

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

August 28, 2013

Olin 304

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Members Present: Carolyn Hough, Nathan Frank, John Pfautz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson, Stefanie Bluemle, Janene Finley, Lendol Calder, Meg Gillette, Mike Egan, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Katie Hanson, Brian Katz

Members Absent: Rick Jaeschke

Guests Present: Kristen Douglas, Christina Myatt

I. Welcome

As this was the first meeting of the 2013-2014 academic year and there were new members to the committee, Carolyn Hough invited everyone to introduce themselves, their department, and how long they had served on the General Education Committee.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion- Brian Katz moved **“to approve the minutes of the March 27, April 3, and April 17 meetings as submitted.”**

John Pfautz seconded.

There was no discussion and a vote was taken.

MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 27, APRIL 3, AND APRIL 17 MEETINGS AS SUBMITTED.

III. New Business

1. ***Approval of LSFY 102 and LSFY 103 Common Elements Checklists***

Meg Gillette presented the checklists. She suggested that during that the committee consider all proposals submitted under both numbers for the time being to not eliminate work done over the summer.

Discussion ensued about the intent of the phrase “can you answer yes”. Would the committee look at proposals where not all were checked or is the intent that you must be able to say yes to all of the items.

Meg Gillette will add language indicating these are common elements and you should be able to answer yes to all.

It was suggested that the amount of space on the form be indicative of what kind of answers the committee hopes to receive, perhaps through the use of boxes.

We will wait to add ICC language to the form as that has not yet been rolled out.

Meg Gillette will vet all submissions.

Discussion ensued as to whether or not we could move forward with approval without seeing the changes/additions/corrections discussed.

Rowan Schussheim-Anderson **motion “ to approve the LSFY 102 and LSFY 103 Common Elements Checklists with the additions/corrections/changes discussed.”**

Lendol Calder seconded.

The floor was opened to any further discussion. There being none, a vote was taken.

MOTION PASSED. MINUTES STAND APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

2. **Discussion of Gen Ed’s goals for 2013-14**

Carolyn Hough and Kristen Douglas had met and talked about goals for this academic year and where the committee will head.

Goal #1: Modified ages draft by Week 6 of Winter term. Faculty forum and conversation in January with a vote in the Spring.

Starting point-There are two realities that must be addressed.

--Assessment-This is the wave of future, it is here not going away. With Ages we can't say what is working and what is not, we have received some good data from LSFY, but for LPs and suffixes we don't know

--Student learning outcomes- We have identified nine outcomes. These learning outcomes were discussed frequently in forums and retreats. How do they fit with Ages?

The two need to go together. The question becomes how do we move forward?

Discussion ensued with the following topics:

Requiring a portfolio as a graduation requirement organized around the nine learning outcomes. Student is responsible for arguments and supporting materials, academic advisors, would evaluate and assess. It would be nice for advisors to be paid for this. The portfolio allows students to bring in artifacts from various facets of their experience- classes, campus life, Greek life—and would most likely require students to use things outside of their major. The portfolio would not necessarily tear down Ages. There was discussion that the portfolio is bigger than just the Gen Ed Committee. Portfolio has a lot of responsibility on student. As we approve courses, we are asking faculty to tell how they are going to make those connections and outcomes. How do outcomes map to expectations? The question was asked “ who is in charge of this conversation about portfolio and outcomes?” Kristen Douglas answered that it would be the assessment for improvement committee. It was thought that collaboration with major stakeholders would assist in providing direction for the committee.

We will have to reform what our goals are through Ages with ICC, can we make the Winter term week 6 deadline? It was thought that while that may be a daunting deadline, the committee can do things piecemeal, complete ICC and work towards a portfolio model. The question offered for reflection was, “How many years have we not rolled out anything?”

We need to know how to tweak the Ages system before we assess, finish that and ICC and then move forward. It was noted that ICC must be completed this year as that was a motion passed and filed in the minutes.

The question was asked, what will impact of new strategic plan be on what we are doing? Again, it was noted that bringing in other stakeholders will help with direction. It was noted that faculty/staff have expressed that there are too many changes without qualitative data to support those changes. Staffing concerns are an important piece of data.

It was decided to invite Ellen Hay to a meeting to get the Assessment/Gen Ed synergy going.

The committee will pick up the conversation about rolling I into PN.

It was expressed that we need to get down to nitty gritty and make decisions even if those decisions are not popular.

The overall goal is to have one set of objectives.

There were questions about Gen Ed's role as assessor. What are we assessing when we are measuring something that has not happened yet?

It was felt that everyone should do their homework before our next discussion. Some expressed an interest in dividing up to discuss LPs and language that would map them. Carolyn suggested that the week four meeting could be broken into groups.

3. Discussion of Gen Ed's proposal approval process for 2013-14

Members liked the consent agenda used in the past. Not everyone would review everything coming through but the documents will be available on the Google Drive for all who want to see them. Those proposals which the subcommittees feel need to have discussion will be removed from the consent agenda and placed into discussion at the meeting.

It was suggested that for our next meeting some proposals be taken off of the consent agenda so we can discuss. This will give new members a better idea of what it is we are looking at when reviewing proposals. We will do this either by taking off those suggested for discussion by the committee or if none are put up for discussion, Carolyn will pick a few to take off the consent agenda.

Proposal Subcommittees for 2013-14-

LP- Brian Katz, Janine Finley, John Pfautz, Rowan Schussheim-Anderson, Mike Egan

LSFY- Meg Gillette, Katie Hanson, Lendol Calder, Nathan Frank, Stefanie Bluemle, Rick Jaeschke

4. Update from Academic Affairs

Kristen Douglas shared Pareena Lawrence's desire to rename the committee- Liberal Arts Core Curriculum as opposed to Gen Ed. The committee asked what needs to happen for this to be done. Kristen will check and let everyone know at the next meeting.

There was a request to look at LSC201- transfer student course. Do we need to modify that class? It would be beneficial to hear the collected feedback and look at perhaps not requiring the class for those transferring a greater number of credits. (The data seems to suggest that those with a higher number of transferring credits do not find the course to be as beneficial as those transferring a smaller number of credits.) If changes are warranted, Academic Affairs would like to see them in place for Fall 2014.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT

Our next meeting will be Wednesday, September 4 at 4:00 PM. All course proposals to be considered at that meeting are already in Google docs.

Agenda, minutes and any other supporting materials will be available by Friday of each week.

V. ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt