Notes from General Education Advisory Task Force Committee Meeting
Tuesday, February 2, 2010
3:00 – 5:00 p.m., Gillham Park Room, Administrative Center

Attending: Cindy Pemberton (chair), Mary Allen (recorder), Laura Gayle Green, Cheryl Grossman, Tim Timmons, Marilyn Taylor, Julie Cheslik, Deb O’Bannon, Kim Bray, Lynda Plamann

Absent: Jolene Lynn, Wayne Vaught, Paul Cuddy, Linda Garavalia

I. Convene Meeting – Cindy Pemberton

Cindy Pemberton convened the meeting, and thanked Kim Bray for serving as chair in her absence at the meeting on January 19.

Cindy Pemberton reported on her attendance at the AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities) meeting held recently in Washington, D. C. She attended a pre-conference workshop on e-portfolios and reported that the increased number in attendees reflects a larger focus on assessment at many institutions. A question raised at the meeting was how to use e-portfolios to help students learn. Many struggle with this question, both from the student and faculty perspective. She also attended panels focusing on general education, one of which included representatives from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL). Cindy Pemberton has asked Drs. Nancy Mitchell and Rita Kean, both from UNL, to meet with the UMKC General Education Advisory Task Force on March 2. It would be helpful for this group to hear from the perspective of Drs. Mitchell and Kean as UNL has recently instituted changes to their general education program. UNL and UMKC have similar cultures in the sense that decisions have been made autonomously, and given this similarly, their perspective on revising general education requirements will be useful to this group. UNL has sent teams twice to the AAC&U Summer Institute for General Education.

It was stated that at the previous meeting, the issue of UMKC not having a more renaissance education resonated with the task force. A more “trade school” approach has been the norm, and we need to prepare our students not just for a job, but provide a wider view of the world. It is believed that this language will play out well with UMKC faculty.

Cindy Pemberton stated that she is working with Jake Kupiec in the Provost’s Office to help design a communication plan as we try to get broad participation. Jake Kupiec specializes in communication, and it would be useful to have her attend one of our meetings so that the membership will have a better sense of what we want to accomplish to enhance participation.

II. Reports:

a. University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Tim Timmons reported the general education process undertaken at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Cindy Pemberton asked the membership to look at the UNL web page and come up with questions for to the task force meeting on February 16. We will collect those questions and spend time in
discussion. We will use this website as a resource as we move forward and will look at process as well as what their program consist of.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions: (Place on list of questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Ask about guidelines and templates (T. Timmons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Explore course offerings at UNL (C. Pemberton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Can one unit opt out? At UNL, there was a ratification process at each point in the process. How did that happen on campus?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **AAC&U Proposal, re: General Education Summer Institute.** Cindy Pemberton reported that she, Laura Gayle Green, and Wayne Vaught, have been working on the proposal to submit to AAC&U for the General Education Summer Institute. Cindy Pemberton will send a draft of the proposal to the membership for their review in the next few days. The committee was asked to not wordsmith the proposal, but rather looks for any obvious holes in the document. She will send this proposal to Provost Hackett for her approval before it is sent on-line to AAC&U to meet the February 19 deadline. We should be notified sometime in March if we are selected to attend the institute.

III. Discussion:

a. **Timeline**

Cindy Pemberton provided an overview of a proposed timeline for the implementation of the general education plan. This timeline will need to be tweaked further to mesh with established deadlines. The plan may not be implemented until fall 2013 due to catalog deadlines. The catalog deadline is driven by pre-enrollment in the spring for the March deadline.

| Action: Revisit timeline |

Discussion commenced surrounding the implementation of the new general education plan. Implementation does not need to be accomplished in a total rollout. A phased implementation plan is something that this group can discuss during the visit with Drs. Mitchell and Kean on March 2.

As we go forward, we need to be mindful of connecting student learning outcomes with University-wide general education.
b. Finalize Bullet Points (attached)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Mary Allen will follow up on the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer student graduation rates – how does it compare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double check our numbers on graduation and how it’s changing (up or down), comparable schools, transfers (this information is on the website). Pull this information into support document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Points:

- It is believed that UNL did revision of curriculum, then did assessment part. We need to do the same at the same time.

- The Higher Learning Commission is asking that we have an assessment plan documented to show how we collect student learning outcomes, how we use the program and how it impacts student learning. The University of Missouri-St. Louis is also undergoing a general education process and we may want to talk to representatives from that school. Something else to consider is having a conversation with the area junior colleges to advise them of what it is we expect early on from students who transfer from junior colleges to UMKC.

- Bullet points – think of things to bring to this meeting.

c. Discuss, identify and develop General Education revision framework recommendations. Develop framework for presentation to the Provost.

The Provost wants to have a framework that makes sure we deal with transferability issues, as well as a general education revision process for student learning outcomes.

Discussion Points:

- Need to start generating those things we agree on.

- Design and implement assessment, cybernetic feedback, group needs to be self-perpetuating.

- Built in revision process on courses/experience.

- Framework – Design and implement a continued assessment and re-design process for courses/experiences.

- Develop student learning outcomes that are the basis for general education (adoption of the LEAP student learning outcomes)
• Consequences of non-compliance if ignored? Does course need student learning outcomes? What are consequences of not doing?

• Open system – feedback from students in last five years go round. Open and transparent to all constituent groups. Buy-in process/governance.

• Timeline for Buy-in/ratification/vetting

• Unique Student Body Population

• Transfer students, growth, first time, full-time student population

• Student Learning Outcomes compared to LEAP

• Broad assessment/outcomes. Have to know outcomes to do assessment

• Governance (tie to vetting)

IV. Other Business

Action: Marilyn Taylor will get with her faculty, re: LEAP

V. Adjourn

Next meeting – February 16, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m., Gillham Park Room