

## BSLAS COORDINATING COMMITTEE

March 1, 2022

### Meeting Notes

Zoom meeting – 2:00 p.m.

#### Attending

|                          |                             |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Randy Prus               | Lei Qian                    |
| Charles Matthews         | Amy Gantt                   |
| Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey  | David Monk                  |
| Susan Hodson, ex officio | Carolyn Fridley, ex officio |

#### Not attending

Maribeth Nottinghamham  
Kathleen Hardgrove

1. **Call to order.** The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Randy Prus, BSLAS-CC Chair.
2. **Approval of minutes.** Charles Matthews motioned to approve the minutes from January 25, 2022, seconded by Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey. Without discussion, the minutes were approved by acclamation.
3. **Feedback from the [Institutional Assessment Committee \(IAC\)](#) on the Program Outcomes Assessment Report (POAR).**  
**Discussion:** Charles Matthews noted that the IAC traditionally provides minimal feedback, however, this POAR received more feedback than usual, and included several useful points. Carolyn Fridley agreed and added that the Committee was already aware of some of the issues raised and have been, or are being addressed (e.g., the first two learning objectives come from the goals for General Education courses, assessed by the ETS Proficiency Profile). A question was raised about the feedback that reads, “...there are no stated goals...” yet the POAR included the Program’s five learning outcomes. Charles Matthews explained that some Programs have a mission statement, followed by goals, and that we can use what we decide. The more significant issue, he believes, is the second half of the sentence that reads, “and only one outcome has more than 1 assessment.” Having more than one assessment is difficult for our Program because there is only one required course (LAS 4991-Capstone), while other Programs have many more. It may be that our Program continues to score low on “a sufficient number of goals (objectives) that clearly address the breadth of the program requirements and expectations” because our Program is broad-based. Jennifer-Lodine-Chaffey asked if similar Programs at other universities have goals similar to ours. Carolyn Fridley explained that there has been a review of other Liberal Arts programs, but it is difficult to apply the goals of those programs to ours because our Program is significantly smaller than most. Charles Matthews asked whether the Committee should consider adding other courses, which cannot be answered until the goal of the program is determined. If we want this degree to be more than the degree for students who have accumulated a lot of hours, perhaps we should consider writing a new goal and then consider adding a course to achieve that goal. Carolyn Fridley added that the degree is regarded by many as a “catch all,” and if we want the degree to be considered differently then the degree needs to be re-imagined so it is considered in the same way as traditional degrees. Conversations with administrators would be necessary for the degree to be marketed differently and promoted as a destination degree rather than a default degree (and as valuable as traditional degrees). While this degree serves a useful purpose for many students, it has an image problem. Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey asked about the distinction between a goal and an outcome, suggesting that goals are broad (a hope), whereas outcomes are measurable. Charles Matthews added that the Mathematics program does not have goals; it has specific learning outcomes that are measurable. Amy Gantt shared the POAR from the Art Program and the distinction they make between goals and outcomes. Lei Qian said the Computer Science Program did not have goals, so they wrote them based on the learning outcomes. He said that the goals, at their core, are to “know something, do something, continue learning, and [be] ethical.” Charles Matthews suggested that the Committee concentrate on learning outcomes and perhaps add another. We should do what we think is right, and not conform to the POAR Reconciled Report. Lei Qian suggested adding more measurements. With only one required course, however, all assessments come from that course. Randy Prus asked that if another course were added would it be to improve the program or to improve the POAR? Carolyn Fridley asked if it would be useful to talk with Teresa Golden about the issue of one assessment. Randy Prus said that we would first wait for input from the external reviewer, and then for feedback from the [Organized Research & Program Review Committee](#).
4. **Proposed learning outcome.** “Identify and explain connections between individual academic disciplines and how their differing perspectives enhance understanding of a contemporary problem.” Charles Matthews motioned to delete the

current first and second learning outcomes and replace them with the proposed outcome. Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey seconded the motion. **Discussion:** Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey observed that the four remaining objectives would be similar to those in Computer Science (to “know something, do something, continue learning, and [be] ethical”). Prior to this meeting Carolyn Fridley provided the Committee with a document that illustrated how the current and proposed learning outcomes are measured in the capstone project, its attendant assessments and corresponding assignments. Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey asked why MLA is used in the project rather than APA or Chicago Style formatting. Carolyn Fridley explained that when the Capstone was developed she found that many students had never written an academic essay and had no familiarity with any bibliographic protocols. Since the Capstone is taught in a 7-week accelerated course, the timeframe makes it prohibitive to teach several bibliographic protocols so she decided that since the degree is housed in English, Humanities & Languages then MLA would be used. With a motion and a second on the floor, the motion to delete the current first and second learning outcomes and replace with this new outcome, a vote was conducted and approved without objection.

5. **External reviewer (Program Review).** Randy Prus reported that that while he had not heard from Dr. James Bell (the external reviewer) he was copied on an e-mail from Natalie Weaver (Administrative Assistant/Accelerated Programs Admissions Specialist, Academic Affairs) to Dr. Bell on February 22, 2022, confirming that Dr. Bell was selected as the external reviewer and was provided with the Academic Program Review Guide, Service Contract and Vendor Payee forms.

6. **Adjourn.** Charles Matthews motioned to adjourn, without a second, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Carolyn Fridley