

**General Education Committee
Minutes**

February 11, 2002

Present: Mark Hardt
George Benedict
James Nowlin

Randall Gloege
Michael Dennis

Absent: Barbara Zuck
Squy Wallace – *excused*

John Cech – *ex-officio*
George White – *ex-officio*
Janie Park – *ex-officio*
Dan Zirker – *ex-officio*

Randy Rhine – *ex-officio*
Joe Michels – *ex-officio*
Curt Kochner – *ex-officio*

Presiding: Mark Hardt, Chair

Mark Hardt called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. in CEHS 216.

The January 28 meeting minutes were approved.

I Motion Regarding Adjudication of Gen Ed Courses

Motion (from 11/26/02) as presented to the Academic Senate on January 30, 2003:
Motion by James Nowlin, seconded by Michael Dennis to recommend to the Academic Senate that **the General Education Committee**, in addition to its current charges, **become the adjudicator of acceptance or rejection of proposals for General Education and report directly to the Academic Senate.**
Motion carried.

It was cited that this motion failed in the Senate 6 to 5. A new motion can therefore be made.

It was stated that the Senate can ultimately approve, reject, and remand the Gen Ed proposed courses, should it be necessary.

It was noted that no one seems to be happy with Gen Ed as it is now. A break with tradition is needed.

It was also stated by several committee members that if the Gen Ed Committee is not allowed the power to adjudicate the Gen Ed course proposals, they will not serve on such a committee.

Resolution

The General Education Committee recommends to the Academic Senate that the General Education Committee, in addition to its current charges, become the adjudicator of acceptance or rejection of proposals for General Education and report directly to the Academic Senate. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee evaluates course proposals for academic merit, but judgement for eligibility and placement into the General Education Program is the responsibility of the General Education Committee, which reports directly to the Academic Senate.

- Motion by Randall Gloege, seconded by James Nowlin to approve the resolution.
- Motion unanimously approved.

It was noted that class size should be evaluated for the submissions for Gen Ed. It was also noted that this resolution is not to take from the UCC, because they can talk over Gen Ed and hash it out as much as needed. This resolution merely adds another step.

II. Mission Statement and Objective

It was noted that using “Distribution” instead of “General Education” will confuse students and also other institutions our students may transfer to.

It was also noted that if the label of General Education is changed, it will have to be noted both ways for at least the next two catalogs, e.g. Distribution (General Education). Even if the name is changed, which is desirable, people will call it Gen Ed for many years to come.

It was also noted that the word *general* in General Education is not clear. What kind of *general* is meant?

Academic Core or Core Curriculum were suggested, but it was noted that most majors already have a core, and that should not be confused with Gen Ed.

It was stated that it could be called, at least for a few years to come, Academic Foundation (General Education). The committee agreed that this is an appropriate and clear name.

It was cited that the mission statement for Academic Foundation (General Education) needs to be brief and to the point.

The meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna