

General Education and Instructional Effectiveness Committee
Draft Agenda
2:00 PM, Monday, November 15, 2021
Virtual Teams Meeting and in Rawl Annex 142

Attendees: Regular members: George Bailey (presiding), Rhonda Kenney, Chrystal Chambers, Chris Oakley, Karen Vail-Smith, Randall Martoccia. Ex-officio members: Ying Zhou, John Collins, Elizabeth Mizelle, Mary Tucker-McLaughlin. Others: Amanda Klein, Rachel Baker.

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:03PM
2. The minutes for October 18, 2021 were approved as presented.
3. Announcements: Domestic Diversity credit was given to SOCI 1100, Introduction to Sociology, and Global Diversity credit was given to ANTRH 1100, Cultural Anthropology, both transferred from the College of DuPage.
4. A request for the continuation of Global Diversity credit for NURS 4220, Perspectives in International Community Health, was approved.
5. George Bailey presented a progress report on the request from the College of Fine Arts and Communication to revise the Fine Arts General Education student learning outcomes in response to information gained from assessment: An initial draft of a policy for requesting changes was created. The draft was discussed with CFAC assistant dean Robbie Quinn and HCAS associate dean Derek Maher was informed that a policy was being prepared. The committee discussed the progress to date. George will continue developing a procedure for the Faculty in any General Education area to request changes to their area learning outcomes based on information obtained from the assessment process. He will work with faculty and administrators in the Fine Arts area (which includes five courses in the Harriot College of Arts and Sciences) to address their request from the faculty in the CFAC for changes. It was noted that the full ECU faculty will have an opportunity to provide input on recommended changes prior to a recommendation going to the Faculty Senate.
6. SSOI Bias sub-committee report, Dr. Crystal Chambers, with Dr. Amanda Klein, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion committee. ECU policy does not allow identifying a student who violates its student integrity policy by making inappropriate comments in the comments section of the SSOI (comments that violate ECU's policy prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex, race, etc.). ECU treats such comments as protected speech. Students will only be identified if they make threats. Other universities reviewed by the sub-committee allow identification of students who engage in academic integrity violations (as described above) on a survey of student opinion of instruction. Examples were provided of student actions that might be Title IX violations, but which ECU does not consider Title IX violations, such as students making negative comments about Pride T-

shirts. At ECU, students are not told that their SSOI responses are anonymous. Rather, they are told that their responses are confidential, which does not imply that they will not be identified no matter what they say in the comments section of the SSOI. Karen Vail-Smith pointed out that students do not understand the difference between their being anonymous and their responses being confidential. It was noted that syllabus statements are unlikely to be read. It was noted that the survey tool could inform students that the survey is not the place to make complaints about the instructor, it is for evaluating the course. Ying Zhou stated that the survey form already says this. Crystal noted that right now, ECU treats the results as if they were anonymous, not just confidential. Crystal noted that the research literature on the SSOI reveals that it provides "customer feedback." It allows students to "let off steam," and it is filled out mainly by the students who were the most and least pleased with the course. It was noted that ECU is required to survey students on the quality of instruction [it is required by the UNC Code]. Ying described the steps taken to inform students of the opportunity to take the survey. It was noted that we can change what we tell students. Elizabeth Mizelle noted that faculty teaching face-to-face classes are required to read a statement to students that describes what they are being asked to do when they fill out the SSOI. Crystal said this overlooks distance education courses, and that instructors in face-to-face courses may not read it to the class. Ying said the statement could be included on the SSOI form. Crystal introduced the possibility of having a short video for students to watch that would explain to them what they supposed to do and not do. Students would have to watch the video prior to doing the survey. Ying expressed concern that this would further reduce our already poor response rate. Crystal noted that our response rate is on a par with that at other universities, and that we need to get the middle group of students to respond (those that are neither very happy with the course or very displeased with the course). Karen Vail-Smith said that we should tell the students that they are not anonymous. Crystal said that the sub-committee is just getting feedback right now, and that the committee should consider making an educational video on how to do the survey. Randall Martocchia said that since the likelihood of a threat is rare, why not just make the survey anonymous. Rhonda Kenney said that she likes the idea of a short video. It could inform the students that they are not anonymous but that their identity is confidential. And it could reinforce the purpose of the survey. Ying said that she is open to anything that makes the process fair. Crystal asked what should be the contents of the video? The fine arts faculty could do the video, but where would we get funding for support?

Other Business: Ying reported that the results of a recent survey that provided data on student engagement were mostly on a par with other universities. ECU was low in two areas, one of which was demonstrating learning through quizzes, assignments and other activities. Crystal suggested that this was due to going to 8-week block online courses in fall 2020. Ying agreed.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 2:55PM.

Submitted by George Bailey.