

General Education Committee Minutes: 4/23/2020

11 am – 12 noon, Online

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

Absent: Jacob Pollak (COEHS), Mary Beaudry (COHP), and Leonard Johnson (Academic Affairs).

1. Approval of Agenda: Approved unanimously
2. Consent Agenda: Approved unanimously
 - Minutes for 4/14/2020
3. Announcements
 - None
 -
4. Question: Is the “operational definition” part of the General Education Program? What process do we need to follow when a subcommittee wants to change their operational definition? (In this case, Self and Society)

The committee decided that changes to the operational definition, hallmark of a bulldog, relevance, and learning outcomes are not changes to the general education program, and that the appropriate approval process is the UGEC and Academic Senate.

The committee asked the Self and Society Subcommittee to elaborate on their proposed changes, specifically defining the meaning of “social science theories and methods” and providing illustrative examples. As the defining characteristics of the different competency areas in the program are theory-based, the other subcommittees will be asked to do so in the fall.

5. Proposals
 - Culture: AMGT 360

The AMGT 360 proposal was originally rejected in Spring 2019 after several rounds of revisions and discussions. The proposer resubmitted the proposal, and after two rounds of revisions, the subcommittee approved by a vote of 4 to 1.

The UGEC voted unanimously to ask for revisions, expressing the following concerns:

- It isn't clear how the course treats "car culture" as a cultural phenomenon. The course appears to be more about the automobile's role in the economy and how the industry works, but within a chronological framework. If it is to be viewed as a cultural phenomenon, it should be defined with respect to some framework for understanding culture.
- The course doesn't problematize car culture. The context of a course should be in terms of a question that is to be explored using cultural analysis. As an example, the course description declares "Cars are the symbol of America" rather than posing a question.
- There isn't any clear description of the evidence or methods of interpretation or analysis used in the course. For example, historians look at different types of primary sources through different points of view. What is the analytical framework for this course?

The UGEC recommends that the proposer identify one or two point people who could serve as culture experts to help