

## **Minutes**

Sept 25, 2006

General Education Committee

Present: Jennifer Borup, Kelly Browning, Kristine Butler, Tricia Davis, Tracey Gladstone, Brian Schultz, Susan Tarr, Donavon Taylor, Rich Wallace, Ian Williams (Chair), Ruthann Wood.

The meeting was called to order at 10:12 a.m.

Minutes for the last committee meeting were not available at this time. They will be distributed and revised at our next meeting.

Since the agenda for today's meeting was not posted publicly in advance of the meeting, we decided that no motions would be made nor passed today.

A revised version of the "guidelines" document, passed at the last meeting, was distributed.

The first item of discussion was that concerning the structure & size of our committee; specifically whether this committee should report to the AP & P committee or directly to Faculty Senate. The chair asked for a consensus from the committee on these issues. After considerable discussion and conversation, the consensus was:

That the general education committee should be a full faculty senate committee and report directly to faculty senate (function "g" should be removed for the charge of this committee).

That our committee should focus on assessment plans of general education courses, and not be singularly responsible for the assessment of the general education program. A distinction between these two types of assessment (assessment of a course and of a program) being important in this context.

That our committee takes responsibility for collecting and reporting on the course-assessment for general education courses.

A motion expressing these sentiments will be submitted for the next meeting and Wood volunteered to write this motion.

Discussion concerning the number of faculty members that ought to serve on this committee, and how they should be chosen, followed. Most members felt that representatives from both the Provost's office and the Registrar's office are essential to this committee, but that library representation is not as vital. There was some support for the contention that the committee should have only eight faculty members, but it was also pointed out that having more than one specialist in an area (specifically an area under

scrutiny while a course proposal is considered) allows might lead to better judgments by the committee. So a larger committee has its advantages too. This led to some further discussion concerning the way in which the committee is drawn from the faculty. One option is to have proportional representation from the colleges. Another is to have representation based upon the different designator subjects: communication (CW, CS, CA), social sciences (SB), humanities (HF), science & math (M, S, SL) & health (HW). There is some complication that develops as a result of the EC and MD designators. It was also noted that trusting Faculty Senate to ensure that the committee was representative of the faculty is a legitimate option.

Tracey Gladstone volunteered to frame a motion that would address this concern for the next meeting.

The chair mentioned that item two, of today's agenda, will be addressed at the next meeting, viz: Is it possible for a General Education class to have a GPA pre-requisite? If such a class were submitted to the committee, would that type of pre-requisite preclude its adoption in the General Education program (the question might pertain to a class aimed particularly at honors students)?

The committee adjourned 11:04.

Respectfully submitted

Ian Williams (Chair)

Next meeting will be Monday Oct 2<sup>nd</sup>.