

## **General Education Committee Minutes: 11/12/2019**

11 am – 12 noon, UC 203

**Present:** Victor Piercey (Director), Paul Zube (FNTFO), Monica Frees (RSS), Rachel Foulk (CAS), Khagendra Thapa (CET), Mari Kermit-Canfield (FLITE), Jimmie Joseph (COB), Angie Mishler (Academic Counselors), Amy Greene (EIO), Clifton Franklund (Assessment Coordinator), and Leonard Johnson (Academic Affairs)

**Absent:** Jacob Pollak (COEHS), Kathryn Wolfer (Senate Liaison), and Mary Beaudry (COHP).

### 1. Announcements

- Natural Science Closing the Loop Conversation: Thurs. 11/21

Victor announced that the next meeting will be to participate in/observe a closing the loop conversation about the natural science assessment data. This will take place in STARR 136.

### 2. Approval of Agenda

Approved unanimously.

### 3. Consent Agenda

- Minutes for 10/29/2019
- PUBH 210 (Culture)

Approved unanimously, following (a) a change to the minutes indicating that there was one vote saying “No” to the question about time on FLOs for COHP 101, (b) a question about the number of votes for PUBH 210 for culture, and (c) a question about whether PUBH 210 would be open to students from all over campus.

### 4. Proposals

- READ 176 (Self and Society)

At the outset, it was noted that our revised general education program is supposed to be flexible.

Operational Definition: The committee voted to answer “No” by a vote of 5 to 3. The committee examined the operational definition, hallmark of a bulldog, and relevance in order to determine whether the course satisfied the operational definition. The concern that was raised was that while the content of the course in terms of what is discussed, read, written about, etc. satisfied the spirit, but the course outcomes and course methods and assessment did not align with self and society.

FLOs: The committee voted unanimously to answer “Yes.” The committee noted that the course addressed FLOs 1 and 3 strongly, addressed FLO 4 moderately, and hit FLO 2 weakly. The committee did not think that every FLO has to be addressed at the same level, but that all have to at least be addressed, and some have to be addressed strongly. While the committee did not select a specific threshold, they were satisfied that this course addresses the FLOs sufficiently.

Time on FLOs: The committee voted unanimously to answer “Yes.” The committee noted that the same discussion from the question about FLOs applied to the question about time on the FLOs.

Assessment: The committee voted unanimously to answer “No.” The committee expressed concern that the rubrics, assessments, and course learning outcomes did not align with the self and society competency, while the content that was used in the discussions, written assignments, presentations, etc. did align. The committee voted no because of this concern.

Final recommendation: The committee voted 6 to 3 to recommend conditional approval of the proposal. Specifically, the committee recommend to Academic Affairs work with the proposer to align the course outcomes and assessments with the self and society outcomes prior to final approval.

Some other points were raised after the final vote:

- One committee member expressed concern that the changes to READ 176 to align it with self and society risk harming the integrity of the course itself, which was doing good and important work.
- One committee member wants the self and society committee to explain what “social science theory and methods” means.
- The committee generally liked the idea of considering how strongly a course addresses each FLO with different levels and thresholds for approval, and this may be a direction to modify and improve the decision criteria.