

**General Education Committee
Meeting Minutes for January 24, 2020**

Committee members attending: Janice Brickey, Lando Carter, Joey Gray, Ryan Korstange, Kevin Krahenbuhl, Melissa Lobegeier, Aliou Ly, Theresa McBreen, Tammy Melton, Greg Nagel, Ryan Otter, Deana Raffo, Karen Reed, Connie Schmidt, Laura White

Ex-officio members attending: Chris Brewer, Peter Cunningham, Leah Lyons, Steve Severn

General Education Design Team members attending: Michelle Boyer-Pennington, Keith Gamble

SGA student representatives attending: Samuel Blumer

Guests attending: Ann McCullough, Kari Neely, Jason Pettigrew, Roger Pieroni

Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 2:12 PM by Aliou Ly.

Announcements & Reminders:

- Susan first brought up the topic of the committee's voting procedures. Since the last meeting, Susan met with committee chair Aliou Ly and committee vice-chair Ryan Korstange to discuss the issue. Steve Severn gave the committee a working document to use going forward, however we are going to postpone changes to both our voting and operating procedures for now.
- Susan stated that the committee would like to thank the faculty from World Languages and Cultures who are attending their fourth General Education committee meeting. Susan apologized that our procedures problem has held up the vote on their proposal.

Approval of Minutes: Minutes for the meeting on November 22, 2019 were unanimously approved.

Old Business: Tabled proposal for FL 1000

- Aliou said that departmental faculty from World Languages and Cultures were present to answer any questions from the committee regarding the proposal. A motion to bring the proposal to the table was seconded. Aliou reminded the committee that the proposal only had to address 4 of the 7 areas of social sciences to be recommended to move forward.
- Connie Schmidt stated that she had some questions/comments for the departmental faculty. She reiterated that although this looks like an interesting course, her department (Psychology) does not feel it fulfills the goals of social sciences. Connie said that social sciences are a perspective that involves shared methodology/theories. The common methodology is the scientific method, and there are methods courses in the program to make sure that this methodology is addressed. This class, however, uses primarily the linguistic methodologies such as discourse analysis, which are not typical

social sciences methodologies. Connie is concerned about broadening the definitions of any of the General Education categories because this could open up other areas for redefinition, and gave several examples. Connie stated that this course is better suited for the humanities section, and she read the General Education description for humanities. Connie also pointed out how the textbook title for the proposed course better reflects the humanities category.

- Kari Neely responded. She stated that they have to teach cultural components in their classes. Her methodological approach reflects her background in anthropology. She pointed out TBR's former social/behavioral guidelines talk about cultures. Kari pointed out that peer institutions offer linguistics classes.
- Connie Schmidt responded to Kari and asked if the other instructors for this course would be anthropologists; Kari responded no.
- Samuel asked if this would be a distance education course; Kari responded that they don't know yet.
- Kevin asked Connie if her primary concern was that students opting into this course would not take methodology courses. Connie said no, that the concern is social sciences such as psychology do not use the same methodologies as foreign language. Kari responded with several charts to demonstrate that they used linguistic methodologies common to anthropology such as discourse analysis. Kevin asked if there was any training on these methodologies for the students, because these methodologies are heavy concepts and this class is designed as an undergraduate course (even freshmen could take the course). Kari said yes, they are guided.
- Aliou asked if there were any last comments before voting. Kari gave an overview of the importance of this course to our students in helping them better understand global issues.
- Aliou explained the procedures for the vote: a 2/3 majority was needed for the proposal to move forward. Today 17 committee members were in attendance. The vote was phrased as: recommend or reject the proposal. The results were that 12 recommended, and 5 rejected. Kari stated that if our procedure allowed for a 2/3 majority of the committee members present, rather than 2/3 majority of all the members on the committee, then the proposal would have passed.

New Business:

- Vote on a moratorium on new proposals
 - Aliou stated that the vote today reiterated that we needed to get our procedures in order. The provost highly recommended that we adopt a moratorium on any additional proposals until we get our procedures in order (the problem being that currently every committee member must vote; if you aren't present for the vote then your vote is considered a No). Tammy clarified that this is a moratorium on any new proposals until we are done with the Gen Ed redesign. Steve suggested we should accept new proposals, but just not act upon them; they would be filed in Curriculog but wouldn't be acted upon. Tammy said there

would be no incentive for faculty to do so. Susan said that redesign is a big undertaking; we need to clear our desk so we can focus on the redesign. Peter said that anyone could create anything in Curriculog; however, our directions say that anyone considering doing a Gen Ed course proposal must first speak to the Gen Ed director (Susan). So at that point, Susan could easily explain to people that we aren't taking proposals until the Gen Ed redesign is completed.

- A motion was made, and seconded, for a vote on a moratorium on considering new course proposals until the completion of the Gen Ed redesign. The results were: 13 yes (to a moratorium), and 4 no (no moratorium; continue accepting proposals). With these results, the Gen Ed committee will not accept any more course proposals until after the redesign is complete.
- Update on General Education Redesign Timeline: Susan Myers-Shirk, Director of General Education
 - Susan presented the schedule for Gen Ed redesign (see Appendix A). Susan stated that whatever structural changes we make need to be tied to our values, and our values need to be tied to our outcomes. The models for potential change are coming, based on all the conversations, town halls, etc. Susan stated that we should talk to our colleagues about the models. Our goal is to narrow down to 3 models, at which point we'll send the models out to the university community. We'll have a public forum to allow them to comment on the models. The data we get in March, regarding university feedback, will be presented at the April meeting.
 - Committee discussed the need to get our voting procedures worked out.

Appendix A: Redesign schedule

General Education Redesign Spring Schedule

General Education Learning Outcomes Workshops

Wednesday, February 05, 2020	2:20-3:45	JUB 100
Friday, February 07, 2020	9:50-11:15	JUB 100
Wednesday, February 12, 2020	8:30-9:55	JUB 100
Thursday, February 13, 2020	1:00-2:25	JUB 100
Monday, February 17, 2020	10:20-11:45	JUB 100
Tuesday, February 18, 2020	2:40-4:05	JUB100
Friday, February 21, 2020	9:40-11:15	JUB 100
More as needed		

University General Education Committee

Friday, January 24, 2020 Faculty Senate Room (JUB 100) 2:00-4:00 PM

Friday, February 07, 2020 Faculty Senate Room (JUB 100) 2:00-4:00 PM

Friday, February 21, 2020 Faculty Senate Room (JUB 100) 2:00-4:00 PM

Friday, March 06, 2020 Faculty Senate Room (JUB 100) 2:00-4:00 PM

Friday, March 20, 2020 General Education Outstanding Teaching Award Subcommittee Faculty Senate Room (JUB 100) 2:00-4:00 PM

Friday, April 03, 2020 Faculty Senate Room (JUB 100) 2:00-4:00 PM

Friday, April 17, 2020 Faculty Senate Room (JUB 100) 2:00-4:00 PM

Timeline

February & March:

- Workshops for any interested university faculty to participate in articulating student learning outcomes for the new general education program; based on values defined during focus groups, spring 2019 (see attached).
- University General Education Committee reviews and refines models provided by design team; votes on models to be sent to university community for review and comment

March:

- Public forums for university-wide debate on models; date and location TBD
- University General Education Committee reviews nominees for Outstanding Teaching in General Education Award
- University General Education Committee solicits letters of interest from departments who wish to participate in the redesigned general education curriculum.

April:

- University General Education Committee votes on its preferred model* and makes recommendation
- Review by Admissions and Standards
- Forwarded to Provost's office for review and approval

NOTE: This refers to approval of the structure or model. AY 2020-2021 will be devoted to additional design and outcomes writing, depending upon which components are approved.