 2017