Members Present: Baldwin Sanders, Brent Kinser (Chair), Damon Sink, Elizabeth McRae, Ethan Schilling, Heidi Turlington, James Deconinck, Jeanne Dulworth, Leigh Angel, Paromita Biswas, and Sean June

Members Absent: Jen Schiff

Recorder: Deidre Hopkins

Ex-Officio Members: Randa Hodges

Guests: Andrew Adams

1. Introductions around the table.

2. Andrew Adams - presentation as to how the HIP capture in FAD will work:
   - www.Fad.wcu.edu (use email credentials to login)
   - It was decided that the best place to include the HIP information for the course would be under the scheduled teaching screen. This screen houses other information such as: term, academic year, and course prefix, enrollment, responsible for this course, percentage of course taught, capstone projects, and now the HIP.
     - As far as help tool - there is a little circle with a (?) where you can find the descriptions of the HIPs. (Brent provided the committee with a copy of these descriptions.)
     - If anyone has any changes/edits that need to be made to the information given, let Andrew Adams know and he will make the change and send it off for updating.
   - If the group agrees on the HIP descriptions that Brent provided, then we will move forward with using those on FAD.

3. Approval of minutes from the September 3, 2015 Liberal Studies Committee meeting:
   - The minutes from the September 3, 2015 Liberal Studies Committee meeting were provided to committee members and members were provided the opportunity to review the document. The minutes were subsequently approved.

4. Approval of minutes from the September 24, 2015 Liberal Studies Committee meeting:
   - The minutes from the September 24, 2015 Liberal Studies Committee meeting were provided to committee members and members were provided the opportunity to review the document. The minutes were subsequently approved.

5. Update on C1 – Brent received the final version of the C1 Assessment Team Recommendations. Brent sent the committee a copy of the Final C1 Report.

6. Discuss the proposed revisions of the Assessment Team Recommendations and the Team Charge:
- Brent accounted for all the suggestions that were made by the C1AT. Including the addition of multiple factors in the rubric. The only thing not included is the recommendation regarding on Focus Groups.

- Ethan had a question regarding the review of the syllabi and the fact that LS courses need to include the appropriate objectives from the LS Program, how well known is this fact by faculty who are teaching these courses?
  1. For the most part it is known; however, we can do a better job of informing new faculty who are teaching LS courses, that they will need to incorporate the LS outcomes in their syllabi.

- Libby also had a question about the syllabi: the charge states that we will review the syllabus to determine how well the course content reflects the descriptions.
  1. It was determined that we are spot checking the syllabus to see if their LS outcomes are present and have assignments that assess those outcomes.

- There was a question as to whether the Charge would have to go to Faculty Senate:
  - The LS Assessment Team Charge is belongs to the LSC; therefore, it does not have to go to Faculty Senate for approval. The C1 report will go online into the LS section of the website. The LSC Response to the Recommendations from the C1AT. These documents will live on the LS website. Anything we do in relation to the LS Document will have to go to Faculty Senate.

- There was a concern that every review team will come up with more recommendations to the Charge (i.e., focus groups that are work-heavy) that by the time we get to P6 the Charge is going to be something completely different and very cumbersome.

- Brent offered a couple of options – (1) kick the Focus Group up to an institutional level concern instead of this committee. It is agreed we should be doing Focus Groups, but they are a lot of work and a lot to ask for this committee to be responsible for heading that up. (2) Create a Faculty Fellow who would be responsible for the Focus Groups.
  1. We can respond to the recommendation that the Focus Groups are a really good idea, but it is a significant amount of work that needs to be addressed at the institutional/administrative level.
  2. Maybe something that Coulter Faculty Commons could be a part of and if they have the resources, they could get a Faculty Fellow.
     a. The committee agreed that it was a good idea for the Focus Group recommendation to be kicked up to the institutional level.
        i. With this approach, we will not put additional language in the Charge to pursue the focus groups further, we will leave it out since we are kicking it up to the institutional level.

- Concern regarding the recommendation to increase the number of artifacts that are assessed. Is there a difference between 10-12 artifacts compared to 15-20 artifacts in terms of the validity of the report?
  - The idea was to not do an incremental change to get at the “sweet spot” where the work is balanced with our end number. For instance, next semester instead of 6 artifacts we assessed 8 artifacts, that gives us a slightly larger amount of data but it is not overwhelming.

- As far as the Rubric goes Brent added a separate line item for each of the sub-skills that are included in the outcome (i.e., locate, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate) so that they could be scored separately.
• If we get approval on this document then we can get the Charge out to the upcoming teams so they know what is required of them.
  • Motion was made by Jim DeConinck to approve the LS Assessment Team Charge. The motion was seconded by Ethan Schilling. No further discussion. All was in favor and motion was carried.
• Regarding the C1 Assessment Team Recommendations, the responses to the recommendations have been supplied to the committee for final review. Brent will make the changes discussed (Focus Groups) to the Recommendations and Response.
  • We can either table this until the revisions are made or we can approve pending revisions and Brent will send the final Recommendation/Response to the committee via email.
    1. Motion was made by Elizabeth McRae to approve the LS Assessment Team Recommendations / LSC Response document, pending the revisions. The motion was seconded by Sean June. No further discussion. All was in favor and motion was carried.

7. Discuss revisions to the Liberal Studies Document (which will go to Faculty Senate upon completion):
  • Brent has been working on this document throughout the summer, it is still incomplete as the Assessment Description and a couple other areas have not been revised as of yet.
  • We are going to have an incremental change. The first round of revisions we are cleaning up the incentive section, the learning community requirement, and those things that were built into the original document that are no longer reflective of the LS Program. We will submit the updated document to Faculty Senate. As other recommendations come about, we will make those changes to the Document and bring forward to Faculty Senate. It will be an ongoing cycle of incremental change.
    • Changes need to occur in the context of whatever Assessment we are doing.
  • This document needs to live and breathe and continually revised. It is not a constitution, it needs to evolve and change as recommendations are made.
  • It was determined that everyone in the committee did not have a chance to review the changes that Brent sent out.
    • Brent will move forward on writing the revisions of those items he had not had a chance to complete, so that it is closer to completion.
    • Brent would like to have the LS Document to Faculty Senate by early Spring semester.
    • Committee homework – review the LS Document as it is now and come prepared to discuss any changes or recommendations that you may have. Once we return from Fall Break we will discuss in more detail.

8. History Department will start putting new curriculum into Curriculog very soon so that will be something we will address those pieces as they come through.


Time of Meeting Adjournment: 4:36pm