***Gen Ed Committee Meeting Minutes:***

**Date and Time of Meeting:** Nov 26, 2018 2:30 PM

**Members Present:**

Botao An

Kathryn Elvey

John Lappie

Cathie LeBlanc

Holly Oliver

Wendy Palmquist

Sarah Parrish (late)

**Members Absent:**

Brandon Haas

Joseph Rino

**Present for discussion:**

Elliott Grunner

**Approval of Minutes:**

Approved, minor correction on detail.

**Preapprovals (Sunset Renewals and Initial Proposals):**

List:

* N/A

**New Business (Sunset Renewals and Initial Proposals):**

List:

CM 3006; GACO; 6- yes; 0-no; 1- missing

IS 1XXX; 5-yes; 0-no; 2-missing

AH 3100; GACO; 5-yes; 0-no; 1-abstainee; 1-missing

CSDI 2200; SIDI; 5-yes; 1-no; 1-missing

DN 3060; GACO; 5-yes; 0-no; 2-missing

**Key points from Discussion about proposals reviewed at the meeting:**

**Quick Points:**

* Cathie notes that the agenda has not been announced to the campus. This led to a discussion over the announcement of agendas and the posting of minutes. The exact procedure seems to be unknown; Kate agreed to e-mail the Steering Committee asking how the principal policy-making committees get their agendas and minutes onto the Faculty Governance blog.
* Cathie discussed the Wicked Problem course. The course has been given a number; the Curriculum Committee has recommended a name change. The name will change, to something with a verb (something along the lines of “Tackling a Wicked Problem”).

**CLA Discussion**

-Elliott spoke, regarding CLA (the Collegiate Learning Assessment). Elliott has numerous objections to both the nature of the CLA, and how the CLA is being used. Elliott asks that the committee consult him should the Gen Ed committee ever deal with the CLA, or a similar program.

-Elliott’s fundamental concern regarding the CLA is that it uses a computer algorithm to grade student writing. This algorithm is secret (proprietary), and therefore cannot be replicated. Elliott objects to the use of the CLA, or any machine-reading program, to grade student writing.

-Cathie argued that the Gen Ed committee should be consulted both in terms of whether the CLA is used and how the CLA is used.

-Elliott argues the protocol is flawed. Doing poorly on the CLA as a First Year Student, and doing better as a Senior, makes the university look good. This incentivizes

-Kate notes anecdotally that students may not want to take the CLA because of its length.

**January Jamboree, Thematic Pathways**

-Cathie says this jamboree will be focused on Cluster Pedagogy. Cathie has been consulting about what items should be on the jamboree schedule. Cathie believes the Gen Ed committee should be doing at least a one-hour session during the jamboree

-Holly suggested introducing the habits of mind benchmarks, but this was discussed at University Days

-Kate suggested discussing Thematic Pathways at the January Jamboree. The Gen Ed committee has not been able to move forward on the Pathways due to internal disagreement over its definition. Kate suggested a workshop to discuss these ideas with the overall faculty.

-Cathie notes that the goal is to enable students to take ownership of what classes they are taking, and to articulate what they have learned once they have graduated. Cathie has no objection to faculty making thematic studies per se. However, Cathie argues that the classes in the pathway have to do something differently *within* the classes to establish those connections. These connections should be explicitly articulated.

-Kate is concerned that thematic pathways may enable students to simply keep taking classes with the same professors, and call it a pathway. Kate is in agreement with professor created pathways. There is dissent within the committee regarding student-driven pathways, but that is so far down the line that it can be set aside for now.

-Wendy suggested common meetings between students within the pathway, to discuss what they are learning through the pathway and making explicit connections between the courses.

-Cathie does not object to that approach, but sees it as only one approach to making connections between pathways.

-Holly does not think a jamboree session on this is worthwhile when the committee itself is nowhere near a consensus on a thematic pathway model.

-Cathie recommended a jamboree session where professors bring existing syllabi, and they annotate it to note when they are getting students to apply/learn the habits of mind.

-Wendy recommends a survey to faculty asking what kind of session they would like

-Kate noted that time is limited.

