

**Mercer University
University General Education Committee**

Minutes

20 February 2025

Zoom: <https://mercero.zoom.us/j/8158958366?omn=95379455394>

Attending: Alana Alvarez, Sharon Augustine, Wesley Barker, Stephen Hill, Suzie L. Madden, Bret Matherne, Carol Sargent, Maura Schlairet, Christopher Schmitz, Nannette Turner, Kevin Gwaltney, Troy Nash, Kelly Reffitt, Achim Kopp (co-chair), Colleen Stapleton (co-chair)

1. Approval of minutes from Oct. 24, 2024

Motion by Carol Sargent to accept. Approved unanimously

2. Proposal to add TCO 240. AI Content and Design to the University General Education program, presented by Stephen Hill.

Discussion of this course as an example of what faculty can think of in terms of including technology in the University General Education.

Category – humanities.

Competency – interpretive reasoning.

Motion by Wesley Barker to accept and seconded by Sharon Augustin. Passed unanimously.

3. Discussion of initial analysis of Written Communication and Oral Communication data from Fall 2024 (Troy Nash)

Troy Nash summarizes the document.

As of this meeting, this data is only from Fall 2024.

This is practice run to get data from Canvas and write code to do analyses.

This document is not to be used to make decisions.

These are initial analyses and he has some questions.

Question 1 – Troy counts the almost 600 data points as a win because this is increased from all previous years.

Thanks to Stephen, Alana, and Wesley for getting the word out about the rubrics in Canvas.

Question 2 (proportion of enrollment represented in the assessment data) – we can work on this.

Question 3 – Troy counts results as a win.

Question 4 – Across the board the students struggled most with SLO2. This would be the kind of thing we would look at going into the fidelity of improvement. Based on

this data, it might make sense for CLAS and CPV to collaborate on helping students meet SLO2. Thus, improvement plan would be similar. Overall, students from CLAS were rated more highly than CPV students, doesn't mean they performed better (because different faculty, etc.)

Oral comm

Troy counts as a win the number of students who were assessed.

Question 3 – Good, but looks like some assessors missed 3.1 but Troy is overall happy.

Question 4 – There are some differences between schools probably because of different raters, different students. There is an interaction between SLO and school/college in particular for SLO 3.1. CLAS students were rated more highly than CPV students. This is an instance where CPV might want to do something on their own in the improvement plan. This is an example of where one college (CPV) wouldn't have to address the same SLO as CLAS and ENG.

Wesley pointed out that some instructors are allowing use of AI and that might be something to consider in this assessment.

Troy estimates of time for this analysis to be completed will be after Spring finishes. He will submit request to Terry Bickley to obtain Spring data and then will do analysis of all AY data.

This can be starting data of discussion for Fall 2025. Then, we can think of what's next for improvement plans for Oral and Written Comm

4. Proposal for Provost funding of faculty development activities in AY 2025-26 (Colleen Stapleton)

Kevin suggests adding a travel line to add to proposal for 1-2 to present.

Kelly Reffitt suggests considering hourly pay for adjunct faculty, perhaps how many hours the adjunct will attend.

Troy and Kevin both say what we are doing in assessment is fairly unique. From previous conference where Troy presented our work, there weren't many other institutions doing this work, and we can contribute to some basic improvement in assessments in general education.

Question on how faculty perceived the assessment --

Alana – faculty were happy with how easy the process was, hasn't heard anything negative so far.

Stephen - Similar from one faculty member.

Wesley – Had to follow up with oral comm; oral com all taught by adjuncts; no faculty was negative.

5. Other business

March 22 – next meeting.

K Reffitt – Echoes Kevins comments and thanks the faculty who participated in the assessment and thanks Troy for this good work.