

Liberal Arts Council Meeting
CC 2201
November 21st, 2023 | 3:30-5:00p.m.
Agenda
Minutes Final

Present: C. Bebee, B. Casey, R. Dineen, M. Fryer, M. Heiny, (Couch), H. Muller, A. Steele, T. Wood,
Present in Zoom: M. Berg, J. Elkins, M. Houston, C. McClatchey, C. McMahan, K. Records, D. Staton
Absent: C. Couch, N. Geisendorfer, N. Matchett, T. Smith,
Byers, L. (was removed from LAC and Outlook email group)

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 3:42 p.m. after technical issues with the Owl and Zoom

Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved without objection.

Approval of minutes

The minutes were approved without objection for the last meeting on 11/7/2023.

Reports

Chair's report (Muller):

- **Next meeting on 12/5 at 3:30 p.m. will be in the Council Room at the UC** because the Campus Commons room needs to be used for an internal event and they need access early in the afternoon.
- Curriculum Workflow:
 - Remaining On-Time courses to review
 - WCWL – ENG 123
 - HLH – ENG 205
- Per Council and CCC needed additional work for approval
- Remaining Post Date Courses to Review
 - HLH – ENG 262
 - SBS – SOC 221
- CCC Work
- Review the Registrar's Transfer Criteria
- Correspondence and Meetings
 - The Chair continued emails on mapping and the IS/MS assessment chart as well as the link between these as preparation for direct assessment.
- Assessment – nothing specific of note.
- Assessment Sub-committee
 - Reviewing for editing purposes completed rubrics/outcome for all competencies on Canvas– Chad has uploaded all.
 - Reviewing draft general rate and review student survey for indirect assessment - will preview if have time at end of this meeting.

- Standing Reports
 - GE Council (Matchett) – absent (FMLA), no report
 - AVP of Undergraduate Studies (Matchett) – absent (FMLA), no report
 - Curriculum Category Committee Reports
 - Written Communication & World Languages (Wood) Continuing to work on ENG123 course.
 - History, Literature & Humanities (Smith) absent - We believe they are still working on ENG205.
 - Philosophy & the Arts (Casey) - found some issues in one of our syllabi – identified it and will work it out.
 - Social & Behavioral Sciences (McMahan) – nothing to report.
 - Mathematics & Natural Sciences (Steele) – nothing to report.
 - International & Multicultural Studies (Muller) nothing to report.
 - Ad Hoc Committee Reports
 - Assessment & Curriculum (Muller) – in chairs report.
 - Update from Director of Assessment (Beebe): followed up with (IT staff?) can remove IS/MS off the dashboard – will update in January 2024.
 - Outreach & Communications (chair TBD)

Unfinished Business

- Board Policy and Bylaws
- Finalize LAC-gtP alignment for all courses
- LAC Transfer Course Guidance Criteria
- Access to LAC Assessment Dashboards/Data

New Business

- Student Exception request – Kim Mendoza, recommend deny.
 Student has transferred in with 56 credits and is requesting the four courses taken with a lab that did not transfer in as LAC courses count for LAC science with a lab. They are transferring in some credits from other states and no syllabus is offered.
 Michelle Heiny: They are transferring from Lowry with an Elementary Ed major – scripted LAC courses, has some science courses approved as required science courses – 266 and 265 – they subbed for LAC. Elementary Ed does not have very many electives CHEM 101 – One credit short of the lab.
 - Casey, Brian – Move to approve the request based on quantity of science courses and labs already taken and on the limitations for taking additional courses due to the quantity of courses required in the student’s major program.
 - Wood, Tara – second
 - Motion approved without objection.
- Course approvals
 - CHEM 103, MNS CCC recommends approval.
 - CHEM 103L, MNS CCC recommends approval.
 - MOTION: There was a motion to approve approved both CHEM103 and CHEM103 Lab
 - Casey firsts, Wood seconds
- Discussion from group:

