



**General Education Committee
Minutes**

March 16, 2021

Present: Tien Chih
Melinda Tilton
Josh Hill
Mara Pierce
Brian Gurney
Bernie Quetchenbach
Jason Comer
Emily Arendt
Leanne Gilbertson
Lance Mouser

Absent: Matt Queen
Cori Day*
Laura Gittings-Carlson (ex-officio)*
*excused
Jeff Willardson*
Megan Thomas*

Guest: Anne Cole

Melinda Tilton called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. via Webex.

I. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

The minutes of February 16 were accepted as presented.

II. INFORMATION & UPDATES

Our April meeting will fall during Finals Week. A poll will be sent to confirm availability. Work is still on hold for A&SC 111.

III. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Title	Status	Received
Group 1		
PHL 271: Indian Philsphies Religions	Edited	3/8/2021
PHL 272: Chinese Philsphies Religions	Edited	3/8/2021
WRIT 201: College Writing II	Edited	3/8/2021
WRIT 220: Business Prof Writing	Edited	3/8/2021
WRIT 221: Intermediate Tech Writing	Edited	3/8/2021

- Group 1 was approved by unanimous consent.

It was noted that MART 260 (a course listed under Fine Arts) is in the process of being deleted as well. The Committee will receive an FYI notice.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Gen Ed Syllabi Review & Artifacts Collected Fall 2020 - REPORT

Ms. Tilton and Dr. Arendt will be writing a letter to the Department Chairs to “close the loop” on the course review process. Several members gave feedback that most of the syllabi they reviewed did not include the Gen Ed outcomes. Some did have the Gen Ed purpose statement, but it was inconsistently used. The letter to Chairs should indicate that each syllabus for each course offered every semester needs to have the purpose statement and outcomes, not just a sampling. It may be that part-time faculty are not informed of this requirement. It became clear that we may have only received the most recent syllabus, even though the review should actually cover the last two academic years. It was noted that the letter to Chairs should also give a heads-up on future collection of artifacts. We will need to standardize what we’re after to make it as simple as possible for Chairs to gather.

It was noted that in many situations, it was hard to see the direct connection from the artifact and a Gen Ed outcome. We likely need a rationale from the instructor about why the assignment meets an outcome or outcomes.

B. Gen Ed Program Outcomes Workshop

The timeline to get outcomes finished and approved by Senate means we need to decide on our outcomes very soon, so the outcomes can be reviewed by Departments before being brought to Senate. We need about 8 to 10 program outcomes.

Several ways to organize the outcomes were discussed. The group agreed that we should have four major categories the outcomes fall under, and narrowed down three of the four to: Solve Problems, Think Critically, and Communicate Effectively. However, the fourth area includes ideas that are much more nebulous. Titles suggested include social justice, social responsibility, citizenship, global citizen, engage ethically in a diverse world, and respect for diversity. It was noted that the “respect for diversity” language is straight from the purpose statement. It was finally agreed that Respect Diversity is a fine overall heading, if the *actions* we are looking for are covered by the outcomes under this heading.

It was suggested that we put all the proposed outcomes and into a survey, and the faculty could then vote to decide which outcomes are best. We could then choose the top 8-10. It was argued that we may end up with a less useful assortment this way, as well as lose the gestalt of the whole.

The Co-Chairs will eliminate some of the overlap and repetition in the proposed outcomes and then send them out to the group as next month’s homework.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.