

University General Education Committee Meeting Minutes
February 27, 2019
4 p.m.
HCC 310

Present: Nicole Crowder (CAS; chair), Brooke DiLauro (CAS), Chris Musina (CAS; secretary), Kelly Perkins (CAS), Marie Sheckels (CoE), Tim O'Donnell (ex officio), Debra Schleef (ex officio), John Morello (ex officio), Brian Ogle (ex officio), Rita Dunston (ex officio)

Absent: Lance Gentry (CoB), Farhang Rouhani (CAS)
Meeting Began: 4:05 pm

The committee began the conversation on going forward after the faculty feedback over the course of the fora, online submissions and survey data. We discussed categories and rationales, and how we want to present them, and what might need to change. The committee also discussed timeline, rationale, and proposal to UFC. As the UFC meeting, with proposal, is on the 27th, we should have it available no later than the 20th, and our committee will be meeting March 11, 13, 18, with the 18th focusing on finalization of what we will put forward. The committee also discussed a meeting with students on the 20th. The committee looked further down the timeline, and discussed what will happen in different scenarios.

We looked again at the rationales, survey, overall rationale, changes to survey, and discussed the results of the second faculty survey. The second survey had a 76% response rate.

Based on survey results, and ensuing conversation, the committee does not feel that we have to resolve the overall name "gen ed". We also discussed the sophomore seminar possibilities. Looking to some of the requests for ethics, interdisciplinary courses, team teaching, etc. However, the biggest issue with the sophomore seminar may be how it will impact transfer students. We should keep that in mind, but not let it fully define what we do.

The committee discussed concerns about cutting down, the general sense that if you cut, you cut across the board, those that feel it's too radical and those in support. The committee also took a deeper look at results that stood out, a main area being - Beyond the Classroom. We need to remind faculty that many of these already exist, and share that information in what we already do, to be sure to show the broadness of this category.

The committee also further broke down the survey data on the second language choices.

The largest contingents were keeping at 202 and lumping into a global category. However, that said, there was a significant movement to reduce and/or modify the foreign language with only 36% advocating for 202 or above. The middle came in at 87 responses advocating for 201 or greater and 87 responses at 102 or lower.

In light of this information, the committee looked at the 201/102 split more carefully and considered the fact that 201 could satisfy intermediate competency and would alleviate concerns about Phi Beta Kappa. We also discussed that possibly going to 201 but taking high school credit might be more appropriate. This could ultimately be a good compromise position considering the data, the survey results, retention, rigor and other factors.

An Ex Officio member of the committee brought several new ideas to the floor in that maybe our flexibility thoughts are too narrow? What else can we do to create more flexibility in the Gen Ed. These were:

- Allowing a pass/fail for Gen Ed., not changing the number you can take totally, or in the majors. As an example, Harvard is changing their Gen Ed to be pass/fail. 1 P/F a semester is the limit and would remain.
- Another thought was that right now the rule is that a Gen Ed cannot count in one or more category, let it count in both.
- Every Gen Ed should also meet an ATC. req.
- Another thought was a possible double dipping, like WI and SI now - SI, DI, WI could continue to do so, but maybe QR+NS for example.

We need to identify the signature, the thought was maybe Sophomore seminar becomes Junior seminar. Seminar experience - Interdisciplinary - creativity, critical analysis, groping with a big question.

The committee further discussed these ideas. In light of how students currently take pass/fail, this would depend on the pedagogy and where we see a line of pass/fail. It could be a recommendation, not part of proposal.

The committee then took another look at the draft rationales, and discussed further, looking at what needs to be worked on in each. Assigning rewrites and edits to committee members, looking to clarify and clear up any confusion that came to light during the fora, surveys, comments, conversation etc. As well as to integrate other thoughts concerns and suggestions. Over spring break we will work on these rationales, as well as the overall rationale to discuss in the March 11th meeting.

Meeting Adjourned 6:02pm