- There was discussion and questions from the group with concerns on mapping to student learning outcomes. They have no concern about whether the course addressed the competencies and content criteria, but members of the MNS CCC interpreted the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) differently than they were interpreted on the syllabus. Steele remembers that differences in interpretation were viewed as expected and normal by CDHE.
 - Specific discussion by the council on the mapping on the CHEM 103 syllabus,
 - Can SLO's be covered "in lecture?"
 - CHEM103 on page 9 of syllabus, do we need to see how the students demonstrate their understanding and outcomes? These will be completed from lecture activities. The content criteria can be delivered lecture.
 - For SLOs how do you determine how the students learn this course's outcomes?
 - Do assessments need to be included in course mapping and not just what is taught?
 - In this syllabus CCC requested and examples were added, linking not to the competency generally, but to the individual SLOs
 - McMahan, comparison to SBS SLO in global learning, that is more about the activities taught.
 - Muller, when you get to direct assessment, you have to have a tool what will be used to assess student learning related to the outcome. IS/MS assessment chart requires indication of assessment tool.
 - Muller, mapping is the in between step to indicate how you are addressing the SLOs with your teaching/course content. If include assessment, that is useful but not required.
 - Due to inconsistency in detail provided for the different SLO's. Steele will reach out about the dilution question, where there was a possible accidental omission of the affiliated test question. But it still feels that we can move forward on approving this course and lab. In the document (syllabus) inquiry and analysis (page 9) it indicates this is where they will need to add the Assessment. And show which exams where students will show their ability. i.e.: Chapter 4, with a question showing the assessment portion.
 - **Motion to approve:** Contingent on adding a question to SLO 1A under inquiry and analysis.
 - **Approved:** – All approved CHEM 103 and CHEM 103L.
- Mapping on Syllabi: Discussion continues in general for what is required on LAC syllabi. There was a discussion challenging that the SLOs must be able to be demonstrated through assessment.
 - Discussion on difference between content criteria being addressed in lectures but SLO's needing to be assessed.
 - You can say lectures can work towards a student achieving the SLOs. But the whole point of direct assessment is gathering data on actual student learning. It is useful to include the course-embedded assessments in the course design.
 - Assessment data – allows us to interpret what is happening with a course and have a conversation about what is happening.
 - Elkins, where do these conversations happen? How does an instructor or unit have a conversation when there is the bureaucracy of the LAC?
 - LAC needs to have to have evidence that the course covers the gtP required competencies and LAC content criteria. The mapping shows us the intentional design of the course.
 - UNC has chosen to completely align LAC with the gtP. Heiny raised a question.

Muller clarify. We have four or five outstanding courses that are not aligned with gtP, but that is a project in process and if they don't align, they will not be in LAC any longer.

- Mapping Discussion continues:
 - Mapping: we now require some method of assessment. Or are we just delivering the content that is being met?
 - Bebee, learning outcomes indicates what students should expect to learn in the course. To have outcomes listed with no assessments identified is instructor focused. We need to move to identifying assessments, so it is student focused.
 - When direct assessment takes place, the data is collated by scoring the student work on the identified assessment tool via the LAC required rubrics. Providing the information about assessment in the syllabus provides transparency to students which is good assessment protocol.
 - Casey, looking at our exemplars on the LAC website – assigning a reading, is appropriate. How do we present to the faculty what they need to do to map their courses? If we require assessment in mapping, do we need to have new examples, do all courses need to be reapproved?

- Angela Steele shared LAC Mapping Expectations power point: [LAC mapping.pptx](#)
 - Example syllabi some are very detailed, some are not.
 - In 2016 the Math Department created detailed mapping for unit, not necessarily for the students.
 - In recent years the mapping became a requirement on all LAC Syllabi
 - Page 6 of power point: Mapping SLO on left, description, and connection on how it was being assessed.
 - Math is now requiring mapping that students don't need to see.
 - Two audiences for mapping:
 1. Students – who don't need all the details, but mapping to what the students learning outcomes will be.
 2. Mapping a separate document that LAC sees and shows where / how the learning outcomes are addressed.

- Mapping discussion continues:
 - Wood: On the CDHE website, there is language about what mapping should be. They offer help and a contact person to talk to. It may be useful for added guidance.
 - Is there a master CDHE syllabus with detailed language? Nancy may have this info.
 - In syllabus requirements, maybe we should do content mapping and assessment mapping.
 - Wood, maybe we should be moving in that direction but keep it open for a few years – to keep moving things forward but helping them (faculty and units) decide how they will assess an LAC course and giving faculty some time to work toward it.
 - Need to have a deadline.
 - Elkins, How do we know if the rubrics are valid and reliable?
 - They are from the AAC&U and have been through validation studies.
 - The rub is – the course instructor designs the assessment. Different instructors are doing different assessments – or techniques.

- This is on a learning curve for all faculty.
- Do we need a mapping subcommittee?
 - We have an assessment subcommittee. What needs to be done?
 - Course mapping will be a discussion for every course that comes to us.
 - Work to have some clarity as head into ISR reviews.

- LAC Transfer Course Criteria Project Question – Out of time to discuss.
- Student Survey – Out of time to discuss.

Comments to the Good of the Order:

- We will wrap today but will have more course approvals and will talk about them in the next meeting.
- C. Bebee offered to run the Zoom and Owl for the next meeting to free up Heidi to run the meeting.

Adjournment: 5:04 PM

Meeting minutes submitted: M. McKeown Kelley