

**General Education Committee
Minutes**

November 4, 2019

Present:	Tien Chih Melinda Tilton Matt Queen Emily Arendt Leanne Gilbertson Brian Gurney Naomi Norris (student)	Bernie Quetchenbach Jason Comer Josh Hill Randi O'Brien Cori Day Lance Mouser Kathleen Thatcher (ex-officio)
Absent:	Will Hobbs* Jordan Neff (student)	Megan Thomas*
	*excused	

Melinda Tilton called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. in the SUB Missouri Room.

The minutes of October 14 were accepted as presented.

I. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 20.h Gen Ed Course: GPHY 262 Spatial Sciences Technology and Applications. Submit for category II. B. Physical Sciences.

Item 20.i Gen Ed Course: GPHY 263 Spatial Sciences Technology Laboratory. Submit for category II. B. Physical Sciences.

Item 20.j Gen Ed Course: GPHY 111 Intro to Physical Geography. Remove from category II. B. Physical Sciences.

Item 20.k Gen Ed Course: GPHY 112 Intro to Phys Geography Lab. Remove from category II. B. Physical Sciences.

Since the faculty proposing these courses are unable to attend today, approval will be held until the December meeting.

It was noted that we could add transferability as one of the criteria for approval for our Gen Ed Core. Transferability could be preferred rather than required. At our next meeting, Kathleen Thatcher, Director of Assessment, will present her work on mapping out which of our Gen Ed

courses transfer to other units in the System. The presentation will also include courses that have not been offered in some time.

A concern was raised that the proposed new GPHY courses may not fit well into the Physical Science category. It all comes down to what we want our students to take away, to get out of Gen Ed. We must also balance the needs/objectives of the Gen Ed program with the needs of the major and minor programs.

- Motion by Matt Queen, seconded by Leanne Gilbertson to **approve Items 20.j and 20.k on first reading.**

- Motion carried.

II. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Letter to Academic Senate: Discontinuation of ETS Testing

The memo will state that no data will be collected this year to assess Gen Ed, because the ETS test is no longer being used. The Committee has seen nothing to change our minds about the best option being the ETS test, plus another assessment such as the e-portfolio.

B. Biennial Review of Gen Ed Courses: Template & Example

This biennial review was first proposed in 2010, and at that time, many Gen Ed courses were being taught by part-time faculty. Last year, the GEC Chairs sent a memo to the Department Chairs which included the Purpose Statement and Outcomes. What do we want in this review? A copy of each syllabus for each section would be best. Some departments do standardize their syllabi among part-time faculty, and departments can tell us that when they submit.

It was noted that we should also evaluate the Dual Enrollment courses being taught at area high schools. But how?

It was suggested that along with requesting a description of how the Gen Ed course meets the objectives and listing assignments, we could also ask for how many times the course has been offered in the last two years. We could ask whether it's being taught by full-time or part-time faculty. We could even ask when it's offered (Fall or Spring) and whether it's online. It was noted that information like this can be found by other means than asking the Department Chairs. We don't need to overburden them.

We could create a rubric that would allow Chairs to fill in the blank on how each course meets objectives, and with which assignments. The College of Education uses an Excel spreadsheet with one line for each objective. We could add a column for assignments or methods of assessment. We could place the spreadsheet in Box so it's available to all Chairs, and they can see each other's responses for examples. Another folder in Box would be the drop-off for syllabi. It was noted that if instructors fill the rubric out instead of Chairs, will we even have the part-time instructor of a course taught three or four semesters ago? Do part-time faculty even have access to Box?

It was noted that if we ask for assignments, we may well get a flood of tests and projects. It will be a lot of information to deal with, especially if the Gen Ed objectives are met through several assignments. What can the GEC actually digest from all that?

We don't want to drill down so much that we start saying that one course is failing. We need objectives that list the skills and knowledge students gain by taking these courses. All we need to know is if the course is categorized correctly and is meeting the objectives of Gen Ed. Further, why do we need to review our current Gen Ed if it's going to change soon. We are not getting meaningful assessment from this review; we are just getting a reiteration of our own objectives.

It was agreed that the biennial course review is not necessary. Instead, the Committee will just ask for copies of each syllabus for each section of each Gen Ed course.

The meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Rita J. Rabe Meduna.