General Education Committee Minutes

September 24, 2002

Squy Wallace

Present: Mark Hardt Randall Gloege

George Benedict Barbara Zuck

Dan Zirker – ex-officio

Absent: George Madden

Janie Park - ex-officioGeorge White - ex-officioJoe Michels - ex-officioJohn Cech - ex-officioRandy Rhine - ex-officioCurt Kochner - ex-officio

Guests: Sandie Rietz Michael Dennis

Brent Roberts St. John Robinson

Presiding: Mark Hardt, Chair

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

There was a quorum.

The minutes from September 19, 2002 were approved.

I. NEW BUSINESS

A. Report from the Gen Ed Committee 2001-2002. Mark Hardt handed out a draft of the report to be submitted to the Academic Senate.

It was noted that capstone is not the proper term for a junior year course. However, summary and/or synthesis is the goal of the course. It was decided that the course should be called a General Education Milestone. Synthesis would not be stressed, but rather a "bringing together" or summary.

It was then stated that the Honors Council is contemplating having face-to-face negotiations with Bozeman, to allow MSU-B's honor courses to transfer to Bozeman. Many of the University's transfer students go to Bozeman, so this could clear up some big problems students have experienced.

It was cited that the points in the Gen Ed Report to the Senate should be numbered, so they are easy to refer to.

- Motion by Randall Gloege, seconded by Squy Wallace to approve the report with changes discussed.
- Motion carried with one abstention.
- **B.** Status of Psychology course at the COT. Barbara Zuck stated that she is still researching the situation.
- C. Outcomes Assessment, Sandie Rietz. Dr. Rietz laid out a chart of her results from the survey of Senate members (This chart is available on the Senate website: http://www.msubillings.edu/senate). She divided them into five areas, the five areas of human development. These headings were labeled Intellectual Growth and Development: Content/Thought/Expression, Skills Development and Application, Physical Development, Social Development/Social Responsibility, Development of Individual Attitudes and Dispositions, and Spiritual Development. The comments of the Senate were then placed under the 5 headings.

It was pointed out that before any courses are cut, the committee should know exactly what goes on in that course, so the committee knows what it is cutting.

Dr. Rietz then stated that when they were going through NCATE accreditation, they built a grid similar to the one she presented here and then she went through each of her courses to see which requirements they met. Each course did not meet *all* the requirements on the grid. She ended up writing a three to four page paper explaining how each course met the requirements. The same could be done for Gen Ed courses.

It was stated that the outcomes need to be separate from professional judgement, something that a committee could vote yes or no to.

It was also cited that the University could cut the Oral Skills category, as it is not required by the Regents. However, the Regents could always change their minds on the minimum requirements of Gen Ed.

It was indicated that the source of the five-area Human Development chart should be found for the next meeting. It was also noted that a short article explaining the theory involved should be brought to the next meeting for those who don't have a great deal of experience in human development.

The point was raised that the University should be able to explain why these 30± credits of Gen Ed are so important.

The question was then raised as to whether all five areas need to be addressed at the University level. Also, do they need to be covered equally?

It was stated that this is a point of departure to begin building a structure to plug information into.

It was noted that in the past, the goal of Gen Ed was expressed as "learning what is to be a human being."

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna