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

Ex-Officio Members Present: Summer DeProw, Gina Hogue

Members Absent: Hans Hacker, Ilwoo Seok, Marc Williams, Matt Costello, Ltc. Michael Fellure

1. LF motion to accept 04.27.17 minutes. LMG second. Pass
2. Subcommittee for physical science, consisting of HH, KH, RK, LMG, and PT, reported to the GEC the conclusions of the private meeting with Drs. Pratte and Burns regarding the assessment plans for the physical science. Those are as follows:
	1. HH Provided Narrative and Summary, which is attached.
	2. All agreed it is an accurate statement.
	3. Some on the physical science subcommittee were not sure they agreed to come up with assessment questions for the assessment instrument.
		1. The physical science department would include the rubric. There was an agreement that they would use the assessment plan form. But subcommittee is unsure whether they agreed to different questions and different instrument for each class. The subcommittee received major push back on doing different questions and instruments for each class, but the point was made that it was not directed at the committee.
	4. The GEC is at a philosophical cross-roads here. This is how we have requested all of the departments/courses/etc. They have a philosophical disagreement with that. What this means is that departments can assess their courses with whatever means they want and they don’t have to tell us how they’re doing it. They have a strategy – it’s a rubric. The question is “how can you apply one set of questions to all of these classes?” And we haven’t gotten an answer. We got the questions, and then they developed a rubric.
	5. The GEC had a spirited discussion and attempted to answer the following questions:
		1. Whether it is beyond the scope of this committee to enforce compliance?
			1. Most agree that it is not the committee’s job to enforce compliance.
		2. Where do we go from here?
			1. The GEC is not tasked with compliance. The whole purpose of assessing/looking at how the departments are going to asses is to see that they are assessing and to see if they are using the data.
		3. Is the mission creep comment/complaint regarding forced compliance that the committee is overstepping authority?
			1. Committee discussed its campus reputation of overstepping its authority, and of misinterpreting or being misled regarding HLC.
		4. Is it too much to ask: what is the plan, what are the questions, you are using to assess your students?
			1. At some point you have to put something in front of the students.
		5. The GEC is responsible for helping departments carry out their assessment and making sure that their assessments are working. And we don’t know because theirs has not been implemented. It is our responsibility to go back and look at it and see if it is working or not. Someone would go back and say this is not working, now what?
		6. When did they commit to give us the plan?
			1. The department didn’t specify a deadline, and the committee discussed setting an appropriate and achievable date for submission.
		7. One member explained that it would be bad to have HLC ding our committee because we haven’t done our job because one person said “mission creep,” even though we haven’t heard that by anyone else. People complete the assessment plan form, we review, we give feedback, etc. We can’t give feedback unless they give us something. They’ve given us a bit, but we just need a little bit more.
		8. According to GEC purpose statement, the Assessment Office will provide data to the committee for review. And the Assessment Office would like for the data collection process to begin in fall of 2017, and a deadline for submitting the instrument to the GEC by July 1/June 30.
		9. The chair of the GEC will communicate with the department to the effect of: “…we expect to see by the end of the 16/17 academic year, for implementation and data collection at the beginning of fall 2017. GEC will review this at the first meeting in the fall semester.”