

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

January 22, 2014

Evald 305

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 PM.

Members Present: Carolyn Hough, Janene Finley, Nathan Frank, Mike Egan, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Rick Jaeschke, Katie Hanson, John Pfautz, Meg Gillette, Stefanie Bluemle, Brian Katz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson, Eric Pitts (SGA)

Absent: Lendol Calder, Jacob McManus (SGA), Liz Perez (SGA)

Guests: Christina Myatt

**I. Approval of Minutes**

Motion- Rowen Schussheim-Anderson moved **“to approve the minutes of the January 15th meeting as submitted.”**

John Pfautz seconded.

Discussion was opened. As there was no discussion or needed corrections, a vote was taken.

**MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 15TH MEETING AS SUBMITTED.**

Christina Myatt will file the approved minutes with Mary Koski in Academic Affairs.

## II. OLD BUSINESS

### A. Discussion of revised sub-committee proposal documents

The purpose of this meeting was to talk through components of the overall proposal. An intro statement has not been drafted yet. The committee went through the documents with each subcommittee highlighting changes that have been made since feedback was offered.

#### ICC

The changes are mostly language.

It was noted that the second bullet point should be either inside or outside the US.

What else can we include in the proposal? It was decided to use the question and answer format for the document.

It was questioned if there needs to be a statement that rationalizes the changes for faculty.

It was decided that all proposals should include:

What do we have now?

What changes are being proposed?

Why?

What effect will this have on current courses?

It was questioned as to what is the ideal length for these proposals?

The committee as a whole felt that we need to give enough information but not so much that people won't read it. Can we do an executive summary and then put longer documents after? Executive summaries should include the four questions.

It was also suggested that each section of the proposal use a like the suggested LP document.

It was believed that some people will want more info and we should offer it in order to show transparency. All documents will be offered. Those documents should include a timeline so people understand what has led to this document.

Carrie will create a public folder with all documents.

ICC needs more fleshed out document which includes the four questions by next week.

The question was asked: How does ICC relate to suffixes and LPs?

Short term it is a skills based competency

Don't call it a suffix, list it as a requirement

Q and ICC have strong maps to learning outcomes

Discussion ensued about how not all disciplines are represented by the LPs. This point is of interest to many on the committee and may warrant future discussion but was tabled for the purposes of this document.

### **LCs**

The sub-committee changed the “why” to be a more positive explanation.

Common components become suggested rather than required.

If we wish to be flexible, we need to not have a concrete “must have” list.

We will have to look at proposals on a case by case basis based on the answering of the three major questions.

Created a learning outcome

The sub-committee will put together an executive summary that will help define LCs.

Interdisciplinary programs can apply but they would need to prove how it fits, did not want a blanket "all interdisciplinary".

Can we include what is an approved study abroad- what are the requirements for it to be automatic? Some explanation of what designated means.

It was agreed that we will need to see one more iteration with changes before approval of the document.

### **LPs**

The sub-committee will need to edit the document as some of the things that were removed from the timeline were not removed in the detailed explanation.

In how do we interpret- can we change language to match language from the LC proposal?

It was believed that we should lose the bullet points at the end of interpret section and instead use that as part of the overall summary (intro).

It was suggested that we take out the assessment part- check to see if any of it can go at the end of the paragraph before and let the rest be handled in the overall introduction.

Take out unneeded parts in the data.

We will need to discuss how we are getting word out and how we are soliciting feedback.

We want to make sure signature questions are not owned by a particular division.

At end of the LP proposal- nine vs six- what are we doing? Needs more discussion. Let's talk about this more next week.

Carrie reminded everyone of the timeline.

The full document will need to be approved by Gen Ed in next few weeks.

We will get info to faculty by the end of Winter term.

Next term, we will begin having fora.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

Update from Academic Affairs

In the interest of time, no update was given.

#### **IV. ANNOUNCEMENT**

Our next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 29 at 4:00 PM in Evald 305.

Next week will have proposal from registrar about separated students to discuss.  
Revised drafts of each sub-committee's document should get circulated before the next meeting- by Tuesday noon.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt