I. Approval of minutes from the November 18, 2016 meeting
   A. Minutes approved

II. Review and vote on newly-submitted and/or resubmitted courses
   A. We received two new proposals, but they arrived too late to be considered at this meeting; we will review these at the January meeting. January 20 is the next and only remaining submission date.

III. Moving forward with the freeze removed
   A. January 20 is the deadline for proposals. We will not accept proposals beyond that date for consideration this school year.
   B. We will schedule two meetings per month, with the understanding that the second will be canceled if all items are addressed during the first meeting.
   C. Chairs will still upload proposals to OAKS, and Gia will continue to serve as the gatekeeper this year.
   D. We will submit all proposals to the Senate for a vote as one batch rather than sending them each month as we approve them. We will send them for a vote during the March Senate meeting.

IV. General Education Assessment process: Potential changes to consider
   A. Do we increase the number of artifacts that are assessed in order to keep the percentage of the sample the same, or do we keep the same number of artifacts assessed, thus decreasing the percentage of our sample?
      1. The committee agreed that we will proceed this year with the same cycle.
      2. More courses taught means more artifacts collected. Currently, we sample from those artifacts for assessment. Lynn stated that the sample size could remain the same (i.e., decrease the percentage of artifacts in the sample).
      3. Lynn also presented options: With seven distribution areas, we could sample from two or three distribution areas during each cycle (determined by assessment plan).
   B. Do we begin identifying courses and/or specific professors who have not given good assessments? If so, how, what are the consequences, when do we begin identifying them, etc.? We’ve received reports from ARGs about signature assignments that do not meet the rubric. The number of inappropriate assignments is significant.

Discussion points follow.
   1. Our committee’s charge shouldn’t be going after certain faculty.
   2. In the future, we could have faculty submit three cycles of signature assignments to the committee so that we can determine whether the course remains in Gen Ed.
3. Communicate why certain assignments are unratable. Could even have faculty attempt to grade the assignments themselves when the ARGs determine they are unratable?

4. Gia has the record of “unrateable assignments.” One potential solution could be to have Gia contact the Chair of the department when a signature assignment doesn’t meet the rubric. It then becomes the Chair’s job to address it with the faculty member.

5. Another solution is a three strikes policy: With the second time that the assignment is not ratable, a warning is sent saying that the course is in danger of being removed from General Education.

6. Another solution is to provide faculty development workshops on creating and assigning appropriate signature assignments.

7. Faculty members frame the problem as an academic freedom issue. Many of the signature assignments that don’t fit the rubric are actually better assignments than what would fit the rubric. The problems seem to come from multiple levels (e.g., management, faculty, course being taught by different faculty).

8. The overall problem is that there’s no consensus of what General Education should be. We could create a report of the problems with General Education for faculty (presented to Senate) to begin a discussion and begin moving toward an agreement/solution. This will also help with transparency.

9. We must also consider other policies, such as 300- and 400-level justification, how long departments must wait to resubmit a course that has been removed from General Education due to inadequate signature assignments, etc.

10. At some point, the committee has to figure out how to put the courses on a review cycle to make sure that courses remain consistent.

11. If we limit the number of General Education courses within each department (at least in Humanities), it could be less stressful on the departments.

V. SACS visit
   A. The off-site report from SACS had no questions about General Education.
   B. For the on-campus visit, the committee will need to be prepared to answer questions about General Education.

VI. Math Alternatives
   A. The Math Department submitted a draft proposal. Shawn will contact them to find out when a completed proposal will be submitted.
   B. This committee can not approve the proposal until the final version is submitted to us.