

## **Interim General Education Oversight Committee Minutes for February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012**

**Room 228 Student Center, 10 a.m. – Noon.**

**Members Present:**

Ruth Beattie  
Heather Bush  
Susan Larson  
Juliana McDonald  
Jennifer Rice  
Ben Withers

**Ex Officios Present:**

Bill Rayens  
Mike Shanks  
Debra Sharp

**Guests Present:**

Leah Simpson

1. The minutes for January 10<sup>th</sup> were approved
2. Rayens welcomed new members to IGEOC: Professor Susan Larson (Hisp Studies), Area Expert in U.S. Citizenship; Professor Jennifer Rice (Eng), Area Expert in C&C I; and Professor Patricia Cook (Social Work), Area Expert in Inquiry in Social Sciences
3. Rayens clarified the status of HIS 296 that is about to be resubmitted for consideration in Inquiry in the Humanities. This course was originally approved for Global Dynamics and now HIS wants to have it considered for both. Rayens communicated that he had asked HIS to simply resubmit the package with the appropriate Course Approval Form and Cover Sheet and the course would go out for review.
4. IGEOC had a brief discussion on the status of Honors in so far as that program relates to the Core. Rayens clarified that the package Associate Provost Mike Mullen recently submitted to the Senate Council did not presume that the four topics courses had been approved by IGEOC (they have not), but rather was just about the structure of the program. It is being left to the new Director of Honors to work with IGEOC to get these courses appropriately scaled, revised and approved.
5. FR 205 was approved for inclusion as a UK Core course in the area of Inquiry in the Humanities. Rayens, and long-term members of IGEOC used this course as an opportunity to help newer members understand the need to have thorough reviews of all courses submitted, and to often have a clear Area Expert statement that clarifies the reviews and offers the AE's opinions as well.
6. After considerable discussion that revolved around the history of this rubric and the two sets of template outcomes on which it is based, IGEOC approved the revised Citizenship Rubric.
7. Dr. Lane indicated that the C&C rubric, which was also revised and up for re-approval by IGEOC, would be submitted for approval at or before the next IGEOC meeting.

8. Dr. Withers reminded the group that if contracts needed to be renegotiated for Lecturers who might be expected to participate in artifact grading during the next academic year, then the time is now since contracts are due on March 1<sup>st</sup>.
9. Leah Simpson, from the Office of Assessment led the group in a detailed discussion of the fall assessment results for C&C and Citizenship. Several points emerged:
  - a) IGEOC discussed the need to decide how to communicate assessment results back to the relevant areas, as part of this important feedback loop. It was decided this would be an agenda item for a meeting in the near future.
  - b) IGEOC was reminded that a “2” on the scoring scale was considered “competent”.
  - c) The rate of agreement during norming needs to be better understood; in particular is a rate of 80% good enough?
  - d) A discussion and some resolution are needed regarding the pros and cons of holistic versus quantitative assessment practices.
  - e) Dr. Withers suggested that a meeting of Deans, Associate Deans and Chairs - much like was held last fall – be scheduled for fall 2012 to address how assessment at the University of Kentucky, post SACS review, might be changed to better fit the needs of the University and the faculty.