

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

December 11, 2013

Evald 305

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 PM.

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

Absent: , Janene Finley, Jacob McManus (SGA)

Guests Present: Christina Myatt

**I. Introduction and Welcome of new SGA Rep Liz Perez**

**II. Approval of Minutes**

Motion- John Pfautz moved **“to approve the minutes of the December 4th meeting as submitted.”**

Rick Jaeschke seconded.

Discussion was opened. There were no corrections/additions, a vote was taken.

**MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4TH MEETING AS SUBMITTED.**

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

## **II. NEW BUSINESS**

Carolyn reported on her time at the EPC meeting. She talked about the AGES revision in broad terms but did receive valuable feedback which will be shared with the individual committees.

Carolyn also reported that Gen Ed has been given the go ahead to give more time to the AGES update process. With this in mind, we will work Week 6 as individual sub committees, Week 7 we will pull all of the pieces together. By April 17, it will need to be able to present to the full faculty. It will need to go through forums and faculty senate prior to that date. It will then go to the board in May.

### **A. Consent Agenda**

The consent agenda was approved. The consent agenda consisted of approving THEA 410- Stage Combat as a PE credit.

### **B. Discussion of the LC Sub-committee's Proposal Document**

Discussion was opened.

It was discussed that in presentation we should highlight the benefits of the changes. The document should stress what we think is a good idea and not just talk about staffing issues.

A clarification was made. The proposal starts with Model F as Models A-E are already on the books and have been approved.

It was suggested that we add that other study abroad programs not on the "approved" list could seek approval. It was thought that the exchange option perhaps could be written to emphasize the process rather than being a list of currently approved activities.

The goal of the expansion and varied models is to give people ways to expand their thinking.

There was some discussion about Model H. It was thought that it should be kept as it is and then asking those proposing the LC to address how it meets the common core and learning outcomes.

There was a request for clarification of the 3 plus 1 model. The 3 credit course is academic, the 1 credit

is activity based (service learning, activity, etc.). It was then brought up that perhaps F is redundant. Maybe what needs to happen is to further clarify the 3 plus 1 model.

The question was asked if interdisciplinary programs had been discussed. Is there course work, by nature, an LC? Can the programs make a case for how their course work achieves the LC requirements?

It was thought that in presenting this we need to acknowledge the problem and present data for why this is being done. Can we find a way to make this document and others more educative? Can there be a link that theorizes this? This is grounded in the strategic plan. Integrated, experiential and other terms have been utilized in the plan.

Discussion ensued about the question of assessment.

If all of the work is predicated on the idea of trying to tie things to learning outcomes then the outcome is important. We need to know what it is and must be able to assess it.

Evergreen came with its own set of key learning outcomes that are not attached to the nine overall student learning outcomes.

How do LCs tie in with key learning outcomes? Some are more easily assessed than others.

Do we need to be wedded to these learning outcomes or is it more compelling to have them hook up to the nine learning outcomes? Does each LC make a case for how it fits?

If there were a subset that fit well with LCS that would be best.

Learning outcomes and strategic plan do not cross over. As integration is so important in strategic plan, it is surprising then that it is not one of the learning outcomes.

It was thought that perhaps we don't need to cling to Evergreen 2 learning outcomes.

If we are emphasizing integration in LPs does it not belong in LCs? LCs are currently the only place for integration. Integration between one course is different than two.

It was mentioned that we will have to look at all proposals together and make sure there is not any overlap. In addition, we still have the question of double dipping.

We are still left with the question of assessing LCs. It was thought that maybe it will become clearer

once we see the LP proposal.

For now:

We will Scrap the 8 learning outcomes and forge ahead with something a little more stripped down and that, for now, looks at integration

Research will be done in thinking about adding interdisciplinary majors as LCs.

The document offers many possibilities. In approving new LCs, the Gen Ed Committee will be receptive to new models that embrace the two key elements of LCs.

#### **IV. ANNOUNCEMENT**

Our next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, December 18 at 4:00 PM in Evald 305.

We will be looking at the LP sub-committee document.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt