Voting Members Present: Kevin Humphrey, Randy Kesselring, Loretta McGregor, Ilwoo Seok, Marc Williams, Rebecca Oliver, Matt Costello, Gary Edwards, Lillie Fears, Pam Towery, Bob Bennett, Hong Zhou, Ali Khalil

Ex-Officio Members Present: Gina Hogue, Summer DeProw

Members Absent: Hans Hacker, LTC Michael Fellure

Convene the meeting. 3:35 pm by Bob Bennet

1. Committee to approve the November 9 meeting notes. Motioned by Oliver, seconded by Kesselring – passed
2. Dr. Deprow report “Syllabi Analysis” and University Learning Outcomes Survey
   1. BB: – Ask committee to complete ULO survey. See attachment.
3. Report on Biology QRII’s by Committee Members
   1. BIOL 2203, lab and lecture
      1. RO: Data collection seem strong and will put in taskstream. Goals outlined. Answers to #5.
      2. SDP: typo lab course number. Collect data from all courses-other campuses? BB: not Sri Lanka. How to get the data from CQ?
      3. SDP: Benchmark relates per question or the whole thing? BB: whole test. Then item analysis.
         1. RK: if you do BBL it’s a bit more difficult than going to testing center with scantron.
         2. BB: testing center will pull the info for us. Getting it into taskstream is the problem.
      4. BB: encouraged the faculty to work hard on getting scenario questions.
      5. Committee Approved with clarification. AS will send email out to chair.
   2. BIOL 1033
      1. RO: this proposal has issues. GEC provided feedback, and memo Dec 7 2015 about content – item 6, 13, 18, 24. No changes made after feedback.
         1. RK: what is the dept. chair position? BB: uncomfortable. Concerned with academic freedom. My view and suggestion was to deal with changing words around, he knows about non-distractions; drop the silly answers. That was unsuccessful. This is my dept. and colleague- I need to be out of it.
         2. LMG: has expertise in test development. These are definitely warned against as far as “best practices.” LMG: will volunteer on behalf of the committee to approach the subject with professor as far as fairness in testing.
         3. LF: are the problems you’ve heard mostly from females? RO: yes. LF: I could see that being a problem with the dynamic of females trying to get a grade from the male professor.
         4. LMG: looking again as best practice, there are issues with numbers 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 24.
         5. SDP: this is the only one that is identical to the previous year even after feedback. Course description is very academic – “health”. HLC is coming in March with a “read only” log in to the syllabi repository, and there is a chance that they will stumble upon this. Assessment would like to officially request that the professor reconsider and make changes based on recommendations. This committee has the power to evaluate the quality of the course within the curriculum, and can dismiss the course.
            1. Committee feels that dismissing the course is heavy handed.
         6. LMG: because if what we have in front of us was not taken seriously, it may be magnifying things in the course and not giving an accurate view. We can offer assistance, to the point of committee member(s) working with the professor to edit questions. RK: how to frame the questions is important but also having biology in there. Scenario questions, problem solving…maybe have someone from biology who knows about this assessment stuff along with this committee to go and meet with him. If we put ourselves into the position of saying that we are asking a biologist to change his class, we are overstepping. This is why we should have a biologist in the conversation when speaking with the professor.
         7. BB: talk to chair and ask if he would be willing with a member or 2 of this committee to meet with professor and bring these concerns. This discussion may have to entail an ultimatum.
            1. BB: suggests chair of department, SDP, LMG to discuss assessment instrument for this course with professor.

RO: we are trying to protect the prof too, because if the language in the course creates a sexually charged atmosphere in which a student is uncomfortable, the student could go to HR and there could be a title 9 suit filed.

SDP: the instrument in my opinion diminishes the perception of the quality of the course. If our charge is to determine the quality of the course, this instrument represents that and calls the quality of the course into question. The committee is charged with the responsibility of evaluating the quality of the general education curriculum and this curriculum represents the entire university.

* + - * 1. Committee agrees to have Chair of Biology, Summer DeProw, Loretta McGregor to meet with professor to discuss assessment instrument for the course.
  1. BIOL 2013 2011
     1. PT: questions regarding the 60% benchmark is for all of these proposals. Large sample size for data collection.
     2. LMG: # 7 – 60% benchmark clarification. Committee suggested rewriting statement to read: “Collective score of 60% or higher”.
     3. LMG: # 6 is kind of poorly written. BB asked the instructor if an easy question. No. Concedes to instructor expertise.
     4. IS: lab - typo in course title. Unclear sentence in #5.
     5. SDP: Sri Lanka is teaching this course currently.
     6. BB: Accepted with modification. AS will send forward.
  2. BIOL 2103 lecture and 2101 lab
     1. LF: Questions regarding benchmark. How did you arrive at 60%? BB: by committee. SDP: historical trend? BB: trend and committee.
     2. AK: #9 sample size of 1,000. SDP and BB: historical.
     3. LF: very professional, good questions.
     4. MW: confused by phrasing of first scenario question. Recommend matching formatting of other questions.
     5. LF: do nursing faculty have input? BB: no.
     6. BB: accepted with modification. AS will send forward.
  3. BIOL 1063
     1. MW: item 5- states 4 themes but lists 3.
     2. SDP: when these questions are on the final exam, they’re for a grade, not bonus? BB: none of these are bonus.
     3. Benchmark wording
     4. BB: accepted with modification. AS will send forward
  4. BIOL 1003, 1001
     1. Benchmark wording
     2. BB: accepted with modification. AS will send forward.

1. Next Meeting - Review Chemistry/Physics QRII’s
   1. December 7 – getting chemisty/physics on Monday. Last one for the semester.
2. Dr. Hacker subcommittee report
   1. Hacker absent from meeting.
3. 3 UCC Proposals – Require Intro to Psychology instead of Computer Class in AASN
   1. 2016U\_NHP21\_UCC bulletin change LPN to AASN Online program Fall 2016
   2. 2016U\_NHP22\_UCC bulletin change LPN to AASN program Fall 2016 (002) - curriculum change
   3. 2016U\_NHP23\_UCC bulletin change Traditional LPN to AASN program Fall 2016 (002) - curriculum change
   4. LMG: thinks it is a good idea if the department can accommodate.
   5. AS will set up vote by email due Friday.
      1. All proposals passed by email.
4. GEC member comments
   1. None.

Meeting adjourned. – 5:15 pm.

Subcommittee Assignments

Marc Williams, Lillie Fears, and Hans hacker – Nursing Microbiology Lecture and Nursing Microbiology Lab; People and the Environment

Rebecca Oliver, Randy Kesselring, Hong Zhou, and Mathew Costello - Biology of Sex, Human Anatomy and Physiology Lab, and Human Anatomy Lecture

Pam Towery, Loretta McGregor, Ilwoo Seok, and Michael Fellure – Biology of the Cell Lecture and Biology of Cell Lab

Gary Edwards, Ali Khalil, and John Humphrey – Biological Science Lecture and Biological Science Lab