

**MTSU University General Education Meeting
Minutes for April 2, 2021**

Committee members attending: Samuel Blumer, Janis Brickey, Lando Carter, Warner Cribb, Mark Frame, Terry Goodin, Ryan Korstange (Chair), Kevin Krahenbuhl, Aliou Ly, Tammy Melton, Greg Nagel, James Piekarski, Deana Raffo, Laura White

Ex-officio members attending: Jeff Gibson, Susan Myers-Shirk (Director), Steve Severn

Design team members attending: Katherine Brackett, Brian Frank, Kristen West

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 pm by Ryan Korstange, Chair.

Discussion of Current Draft of Outcomes

Ryan shared that the latest draft of the outcomes is based on feedback from our last meeting. Changes include streamlining descriptions and removing evaluative language. He suggested that we begin the meeting with giving everyone 30 minutes to read the latest draft. He asked members to consider 1) if the changes reflect last week's discussion and 2) if any additional revisions are needed.

Mark Frame asked for a historical perspective on Gen Ed outcomes at MTSU. Susan responded that Gen Ed outcomes were previously mandated by TBR (and we were a TBR institution). This means that MTSU is engaging in this process for the first time. The current program has 32 learning outcomes. The national trend is toward program-level assessment (rather than category-, discipline-, or course-level assessment) with fewer total outcomes. The outcomes should align with our values and be condensed to fewer outcomes to assess across the program.

Upon returning from the 30-minute reading period, Ryan said since we are looking at the outcomes from a variety of experiences and perspectives is valuable.

Susan polled the group to get a sense for what the committee thinks about where we are and how close we may be getting to sending out the document for public comment. Results – send as is 24%, little tweaking to accomplish today 59%, tweaking in next week 18%, approach is flawed and needs additional discussion 0%.

Comments were made in the margins and the committee worked through the changes as follows:

- Technical changes suggested - add subheadings, move the “ask” to the beginning, start each table on a new page – changes made
- Objective B, Critical thinking – question about “before” change to “in the process of” – changes made
- Objective B heading – analysis and inquiry pairing and overlap discussion - changes made where “analysis” definition separated from “inquiry” definition – heading changed to Critical Thinking, Inquiry and Analysis

- Objective A – “public and embodied communication” vs. public and interpersonal communication discussion or public communication – suggested change to remove “embodied” from title and included as a component in the description with “language and embodied expression” – additional discussion about where interpersonal communication should be included and is included in the document
- Inquiry and Analysis – “topic” changed to “problem or situation” – change made
- Limitations and implications – added “uncertainties” to description – change made
- Civic engagement definition – “our communities and our world” vs “our communities, our state, our country, and our world” discussion – no changes made but add citation
- C1 – suggestion to add “adaptability” with “intercultural understanding” discussion – “understanding” and “competence” discussion – “tolerance,” “empathy” suggestions – - straw poll on “intercultural competence” wording – 82% voted no changes - no changes made to keep it broad
- Intercultural Understanding – “aesthetic expression” got left out – change made
- Quantitative Literacy – is “assumptions” description clear? – added “provides a rationale for their appropriateness”- change made

Ryan stated that one issue may still be unresolved which is the omission of interpersonal communication and/or teamwork. Decided to wait to see what comments come in and then decide if it is a substantive issue that needs to be addressed.

Mark Frame made a motion to send the current version of the outcomes out for public comment, Tammy Melton seconded.

Susan shared that there will be multiple ways to get feedback on the document. There is a mandatory two-week period for discussion. Warner Cribb asked if two weeks is long enough for people to meet and discuss. The Chairs Council meets on the 19th. Suggestion was made that the deadline be the 21st. There is a Gen Ed meeting is on the 23rd. Susan and Katie will make comments available to the committee as they come in.

A friendly amendment was made to make the document available for public comment until the end of business on April 21st (assumes it goes out by end of business on April 5th).

The committee unanimously approved to “Send the current version of the outcomes for public comment until the end of business on Wednesday April 21 (assumes outcomes go out by the end of business April 5).

Mark Frame made a motion to not meet on April 16th and review the outstanding teaching award applications electronically, Warner Cribb seconded. 100% approval.

With no new business, the meeting adjourned at 4:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Deana Raffo, Recording Secretary