

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

September 4, 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, LendoI Calder, Meg Gillette, Mike Egan, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Katie Hanson, Brian Katz, Rick Jaeschke, Danica Gray (SGA), Eric Pitts (SGA)

Guests Present: Kristen Douglas, Christina Myatt

Introduction of SGA Members

Carolyn Hough invited our two SGA reps that were present to introduce themselves to the committee. The committee welcomed them and thanked them for their work.

I. Approval of Minutes

Motion- Brian Katz moved **“to approve the minutes of the August 28th meeting as submitted.”**

Rick Jaeschke seconded.

Some thought that we needed to revise the statement about rolling I into PN. It was requested that the minutes be altered to read, “The committee will pick up the conversation about rolling I into PN.”

A vote was taken.

MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 28TH MEETINGS WITH THE ABOVE NOTED CORRECTION.

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

II. New Business

1. Approval of Consent Agenda

Lendol Calder motion “**to approve the Consent Agenda (LSFY 102: From Montaigne to monty Python, LSFY 102: From Massachusetts Bay to Sesame Street, LSFY 102: From Once to Ever After, PL Learning prospective- GERM/SCAN 220, PA learning Perspective- SCAN 241)**”

Rowen Schussheim-Anderson seconded.

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

MOTION PASSED. THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS STAND APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

2. Approval of LSFY 102 Course(s)

Mike Egan motion “**to approve LSFY 102: From BritPo to AmPo**”

Rick Jaeschke seconded.

The floor was opened to discussion.

The question was asked if the committee could approve the course with advisement. There was discussion about complying with the new checklist and how to handle proposals submitted before that checklist was approved.

It was agreed that Meg Gillette would counsel people about the new checklist.

There being no more discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

MOTION PASSED. LSFY 102: FROM BRITPO TO AMPO STANDS APPROVED.

3. Approval of Learning Prospective(s)/Suffix(es)

Brian Katz moved, “**to approve the PH learning perspective for CLAS328: Classical Epic**”

Mike Egan seconded.

The floor was opened to discussion.

Some thought that the course syllabus still read as a PL- most assignments are literature based, no use of secondary sources is noted. If it was truly a PH would depend largely on what was being done in class as the written assignments seem less attached to PH values.

It was noted that the proposal/description makes the PH distinction very clear but the syllabus does not.

The committee hoped that the course would hit literature a little less, human values a little more, and that the syllabus would make it clearer to students how the course applies to the liberal core criteria

There was discussion about the committee's hope that in the future there would be the opportunity to do an actual walk through of course with the instructor and see how the learning perspectives were achieved.

There being no more discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

MOTION PASSED. THE PH LEARNING PERSPECTIVE FOR CLAS 328: CLASSICAL EPIC WAS APPROVED.

Mike Egan moved, **"to approve the G Suffix for CLAS328: Classical Epic"**

Janene Finley seconded.

The floor was opened to discussion.

Discussion focused on what is the "spirit" of the G Suffix. Does "global" mean more than a western take? Does G apply to ancient and contemporary cultures/issues? The current forms say "non-US" but not contemporary but would Canada (which is non-US) satisfy that part of a G suffix designation?

Other questions/concerns raised:

The course meets the letter of what a G is but not necessarily the spirit.

There could be some really interesting secondary source usage but that is not how the course is designed.

Does this course help them learn to live in an ever changing world?

It was noted that there is a precedent to not approving classics in past for G.

It was also noted that the committee has a difficult time deciding on terminology to describe this, no terminology comes up that all can agree on, and ultimately the committee has to go with some terminology on the forms and assume there is a spirit behind that terminology. We don't have a way of describing some things without offending people.

There being no additional discussion the motion was put to a vote. The vote was too close to determine a clear outcome and so the Chair asked for a hand vote.

The hand vote results were: Yea- 6, Nay-7

MOTION FAILS.

Carolyn Hough will send an email with feedback from the committee.

4. Discussion of AGES and Assessment with Ellen Hay

When we started talking about mapping and further mapping AGES onto student learning outcomes, the committee decided to invite Ellen Hay to talk with us about assessment.

The committee does not want to make moves that are off target and saw the ability to talk with and ask questions of Ellen as a learning opportunity.

Ellen hay provided the following information.

Individual departments have been asked to ask an interesting question, find out answer, and find ways to use that answer to improve what they are doing.

Alumni survey showed that students felt their education had lacked oral communication training.

She suggested that the committee ask questions that come out of Mark Salisbury's work especially when looking at learning outcomes.

Ellen suggests that the committee not become overwhelmed. Don't feel like you have to do everything every year. Analyze syllabi, collect papers from courses. Think of four year agenda of what you want to look at.

Question from the committee: Should we have an assessment strategy for each learning perspective?

Ellen- We have data from Wabash study, information is out there. What questions do we have, what answers do we have, what holes need to be filled? Great data on writing, some on civic engagement and responsible citizenship.

Question from the committee: ICC makes some feel out of their depth, lots of rubrics and models; we have a series of questions and objectives, and need to devise a way to do that assessment. The two need to line up; easy to feel overwhelmed, how do we start?

Ellen- Go to what we have already. A particular area that could use growth is "sensitivity to diverse cultural issues".

Question from the committee: How do we access that study?

Ellen: It is on the IR website.

Question from the committee: If inter cultural awareness is a weakness, do we pull some classes and look at things for examples of good and bad?

Comment from committee: AGES is a big black box. We know what's going in but not necessarily what is coming out. Hard to show what is driving/not driving this.

Comment from committee: If the Wabash study uses current DG, means current DG is not getting where we want. We can try something different, still may not get there but can reassess and try something else.

Question from committee: Was the Wabash study the reason for the move to ICC?

Ellen- The Wabash was just one indicator.

Comment from the committee: could the "spirit of G" be a special project of assessment for the short term future?

Comment from committee: We voted last year to eliminate D and G

Comment from committee- We need to know what do we need to do, could do, and should not

do. Seeing if things fit criteria is ours, collecting data maybe, analyzing data-no. Should we try and collect things we think are useful or should we not collect data where we don't have a question?

Ellen- Having a question will clarify the process.

Question from committee: We are struggling because we are talking ICC which is tied to an outcome and then we have PP, PH, etc. and we try to map. How do we move forward with ICC and then still have perspectives?

Ellen- The whole discussion of ICC does not come from one course. This might be something the committee would do in conjunction with the international studies committee.

Lendol Calder mentioned an article he had read that pertained to Liberal Arts Curriculum. There was interest in this article and Carolyn Hough said that she would get the information and send it out as part of the Google Docs for our next meeting.

It was noted that ICC can't do it all but must do something to move us closer to the objective.

Comment from the committee: If student learning outcomes are our new direction-, they don't map as readily to LPs.

Ellen- They map to disciplines.

It was suggested that perhaps time should be taken to revisit the Gen Ed Committee's goals.

Carolyn Hough offered the following suggestion: Let's continue discussion next week, revisit Excel spreadsheet, revisit the knowledge skills sheet, and use these as documents to help us move forward. We can discuss ways to tackle this; as a whole, divide and conquer, etc.

5. Update from Academic Affairs

Because of the time, this was tabled until next meeting.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT

Our next meeting will be Wednesday, September 11 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 5:01 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt