

**General Education Committee
Minutes**

February 12, 2024

Present:	Mark Jacobson Melinda Tilton Ana Diaz Daniel Charlton Eileen Wright Bryan Grove (ex-officio)	Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey Emily Arendt Jason Comer Chairsty Stewart Aaron Schultz (ex-officio)
Absent:	Paul Pope* Keara Rhoades* Jeff Willardson*	Mara Pierce Daniel Willems*
	*excused	

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. in LA 627.

I. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 22 were accepted as presented.

II. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**A. Additional Submissions for Respect Diversity**

Five more courses submitted artifacts. The updated list is as follows:

Emily Arendt & Mara Pierce	PSYX 100 instructors 1 and 2 BGEN 105A
Daniel Charlton & Paul Pope	PSYX 100 instructor 3 SOCI 201 LO1 PSCI 210 instructor 2
Jason Comer & Keara Rhoades	SOCI 201 LO2 PSCI 220
Ana Diaz & Chairsty Stewart	PSCI 210 instructor 1 NASX 105 PHL 110

Bryan Grove & Jeff Willardson	HSTR 159 HSTR 160
Mark Jacobson & Daniel Willems	HSTA 101 ARTH 160 HSTA 102 instructor 2
Jennifer Lodine-Chaffey & Eileen Wright	HONR 111 HSTA 102 instructor 1
Melinda Tilton & Aaron Schultz	ARTH 150 LIT 110

B. Curriculum Mapping for Problem Solve: Results of Conversations

Biology is good to go for outcome #4, but there is some debate about #5. Advise we move forward.

Geography didn't respond.

Math agrees with the curriculum map—all courses cover outcome #3. Some courses do achieve outcome #5, but there is some checking happening. Also, M 161 is not currently being taught and should not be included in the assessment.

Music did not respond either, but last time they needed more interaction to get a response.

It was suggested that an email with simple yes/no questions may elicit a response.

C. Respect Diversity Artifact Assessment: Progress Reports

Faculty didn't know the rubrics we are using to assess the student work, so it's hard to map assignments to the rubric. Especially for simple assignments like quizzes, it seems we are judging the assignment, not the student work. Group assignments were also challenging to judge. Remembering that these are (very often) 100-level courses, we need to keep our expectations at a Gen Ed level. However, revisiting our expectations, and the language we've used to state our expectations may be in our future!

It was noted that the rubric supplies us with good key words for judging the student work. Are students evaluating, applying, or analyzing?

We definitely had courses that submitted their top students' work, and some who submitted a variety of expertise. Our data is going to be skewed, but we are not looking to publish this work. This is our trial run and we will not be perfect.

D. Gen Ed Narratives/Talking Points

From the bulleted lists we have brainstormed earlier, we need to create talking points to share with the professional Advisors in the Advising Center, and also faculty advisors.

The group then broke to workshop.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.