-Cathie suggests coming up with a list of possibilities, and the Gen Ed committee will decide from among that list. The committee will make a decision before the end of the semester

-The committee approved of Cathie’s proposal

**Advisory Group Statement (draft)**

-Introduced by Holly. It requires approval from the Committee

-Cathie asks if the first sentence should refer to the Advisory Group, or the General Education program as a whole

-The sense of the committee is that the first sentence ought to refer to the Gen Ed program as a whole, not the advisory group.

-Holly changed the first sentence to refer to the Gen Ed program; this change was approved by the group

-Cathie asks about the last sentence’s meaning (regarding the Advisory Group’s participation in public-facing general education events). Cathie questions what it means if a member of the Group doesn’t participate, for any variety of reasons, in one of these public-facing events.

-There was a debate over the meaning of this phrase. The sense of the group was that this phrasing does not meaning individual members *must* participate in every public-facing event. The language of the statement was not altered.

-Method of selection to the Group

-How members are appointed was not settled upon before submitting this draft. Some members favored leaving it vague in the statement.

-Cathie objects to having the standing membership choose their own successors, because they would have to meet again.

-Wendy notes that many boards operate this way.

-Cathie notes that the Advisory Group has no fiduciary responsibilities, so it seems burdensome to ask these volunteers to appoint their own successors.

-The sense of the committee was to leave the statement vague, saying merely that new members will be appointed.

-Holly will amend the statement to conform to the committee’s recommendations. The committee will vote on this during the next meeting.

**Transfer Student Focus Group**

-Cathie met with three transfers in their first semester; all are some variety of business majors, all from Lakes Region community colleges. Two students advised against mandating transfer students participate in cluster-oriented courses. One advised in favor of a mandate. All agreed that the experience should be one-credit. All agreed that the experience must clearly articulate how it helps develop marketable skills.

-Wendy suggests having this 1 credit course occur in the first six-weeks of the transfer students

-Cathie agreed to draft a 1 credit experience for the committee’s consideration

-Sarah asks if this 1 credit class might look more like the Habits of Mind bridge classes

-Cathie says the motive behind this is to give transfers the skills they need to succeed in the INCAP. This is really more about giving transfers the project management skills that FYS students develop, rather than habits of mind per se.

-Sarah, herself unsure of her proposal’s practicality, wonders if transfers might meet in this course to look over project-based activities in their other classes, and developing project skills from there.

-The committee made no resolution. Cathie will make a draft for a one-credit course, but this will not be complete before our next meeting.

**IAC, Introduction to Academic Community**

-Wendy discussed the history of this course; one credit, six-week course that was designed to create academic skills for first-years. Twice it has almost been scrapped, but PASS ran it for a few years, and the now defunct office assisting foreign students ran it for a few years.

-It technically remains on the books (unbeknownst to some on the Gen Ed Committee) and occasionally runs. Problematically, this is now being administered by non-academic offices.

-The TRIO program administered the IAC course for some year.

-Cathie asks: Should this course be officially scrapped? Right now it isn’t being administered by any academic office.

-Cathie notes there are sixty students in the TRIO FYS sessions; but only 25 took IAC for credit (but all TRIO students had to partake in IAC activities)

-Cathie notes that this content is important for TRIO students. However TRIO has decided to no longer run the course for credit.

-Curriculum can drop the course, but since IAC was a Gen Ed component the Gen Ed committee must ask the curriculum committee to delete.

-Sense of the committee: Cathie will fill out the forms for deleting the IAC course, the committee will vote on it during the next meeting.

**-Thematic Pathways, Part II: Moving Forward**

-In the last meeting, the committee considered whether or not a working group should be formed to work on the exact definition of a thematic pathway.

-The sense of committee is that Cathie did a fine job of articulating its definition earlier in this meeting

-Cathie suggests writing down what she articulated earlier, as well as the various models she has considered.

**Next meeting:**

* Dec 10, 2018 2:30 PM
  + Follow up on the Advisory statement and vote
  + Review IAC discussion and vote
  + Review January Jamboree