Gen Ed Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, 2018.03.28
9 College Way, Room 202
Committee Members present:
   Lisa Covert, Wesley Burnett, Jim Bowring (minutes), Susan Divine, Mary Beth Heston
Ex-officio non-voting member present:
   Gioconda Quesada
RELS visitor: Zeff Bjerken

1. Previous meeting minutes approved by acclamation after addition of Susan Divine to those listed as present.
2. RELS 103 approved by acclamation.
3. Discussion of Curriculog Forms:
   a. General opinion is all are good - discussion focused on mechanics of use.
   b. Members decided to identify improvements to instructions on left side of forms to make them align more closely with SLOs and to improve the sentence structures.
4. Next meeting is 11 April; Lisa will invite next year’s members for an informal handoff.
5. Feedback from Departments on Gen Ed Month
   a. Lisa reports History affirms 6-hour requirement; History will form Gen Ed committee
   b. Susan reports Hispanic Studies will discuss Gen Ed in April
   c. Wesley reports Economics (as only dept in Business School to do gen ed) sees Gen Ed as assessment = burden
   d. Lisa reports that few departments replied
   e. Discussion: Mary Beth suggested that feedback be used to create framework for similar effort next year; the consensus was that the effort should start in Fall with appearance before Senate; Lisa reported that she did a Fall 2017 Senate presentation as well. Gioconda reminded us that the consideration of 3-year cycles for assessment may go a long way to dampen the resistance to assessment; Lisa said much of the feedback was about assessment even though we were trying to move beyond it as a subject for feedback; we discussed whether having all courses (1**, 2**) in a department was a benefit or not - no conclusion;
6. Student Feedback
   a. Lisa reported that she has requested the results of the Longitudinal Study on Gen Ed, consisting of essays and focus group feedback, and will provide them to next year’s committee
   b. Discussion: We agreed that more thought should be given to how we solicit feedback from students and alumni;
7. Lisa stated that she will draft a summary report for us to review at next meeting.

Note: Due to the fact that the committee was unable to reach a quorum for our final meeting in
April, we conducted our business via email, including reviewing and revising the annual report. The committee chair, Lisa Covert, also conducted an election via email for the 2018-19 committee chair. The incoming committee elected Susan Kattwinkel.
Wednesday, March 7, 2018
General Ed Committee Meeting
9 College Way, Room 202

Committee Member present – Lisa Covert, Kevin Keenan, Wesley Burnett, James Bowring, Susan Divine, and Mary Beth Heston

Ex-officio non-voting member present – Lynne Ford and Giocondo Quesada

1. Lisa Covert asked for a vote to accept the minutes. Lynne Ford made slight corrections to previous minutes. All members approved the amended minutes.

2. Discussion and vote on proposals:

   a) ANTH 203 – Tracy Burkett is a guest representative from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Kevin Keenan had questions about the Signature Assignment for the proposed course – he implied it does not follow the rubric. Lisa Covert suggested that the department might want to revise the assignment. All committee members voted in favor of accepting the proposed course.

   b) HONS 169 – Kevin Keenan commented about the Signature Assignment, as an example for ANTH 203. Lisa Covert proposed a question about the course being offered as a Special Topics course – Tracy Burkett indicated that the “Special Topics” designation is a typo. Lisa offered to verbally comment on the typo in case it’s brought up at the Faculty Senate. Tracy agreed to allow Lisa to comment verbally at the Faculty Senate. The entire committee voted in favor of accepting the proposed course.

   c) RELS 223 – John Huddlestun is a faculty representative from the Department of Religious Studies – he was present for the meeting. No committee member questions about the proposed course. All committee members voted in favor of accepting the proposed course.

   d) RELS 276 – John Huddlestun was present as a faculty representative. Lynne Ford had a comment about the syllabus – she is concerned about the lack of “primary source material” in the outlined course. John asked what would constitute a “primary source?” Lisa Covert commented that one or two listed sources may be primary; and, she commented that [the committee] has interpreted “primary source material” fairly broadly in the past. Kevin argued that the source material might be seminal, and therefore, constitute a “primary text.” John commented that Todd’s (LeVasseur) proposed syllabus might imply that the source material is “primary” according to Todd’s sub-discipline’s definition of primary material. John offered to contact Todd, and have Todd send a one-paragraph explanation about the source material. The committee
decided to wait for the email explanation before voting – it was suggested for the committee to vote via email after the explanation is received.

3. Lisa Covert mentioned that the meeting in March is arguably too late to offer a new course proposal, so she said we will meet two more times (in March and April) to tie up loose ends. Math/Logic Alternative Update – Jim Bowring said that Computer Science seemed reluctant to offer a General Ed course due to the assessment component. As a rebuttal, Lynne suggested that the Math/Logic Alternative is not necessarily an education “program;” and thus, an assessment is arguably not necessary. Lynne offered that she hopes various departments and programs may be more willing to adopt the Math/Logic Alternative if an assessment component is not required. Lynne claimed that she has not spoken with Divya Bhati (AVP for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning) yet; however, she has spoken to the Provost (Brian McGee) in regards to this matter. She stated that she and the Provost have interpreted this matter differently. Lynne argued that we are not assessing the students’ math ability, but rather the efficacy of the Alternative program.

4. Lisa Covert mentioned the Gen Ed Month materials and artifacts collected during Gen Ed Month (February 2018). She suggested that the committee explore all of the material offered by the various programs and pull out the overarching themes. She posed the following questions to the committee: (1) “Where do we go with this?” (2) “What else should we do with this information?” Jim Bowring pointed out that a few faculty members, within the Department of Computer Science, suggested that we get rid of assessment all together. Lisa offered a suggestion of rotating, over the course of several years, when courses are assessed. Kevin Keenan suggested that the sample size (of Gen Ed Month responses) is too small to draw any inference from the comments, and he was worried that the comments may stray from the original intent. Gia Quesada offered to ask the Chairs (from across campus), about assessment, at an upcoming meeting in May. Jim asked if assessment actually affects change within the curriculum at the College. Lynn and Gia offered that foreign language and writing courses have been changed because of findings within the assessment process – Lisa added that small changes have been made in history as well. Kevin argued that a group discussion about gen ed assessment would likely lead the discussion into a direction of criticizing the assessment process and not necessarily guiding the discussion of future improvements to the process.

5. Lisa Covert closed with a brief discussion of feedback from students. A longitudinal study was conducted among students at the College. The study started when the current students were freshmen, and the students are now juniors. There are a couple of artifacts, from the survey, pertaining to general education assessment. Lisa suggested we explore the survey results at the next meeting. She also suggested, at the next meeting, that we draw up a general report on the artifacts gathered from Gen Ed Month.
## General Education Committee Meeting

### 02/21/2018

Attendees: Kristen Ashworth (Recorder), Jim Bowring, Wesley Burnett, Lisa Covert (Chair), Susan Divine, Mary Beth Heston, Kevin Keenan, Gia Quesada; Ex-officio: Lynne Ford

Guests: Doug Freedman (International Studies), Jenifer Kopfman (Communications), Shawn Morrison (French), David Parisi (Communications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision or Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Lisa Covert called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of</td>
<td>No discussion</td>
<td>Minutes from 01/17/2018 were approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INTL 290</td>
<td>Lisa Covert asked about the range of courses that this Special Topics course will follow. Doug Freedman explained that the focus of the course will be regional and that it will cover multiple topics. Lynne Ford asked if the directions to students could better align with the SLOs related to Gen Ed. This is important for assessment purposes. Lisa Covert suggested that a clarification of the requirements to better align with the rubric would be helpful. These suggestions should be shared with each faculty member that teaches this course.</td>
<td>Unanimously approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COMM 215</td>
<td>Kevin Keenan asked whether the weight of an assignment should be clear on the syllabus. Lisa Covert explained that it’s appropriate to show the weight somewhere. In the case of this course, where the signature assignment is a test question, this should be made clear somewhere (potentially on the test itself).</td>
<td>Unanimously approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>The committee will discuss the 4-credit course option at a future meeting (i.e., incentive to stay within major area).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lynne Ford raised the concern that the course is 4 credits, but that students need 6 credits in this area (typically two 3-credit courses). Jenifer Kopfman stated that the department already has another 4-credit course that counts towards Gen Ed.

Lynne also raised a concern that 4-credit courses provide incentive to students to not branch out from their major courses. This issue relates to the way the requirement is worded.

