

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

April 16, 2014

Evald 305

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 PM.

Members Present: Carolyn Hough, Nathan Frank, Mike Egan, Katie Hanson, Meg Gillette, Stefanie Bluemle, Rick Jaeschke, John Pfautz, Brian Katz, Xiaowen Zhang, Janene Finley, Liz Perez (SGA)

Absent: , Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Lendol Calder, Jacob McManus (SGA), Eric Pitts (SGA)

Guests: Christina Myatt

I. Minutes

Motion- Mike Egan moved **“to approve the minutes of the April 9th meeting as submitted.”**

Nathan Frank seconded.

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

MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 9TH MEETING AS SUBMITTED.

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

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Discussion of revisions to the AGES 2.0 Proposal and the Full Faculty meeting on May 8th

There was quite a bit of discussion based on feedback at our last meeting and we have now had the opportunity to talk to each division.

Division feedback was varied. Much of the discussion was about ICC and ICCX.

Carrie would like to circulate something soon that reflects the changes we are making in response to the feedback we have received.

The majority of the committee believe we need to split the proposal into sections and respond to feedback that has been received.

Carrie has met with Pareena. She asked us to think about the fact that HLC is coming. We don't want to do something that people are uncomfortable with but putting some concrete mileposts and deadlines out there is also important.

The question was raised: Can we work towards the revised proposal and then a plan for moving forward on those things we are not putting up for a vote at this time?

A question was asked about the turnover on the committee for next year. It appears that very few are leaving so we would have continuity as we move forward.

The hope is to bring more folks on board and garner buy in rather than what might be perceived as being "forced" upon faculty.

One division suggested having a half day conversation with those who teach G and D. We would use this time to talk about ICC, show how one includes the needed components. This can show people how this will work, get their buy in, and reassure people that we will have enough of the ICCX courses.

Some asked if people would come to these workshops to theorize something that is not a policy and which some think will never come to be?

Can we use the fall retreat for part of this discussion?

We need to illustrate how we see the D and G are related to ICC and ask those faculty members who teach those to provide input as they are invested.

In regards to ICC we need to say that we voted on this outcome, it has to happen with HLC coming up, and here is your chance to be part of the process.

Given that ICC is one of our learning outcomes, given that Gen Ed is part of the place where this needs to happen, we ask that you join us.

Fall retreat theme is strategic plan. This revamp of Gen Ed is part of that plan. That might help to put it into a different context.

We need to make sure we include faculty. The response seems to be as if they are being attacked. The reality is this is new to them as they have not been part of these two years of discussion.

We need to concentrate on integrative components. Some see that as positive but don't see how the students will see that.

Can we couch the changes in terms of the strategic plan?

Can we vote on LCs? It seems like we can. There are some concerns about some of the new models but those with concerns also don't want to see them go away. There is some concern about the independent learning model which is off load for faculty. Can some of that work go to the career center? Our hope would be it is not exclusively on the shoulders of a faculty member.

Do we think that this will affect numbers for traditional 3 plus 3 model of LCs? Many students do not do internships, some like the ease of just signing up for two courses, some student's schedules do not allow for anything but the 3 plus 3.

Can we just strike the 3 plus 1 internship/ independent study model from the proposal? There is some concern that this is LC lite.

The vote going to faculty will now be? I rolled into PN, wait on LSFY to FYI and put with LP changes, LCs can go, ICC will wait

We need to make sure that we present things so it does not allow people to infer that LCs were on the line but rather that we value them and see they need to be a part of the curriculum.

Gen Ed will send out two separate documents that would be voted on separately. These things can change for next year, can change very easily, others will be revamped.

Everyone should revisit the LC document. We should anticipate what things might be said so we have answers.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Name Change of the Committee

Brian Katz withdrew his previous motion of changing the committee name from Gen Ed to Common Core.

B. Selection of a Committee Chair for 2014-2015

Rick Jaeschke made the motion **“to name Carrie Hough as committee chair for the 2014-2015 academic year.”**

Katie Hanson seconded.

The floor was opened to discussion. Being no discussion, the floor was closed. A vote was taken. Motion passes. Carrie will remain chair for next year.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT

Our next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 23 at 4:00 PM in Evald 305.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt