



**General Education Committee
Minutes**

January 25, 2022

Present: Bernie Quetchenbach
Josh Hill
Mara Pierce
Sarah Friedman
Brian Gurney
Susan Gilbertz (ex-officio)

Melinda Tilton
Emily Arendt
Scott Jeppesen
Jeff Willardson
Lance Mouser

Absent: Tien Chih
Jason Comer*
Megan Thomas*

Rachel Schaffer*
Cori Day*

*excused

Guests: Kathleen Thatcher

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. in LA 512 with some members attending via webex.

I. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

The minutes of December 10 were accepted as presented.

II. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Interstate Passport Update

Provost Eskandari signed the Interstate Passport agreement December 31, and Cheri Johannes, our liaison, has committed to making sure our Education students can transfer as seamlessly as possible. Ms. Tilton noted she and Dr. Arendt will be meeting on Passport on Monday, and one of the questions they will ask is if we can map our 9 outcomes onto their 66 outcomes, rather than mapping all our courses. The goal is to create a “block” students can transfer. They will also ask what happens if a student does not finish a block. It appears that the only real gap between Passport’s outcomes and ours is their teamwork area. Some of Passport’s outcomes seem less measureable, but Passport does say the outcomes will evolve over time and will be reviewed every five years.

MSUB is the first institution in Montana to sign on with Passport. The Commissioner of Higher Education has already stated that Passport will be a priority for the rest of the Montana University System. It was noted that, due to CCN, much of the system should already be in alignment, but until other institutions in Montana sign on with Passport, they will still be doing individual transcript auditing for transfer students.

Ms. Tilton noted that she did ask the Passport representative about schools that have signed on and then left. There were two: one left because it was not a good fit, and the other created an in-house solution so they no longer needed Passport. If we do leave Passport, we must make sure our students are taken care of.

III. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Curriculum Mapping

The next step after mapping is to go through each subcategory and discover what we are doing to meet each of those outcomes. Faculty do a lot to meet course outcomes, and it may be that the final project of the course is how students achieve the Gen Ed outcome.

Assessment of student learning can become blurry. An example is Symphonic Band, where the whole group of students performs a concert. Any one student is not necessarily assessed singularly. In that situation, the GEC may have to rely on the instructor assessing the students as a group and providing that information. Further, student artifacts do not necessarily need to be understandable to those outside the discipline—those who would have no context—but that’s why a mixture of evaluators from and outside the discipline will be needed to review such assessments.

The Co-Chairs reviewed the curriculum maps and found some courses had no “Achieved” for any of the outcomes, which seems unlikely. The probable reason is that the faculty were judging at a major or 400 level, but really we need to judge “achieved” at a Gen Ed level. Therefore, the maps should be reviewed, especially those that have no A’s or all A’s. This week’s outside collaboration will be to touch base and discuss the curriculum maps with subgroups.

The meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.