5. **FREN 334 proposal**

Lisa Covert raised concerns about the SLOs in the syllabus, possibly a cut-and-paste issue. Shawn Morrison was surprised to see this and will fix it. Lisa also asked about the oral portion of the assignment, and Shawn clarified that only the written portion should be counted as the signature assignment. Shawn will clarify this language.

Lisa asked Gia Quesada how assessment happens with foreign language courses. Gia stated that the instructors grade them and upload the data for the ARGs.

Shawn Morrison will correct the syllabus and signature assignment language.

6. **FREN 335 proposal**

No discussion

Unanimously approved

7. **FREN 336 proposal**

As with FREN 334, the language needs to be corrected on the signature assignment to clarify that only the written portion counts for the signature assignment.

Unanimously approved pending corrections

Shawn Morrison will correct the syllabus and signature assignment language.

8. **FREN 337 proposal**

No discussion

Unanimously approved
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Update on Gen Ed Month</td>
<td>Lisa Covert shared that she has not received a lot of response regarding Gen Ed Month. She will send another reminder to department chairs. At our next meeting, we will view and discussion what we receive from departments, which will potentially assist us with addressing some of the “big picture” questions we’ve had as a committee.</td>
<td>All committee members should remind departments to discuss the role of Gen Ed in their departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gen Ed and students: Future plans?</td>
<td>Lisa Covert suggested that we begin working on a plan to put in place to involve students in the Gen Ed process. Gia Quesada asked about the data that were previously gathered. Lisa asked Gia to make the student videos available to the committee and share on the committee’s website. The committee discussed the possibility of reaching students in their freshman and senior years. Lisa Covert asked whether the Student Body President should serve on our committee.</td>
<td>The committee will reflect on today’s discussion and be ready to discuss it further and set concrete goals at our next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Keenan shared some statements from an urban studies major regarding Gen Ed. This student decided to major in Urban Studies after taking a Gen Ed course from the department. Lisa Covert asked committee what would be useful for our committee from students. Committee members discussed benefits of Gen Ed (e.g., many employers are looking to hire students with skills that come from Gen Ed courses). Jim Bowring requested that we provide an opportunity for students to ask us questions about Gen Ed. Lynne Ford suggested that we survey graduates about their perspectives on Gen Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Math alternatives options</td>
<td>Lisa Covert pointed out that we have only had one proposal for Math Alternatives. Most courses on the target list were part of Computer Science. Jim Bowring suggested that we check some HHP.</td>
<td>Kristen Ashworth will check with TEDU about potential courses. Jim Bowring will review the Computer Science course list and work with Lisa to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convince the department/instructors to propose courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 PM.

The next meeting will be held on March 7, 2018 at 3:30 PM.
### General Education Committee Meeting

**01/17/2018**

Attendees: Kristen Ashworth, Jim Bowring, Wesley Burnett, Lisa Covert (Chair), Susan Divine, Mary Beth Heston, Kevin Keenan, Gia Quesada; Ex-officio: Lynne Ford; Guests: Deborah Mihal (Center for Disability Services), Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy Dept.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision or Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Lisa Covert called the meeting to order at 3:32PM.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Minutes from 11/29/2017 were approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss and vote on proposal for PHIL 115 as a Math-Language alternative course</td>
<td>Deborah Mihal shared a video on dyscalculia from Understood.org. She also shared data on the number of students who qualify for math/logic alternatives (n=49). Jim Bowring shared concerns: (1) there is no signature assignment, but a quiz in its place; (2) statement about electronic devices. Committee discussed the issue with language. The committee determined that the quiz is okay and that electronic devices would be allowed if a student qualified for that accommodation. Larry Krasnoff shared rationale of PHIL 115 as a math/logic alternative. He added that for assessment purposes, a key would be provided for grading the logic problems. Gia Quesada recommended that we should require a statement in the syllabus that the course counts as math/logic alternative. Does this mean that all syllabi for courses that serve as alternatives would need to have this statement added? Deborah shared that there’s a master list that explains that courses can’t count as Gen Ed credit and credit for math/logic and/or foreign language alternatives.</td>
<td>Vote: Unanimous vote to approve PHIL 115 as a math/logic alternative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lisa Covert will be meeting with other departments to discuss the requirements for alternative courses.

4. Discuss process for creating new forms/updating current forms for Curriculog

We must develop forms for both foreign language and math/logic alternatives for Curriculog.

Jim Bowring suggested that we make it very clear that we are looking for existing courses that could fulfill the requirements of alternatives (adding SLOs for Gen Ed requirements). These are not new courses.

5. Update on Gen Ed month

Lisa Covert shared a draft email that she would like to send to department/program chairs related to Gen Ed Month.

Suggestions:
- Add that someone from Gen Ed Committee can attend
- Will collect minutes after February
- Send individually, rather than a group email, if possible
- If programs/depts do not meet regularly, we ask that they call a meeting

Discussing Gen Ed with students? Discussing Gen Ed in departmental meetings will be a good first step. Gia shared some information about how seniors reflect on Gen Ed (they see value afterwards). It was also noted that employers are looking for students who have had courses in Humanities.

Lisa will send the email this week.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 PM.
Meeting Minutes
General Education Meeting, 11/29/17
9 College Way, Room 202

1) Call to Order

Committee Chair Lisa Pinley Covert called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2) Approval of minutes from 11/8/17 meeting

Committee members present were:

Susan Divine
Jim Bowring
Kevin Keenan
Wesley Burnett
Mary Beth Heston
Lynne Ford
Gia Quesada
Lisa Pinley Covert

Mary Beth Heston made a motion to approve the minutes from the 11/8/17 meeting.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

3) Work on discussion points for “Gen Ed Month”

Lisa Covert asked the Committee to consider generating guidelines for the Departments and Programs that would help organize and facilitate group conversations during “gen ed month” in February.
Two types of guidelines are needed: a set is needed to help engage departments and programs that do not offer any courses in the gen ed curriculum while another is needed for those departments that do offer courses. In addition, Covert indicated that we should consider prompting departments and programs to have discussions that are both useful for the departments themselves, but which also might yield information to guide the Gen Ed Committee’s broader work. The committee’s intention is to help facilitate useful conversations and guidelines.

The Committee spent most of the hour discussing guidelines for departments that do offer gen ed courses, with the following recommendations resulting:

1. Consider reviewing the department’s current gen ed offerings as a faculty. There may be faculty who are unaware of their own department’s participation in gen ed, while all might have new ideas about contributions or engagement with gen ed.

2. Consider inviting emissaries, ARGS, or other representatives from Gen Ed to the Departments after the departments discuss gen ed. The goal of these visits would be to answer questions and provide additional resources that might be needed and/or requested by the department.

3. Consider framing the discussions as a “focus group” and include some broad, open-ended questions. An example is: “What do you understand the purpose of general education to be?” Another would be: “What does the data tell you about general education? Given the data, what would you like to see changed? What other data would you like to have?” [The gen ed Committee will provide relevant data to department and programs.]
4) Update on Special Topics courses/study abroad

The committee discussed creating “shell courses” that would serve as special topics in the general education curriculum when students go abroad. Such courses would have generic acronyms such as “HMT” for humanities special topics and “SSC” for social sciences special topics. When a student studies abroad, he or she would get these credits rather than the more cumbersome process of each individual department having their own special topics that are used. The goal is to avoid the situation where a department or program must include their special topics course in the general education curriculum to account for study abroad courses, but then has to use the special topics course in other circumstances for content that is not appropriate for general education credit. Lisa met with the Dean of HSS to discuss the creation of shell courses, and there was some confusion around whether or not this was possible on the Registrar’s side. Lynne indicated that she believed it was possible and would check with the RO.

5) Discuss spring agenda priorities

a) Need to establish clear criteria for the “line” regarding what could be counted as a gen ed class and what would not be counted.

b) Finalize math alternatives. The Committee has not received any submissions for math alternatives. There was some discussion about the Committee identifying courses, and then approaching the departments and asking them to include the courses as alternatives. Lynne Ford mentioned using the list that Jason Howell crafted before he left the College. Lynne and Lisa may also meet with chairs to discuss the need for math alternatives.

c) Possibility of a ninth category of gen ed: data literacy.
d) Explore using gen ed rubrics in other areas of program assessment.
## General Education Committee Meeting
### 11/08/17

Attendees: Kristen Ashworth, Jim Bowring, Wesley Burnett, Lisa Covert (Chair), Susan Divine, Mary Beth Heston, Kevin Keenan; Ex-officio: Lynne Ford, Gia Quesada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Lisa Covert called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Minutes from 10/11/17 were approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Update on Senate report</td>
<td>Lisa Covert gave a presentation at the Faculty Senate meeting on 11/07/2017. She shared a summary of her presentation with the committee members. One concern was raised related to Special Topics courses. We need to continue sharing information about our committee and the processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Update on committee webpage</td>
<td>Items to include: - Meeting schedule with deadlines in bold - Link to General Education Committee minutes (Senate page) - Link to guidelines for General Education courses/assessment (sample syllabi and/or signature assignments)</td>
<td>Kristen will contact Megan Gould about the access issue and begin editing the page. Kristen will contact Gia to access videos for student testimonials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discuss and vote on student request</td>
<td>A student submitted a request for a course to count as mathematics Gen Ed credit. The student had not chosen a course for which this would count, so it has to go back to the student. Gia will contact the student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Discuss and vote on proposals, if necessary</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work on questionnaire/discussion points for “Gen Ed Month”</td>
<td>For programs and departments that are not very involved in General Education, conversations could include their connections to Gen Ed. Many adjuncts are involved in teaching General Education courses; however, adjuncts are not typically involved in department meetings. We need to figure out a way to address Gen Ed issues with adjunct faculty. Make sure Deborah Mihal is invited to any meeting where we discuss Math Alternatives. Lisa will reach out to departments regarding Math Alternative proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computer Science would like to propose a ninth category in computing. Should computing fluency be a requirement for General Education?

Potential questions for department/program discussions:
- Are you satisfied with your department’s role in the General Education curriculum? If not, why?
- What is our vision for the future of General Education?
- Think beyond assessment

Other ideas concerning departmental discussions:
- Could we ask them to begin discussions with data/results?
- Are assignments effective?
- Are department chairs discussing the feedback from results with faculty?
- We could have a representative from the General Education committee attend all departmental meetings and give a 10-minute talk. We could do
this during February, “Gen Ed Month.”

Gia shared a conversation with Divya regarding “closing the loop,” and the current format of General Education assessment is how Divya’s office wants it to stay.

Other notes:
- Computing courses could potentially qualify for Math Alternatives.
- We have a position on our committee for a student. We can invite someone from SGA to attend a meeting to discuss this.
- We can access FYE survey data and begin analyzing it.
- Many students view Gen Ed as a box they have to check off to graduate, so educating students on the goal of Gen Ed is also important.
- Can we pull this into the Sustainability theme?
- Where are areas where we could make a change in the short term?
8. Discuss scheduling for spring semester

We will continue to meet at the same time during spring semester, Wednesdays at 3:30.

Our next meeting will be November 29, 2017.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30.
General Education Committee Meeting

10/11/17

Attendees: Kristen Ashworth, Wesley Burnett, Kevin Keenan, Lisa Covert (Chair), Mary Beth Heston, Susan Divine; Ex-officio: Lynne Ford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Lisa Covert called the meeting to order at 3:37pm.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes from 9/27/17 were approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review ECON 101 Gen Ed proposal</td>
<td>Lisa Covert provided the worksheet that was used last year as a tool during proposal reviews.</td>
<td>Committee voted in favor of accepting ECON 101 as a Gen Ed course, pending edits to the syllabus (e.g., clarifying assignment, clearly stating SLO).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of proposal:
- The signature assignment will be a question on an exam or a written assignment. If it’s an exam question, the grade breakdown does not specifically state how many points the question would count.
- The SLO is buried in the syllabus.

Discussion of language in form:
- The language could be more concise.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Website update</td>
<td>Lisa Covert shared that she and Kristen Ashworth will be meeting with Megan Gould Friday to begin the process with developing a website for the Gen Ed Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.  | Review 2014-17 Gen Ed assessment results | Lisa Covert shared the 2014-17 assessment data and described how benchmarks are typically set. Lynne Ford shared information regarding adjustments that have been made to benchmarks; in hindsight, our first-year data could have served as a baseline without having set a benchmark.  

Lisa Covert posed questions to the committee: How can we use this data to improve Gen Ed? What form of data would programs and departments want?  

