

General Education Committee Meeting

Minutes for February 11, 2019

Present: Shirlene Small (SS), Linnea GlenMaye (LGM), Sally Fiscus (SF), Mathew Muether (MM), Roy Myose (RM), Kim Sandlin (KS), Rannfrid Thelle (RT), Kathy Delker (KD), Becky Nordyke (BN), Aaron Rife (AR), Steve Oare (SO), Amy Drassen-Ham (ADH)

Guests: Carolyn Shaw (CS), Neil Allen (NA), Kim Engber (KE)

- Welcome by the committee chair – Shirlene Small
- Approval of minutes from 1-28-19 meeting
 - Changes to minutes—discussion of whether WOMS 399/ETHS 399 class was approved or not
- Dr. Carolyn Shaw: Will discuss the assessment of the First Year Seminar (FYS) program design.
 - FYS on-going pilot, voted last year to go longer, partly to make modifications and improvements—have met with instructors to tighten focus of the program/courses.
 - Bringing this early, because pilot-fatigue is setting in, worries over professors not joining on because of uncertainty of program status. But we have data and literature demonstrating the need of this program.
 - Data—improvement in first two years of program, year three not as impressive, but we think there was something about that incoming class of freshmen.
 - See page 4—overarching goals—central mission of the program
 - We had goals for FYS from gen ed goals after completing program—felt like too much/not feasible from a one-semester class.
 - KD/LGM—can you rename “general education basic skills learning outcomes” to have “for first year seminar classes” at end? CS—yep, we can do that.
 - RM—what are the FYS goals versus the gen ed goals? CS—course goals versus overall program goals. Discussion on interaction between program goals versus course goals—perhaps clarify on paper so readers can see distinction. Program versus course goals.
 - Diversity—number five—applies only to courses seeking diversity designation.
 - Page 5—student success learning outcomes. Students may not meet all of outcomes but are exposed to/address depending upon the focus of the individual FYS course.
 - LGM—question—the student should be able to statements—so syllabi need to include the exact language from the outcomes. CS—yes, and instructors reported they are already doing so.
 - Discussion about student learning outcomes versus gen ed outcomes, if professors or students will get confused.
 - KD—do we have a bullet or line about individual instructors determining their own content/disciplinary outcomes.
 - RM—just to clarify, we are trying to determine what we as a committee are reviewing when a proposal comes to us? CS—yes.

- Course components—how to balance what is taught, outcomes, activities, etc. Ways to combine. Must include information literacy, but otherwise three of nine components (see bottom of page nine).
- LGM—I thought information literacy was already in course objectives—under disciplinary? CS—this is to clarify that students need to emphasize this—but otherwise give them room to design their course.
- LGM—back to library thing—we have had discussions about what is appropriate. Some of basic outcomes refer to research, so is that outcome measured by showing an activity in the syllabus, or just through a research paper with citation of sources. CS—there are lots of options—we lay out the outcome, allow the instructors reach the outcome through their own choices.
- LGM—this keeps coming up as interpretations—people wonder what they have to do to have their class passed. Discussion about if the committee understands, if information is disseminated so everyone is on the same page.
- KD—from the library perspective, the student success outcome shows that students must take library module—discussion about for example, i.e. or e.g.—but the point is that while the FYS course must include information literacy, instructors have academic freedom of choosing how to meet the objective.
- SO—how do attendance and participation align with overarching goals? Question over structure of the course versus outcomes. CS—this (page 6) is the basic structure of the class we are asking instructors to have in common, regardless of what is taught. LGM—so, how do you link attendance/participation with the gen ed goals/student success goals. KE—this is laid out in the syllabus, I make a chart linking the assessments and the goals. This is discretionary for faculty—let them link how they will. Discussion of linkage between assessments and outcomes, done through individual choice of instructors/professors/faculty.
- NA—as someone who has taught a FYS repeatedly, I am trying to teach habits, prepare students for future classes in the university, so I support attendance/participation as an important part of class. Discussion on importance of attendance.
- Questions about Midterm—can we change to mid-semester assessment, giving latitude to instructors. Discussion on having instructors report mid-semester grades/SEAS report, etc. CS—apart from course design, FYS instructors are asking about training—which would include SEAS.
- CS—discussion among FYS instructors about assessment—writing assessment of FYS courses—faculty sees little use/value of this assessment, it was put in place per convenience. Would like another way to show progress/meet accreditation. NA—if the assessment not needed, can we stop doing it? Makes for a lot of work/headaches for Kim. KS—explained process First Year Programs undergoes to collect papers and assess improvement. Discussion over value of assessment/course v program. LGM—before removing, we should learn from assessment people possible role of assessment in program that we are missing.
- KD—basic skills learning outcomes—question about speaking and writing. Page 4, number 2—propose change “dialogue, discussion, and writing” to “dialogue, presentations, and writing.” Then page 6 oral/presentations changes to match outcome number 2. CS—I am fine adding presentation as an option but loathe to remove dialogue. Discussion of difference between discussion and dialogue. BN—per discussion with program chair—we cannot require presentations for all classes but should encourage freshman to share and talk in class. What presentation means, if it is always student speech, sometimes reading, etc. KD—I am comfortable leaving in dialogue, but we should be consistent in all

three places—the objectives, the assignments, and the sentence before the assignment table. CS—Okay.

- RM—1500 new freshmen—we going to require this to all first-time college students? CS—yes. Discussion over how many sections—somewhere around forty, can do more in fall, fewer in spring.
 - Discussion over who teaches these courses, load, role of faculty/instructors/adjuncts/clinical/non-tenure track.
 - Questions over categorization, divisional differences of FYS.
 - CS—I will share back suggested revisions with group, do we vote next time?
SS—yes, we take more time to think/discuss, Carolyn will send revised draft, we look at it and vote on proposal at the next meeting—February 25th.
- On- going Business: time concerns—we will visit these CCFs at the February 25th meeting, as well as discuss and vote on FYS revised proposal.
 - Curriculum change forms
 - PHIL 530 Ethics of Space Exploration
 - WOMS 365 Gender & Digital Culture
 - WOMS 380G Gender & Popular Music
 - WOMS 389 Gender & Science and Technology
 - Comments/Information – Registrar's Office
 - As may arise
 - Set next meeting dates – Feb. 25
 - Adjourn