

**General Education Committee
Minutes**

February 24, 2020

Present: Tien Chih
Melinda Tilton
Matt Queen
Emily Arendt
Leanne Gilbertson
Brian Gurney
Megan Thomas
Devin Williams (student)
Kathleen Thatcher (ex-officio)

Bernie Quetchenbach
Jason Comer
Josh Hill
Randi O'Brien
Cori Day
Lance Mouser
Naomi Norris (student)
Jame Nuzuga (student)

Absent: Will Hobbs*
*excused

Guest: Anne Cole

Melinda Tilton called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. in Missouri Room.

The minutes of January 27 were accepted as presented.

I. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Request for Gen Ed Syllabi & One Artifact per Outcome

The draft memo to department chairs was presented. The question was raised as to whether the GEC should request copies of student work that are turned in for the assignments which faculty indicate are meeting the Gen Ed outcomes. It will give us an idea of what we will be assessing in the future. However, it's pretty unlikely that faculty have retained copies of student work from past semesters, and even if they did retain copies, it will take time to round up. We could request the syllabus now and ask for the artifacts of student work by the end of the semester. We may only get courses offered this semester, but it would be useful information. Further, if we gather these artifacts at the end of this semester, we will not review them until Fall semester.

It was noted that D2L does have the ability to "bring back" student work stored in the course shell. Faculty have to request it and it's only available for 24 hours, but it is there.

If we ask for student assignments, we will need guidelines on how much we want. If the assessment is just a test, do we want the whole test? It was noted that we would only want the individual questions from the test which assess the Gen Ed outcomes. This brings up the question of what the GEC should or can do if an assessment is not good enough. If an assessment in a course does not meet our standards, whatever they might be, we have to be willing to pull a course from Gen Ed. Otherwise, we are a rubber stamp.

It was noted that it might be valuable to survey the students in the course to find out if they think the Gen Ed outcomes have been met.

B. Gen Ed Re-Envisioning

The group is moving forward with getting the courses that are not taught out of Gen Ed.

C. CourseLeaf Update

CourseLeaf will be rolled out in Fall, and the course form will include Gen Ed outcomes.

D. Criteria for New Gen Ed Course Proposals

We need something beyond the three outcomes per category to judge whether courses are appropriate for Gen Ed. Many courses that are 300- and 400-level would meet Gen Ed outcomes, but they are for specialists in their fields. Even if a course is in Gen Ed, it should not be meant for a major. However, we already have courses in Gen Ed that are meant for majors, which are included so students don't have to take an additional course on top of Gen Ed. It was suggested that a course needs to meet the needs of students from a wide range of knowledge and skill levels. It was noted that the Committee can always approve a course for Gen Ed if there is a compelling reason to do so.

It was suggested that a preferred, but not required, criteria could be transferability. We can still offer courses that don't transfer, but they will likely be few.

It was noted that courses may have a defined lifespan. The topic may change over time, especially if it is related to technology. Will the course be an enduring skill?

We can ask the proposers to explain how they plan to assess the Gen Ed outcomes, and even ask for assignments. The course would not be locked into these assignments, but it would be good to know the faculty have thought the course all the way through. Further, we could indicate preference for High Impact Practices (HIPs), or ask which HIPs would be appropriate for a course. How exactly the course will be taught should not be set by the GEC, but we can ask for documentation that the course is planned out fully.

E. MUS Gen Ed Committee Update

It is unknown if this group is currently meeting.

F. Gen Ed Re-Envisioning continued

If we will be forced to overhaul Gen Ed, why evaluate what we have now?

It was noted that the re-envisioning is not intended to be an overhaul of Gen Ed. The effort is more about taking what we have now and moving it toward a more integrative model, as the integrative model appears to be an effective practice. However, any changes must be approved by

the Academic Senate. What is changed and how we change it is ultimately up to the GEC and the Senate. It was noted that changing too many parts of Gen Ed at one time will prove difficult, especially if FTE is impacted. The strategic planning subcommittee will share any articles on the integrative model of Gen Ed.

Kathleen Thatcher noted that NWCCU's revised guidelines talk about institutional outcomes rather than Gen Ed. They have said many times that many institutions have way too many outcomes. A good number of institutional outcomes is somewhere between six and twelve. We could make the Gen Ed outcomes our institutional outcomes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.