Lynne Ford shared that one of the biggest challenges is communication back to the departments after assessments have been graded.  

We have the ability to disaggregate data by department or program, but we haven’t done it because of the principle behind it that it wouldn’t be used to target individual programs.  

The committee discussed some of the problems with signature assignments that we’ve seen in the past.  

Lynne Ford suggested that we ask departments to commit a month to review data and reflect on assessment. One option could have a representative from the ARG attend the meeting.  

How can we make review of data and reflection a meaningful process?  

Committee will communicate with deans that we would like departments to commit one month (one department meeting) to address assessment data, possibly January. An announcement will also be made at a Senate meeting. |
| 6. Review and approve email for department chairs and program directors about assessment data | After our conversation about reviewing data and reflecting, we will need to make edits to the email draft to include this information. Prompts we could include:

- Are students getting what they could and should be getting from Gen Ed?

Lynne Ford suggested that Lisa Covert attend the deans’ monthly meeting to discuss this with them. |
| Lisa will attend the deans’ meeting before our next meeting. |

| 7. Study Abroad | A question was raised about how study abroad courses can count as Gen Ed. Lynne Ford explained this process. |

Meeting was adjourned at 4:28 PM.

Next meeting: November 8, 2017
**General Education Committee Meeting**

**9/27/17**

Attendees: Wesley Burnett, Kevin Keenan, Lisa Covert (Chair), Mary Beth Heston, Susan Divine; Ex-officio: Lynne Ford, Giaconda Quesdada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Lisa Covert called the meeting to order at 3:30pm.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Minutes from previous year were approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nomination of committee</td>
<td>Kristen Ashworth had self-nominated, Susan Divine will be the alternate secretary.</td>
<td>Final decision will be made at next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Committee webpage</td>
<td>In consultation with Megan Gould, although we are not required to have a faculty webpage, the committee agreed that it would be desirable and helpful. Using the Curriculum committee webpage as a template, the General Education committee webpage could include: approval criteria; submission process (link to curriculog and link to training for curriculog); sample proposals; calendar of meetings; committee roster; background and rationale of committee; link to members for questions. The committee secretary would be primarily in charge of maintaining the webpage.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agenda for coming year: Math Alternative</td>
<td>In the coming year the committee will be reviewing a math alternative program and the GenEd committee will need to solicit courses and review those courses. The timeline suggested for this is to have proposals due in December. While a seemingly brief timeline, Chair will follow up with Nominating committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the general idea is that many of these courses already exist in the books, but do not count toward the Gen Ed math alternative requirement.

In order to understand and discuss these proposals, the committee needs to replace a member from math and science. Lisa Covert will work on securing this final member of the GenEd committee.

The due dates for those GenEd proposals not related to the math alternative will be set for November 1st and February 1st.

Ex-officio member Lynne Ford emphasized the need for accountability in maintaining re-certification requirements. One issue has been the oversight of special topics courses, especially study abroad courses, that count for credits toward Gen Ed. The question was asked if the assessment of student artifacts was sufficient accountability. In theory, yes, and the college also depends on the various Department chairs to maintain standards. Those courses taught as part of a study abroad experience pose problems of oversight in how the course is taught, what information is in the syllabus (especially when it’s not a directed CofC program), and how to decipher the outcomes when assessment artifacts are not provided.

Lynne Ford suggested a Study abroad humanities GenEd course title such as HUMT or SOCT (T standing for “travel). However, there must be a department housing the course. The committee discussed who would house these courses and concluded that the best place would be the Deans office. The committee discussed putting together a proposal, which would be breached first at the monthly deans meeting. To begin the process of preparing the proposal, the committee will
get a list of faculty who regularly deal with these issues to provide input.

The question also arose as to if these courses would count towards department or major credit. Typically departments have handled this by cross-listing a course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Agenda for coming year: Assessment and re-certification</th>
<th>The committee discussed assessment overall as well as the re-certification process in order to understand what works, and what does not work in various departments. The committee questioned how to approach departments that are not reaching their ILEP goals. There was a consensus that often departments are unaware of the data and, especially, the different types of data that were available from the assessment process.</th>
<th>The committee will work on an email to department chairs about this assessment information.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Adjournment</td>
<td>The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>