Monday, April 9, 2012

Gen Ed DRC Meeting Minutes

Present: Matthew Ruane Cecilia Knoll, Veronica Giguere, Joel Olson, Allan Rosiene, Maria Lavooy, Catherine Cook

MR: Consultant has not called, but told MB that we need to draft some questions for the consultant. Other schools are assessing more classes than we are. Made one change to the second competency to say "Demonstrate an understanding of the...". Also, the words "historical context and" will be removed from the written version of number 6. When given the opportunity, no committee members voiced concern over the described changes.

MR: The consultant has seen our competencies and says that they look fine. However, it's important to keep in mind that this is in the context of where we are in the evaluation process.

Man: I did some checking and found that other schools especially state schools) are going to standardized tests for core assessment. Also, it seems that critical thinking is what is being stressed in the competencies.

JO: Problem is that this will cost money, which we are unlikely to get right now.

CK: We will never achieve 100% of students scoring a 70% on core competencies.

Questions for the consultant:

1.) How is an assessment done for a university that doesn't have a defined core? (That is a set of core courses.)
2.) What is the minimum number of courses to be assessed?
3.) How many courses per competency?
4.) Is there value in testing skill sets (critical thinking, etc.) versus specific knowledge?
5.) Is one direct measurement (assessment) per competency sufficient to satisfy SACS accreditation?
6.) Why was USF found to be insufficient?
7.) Does every student need to be assessed? 70% of the student population?
8.) What is an appropriate minimum skill threshold? 70%?
9.) What is the minimum level of students that must show competency?
10.) What are the consequences of having a goal where fewer than 100% of students meet a minimum core competency score?
11.) Have you had any experience with private engineering schools?