

**General Education Committee
Minutes
January 22, 2018**

Present: Lori Gray, Morgan Bliss, Becky Pearson, John Bowen, Jim Johnson, Thomas Tenerelli, Melissa Becker, Jill Hoximere, Laurie Moshier, Holly Pinkart, Lindsey Brown, Lizzie Brown and Sathy Rajendran

Absent: Jeff Dippmann

Guest(s): Eric Cheney, Bill Provaznik and George Drake

Meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

Lori moved to approve the January 8, 2018 minutes. Holly seconded, and minutes were approved.

Email from the Curriculum Committee (CC). Becky gave a brief overview of the memo from CC regarding the General Education Program change. Eric and Lizzie have more of the background on the justification. The CC also asked to address academic integrity of the program change as well as any adverse effects. Eric indicated that Math was consulted about the changes and they helped write the QR outcomes. Adverse effects are really about the funding of General Education. General Education Implementation Task Force (GEITF) is recommending separating the votes into implementation and the program. There should be a written implementation plan from GEITF approved by both Senate and Provost after it has been modeled to show the different impacts. Assessment is a lower issue. If you look at current program, what do the students think? They don't know why they must take the courses. The new program is intended to be integrated so students can see the connections. Integrated learning is the hallmark of a liberal education. Lori indicated she is not sure we value expertise the way we just focus on outcomes. The new GE Program is based on outcomes and not prefixes. This is what was passed by Senate and this committee followed the parameters they were given. It was suggested to look back at Senate minutes when the General Education Redesign Team (GERT) presented to get information for justification.

Eric indicated from all the faculty feedback received effective citizens, liberal education and integrated learning were the top priorities. Liberal education was the one that most liked, broad education, ethical leadership, and critical thinking. This was a way of setting students up for success at CWU and in their career. At the Gen Ed summit faculty talked about integrated learning. The current GE program is disconnected. First year experience and the first-year seminar are supposed to draw students in and have a good introduction to the university. Engage is the second part where a student can see the liberal education through science and social science and other liberal arts. Capstone is an opportunity for students to look back at skills and the education they have learned. The current structure is to reach students in first two years and this is to reach them through 4 years. Higher level courses in the GE program. Writing is required in many of the courses that are being proposed. Students can currently get through with only one math pre-fix course. Most of these skills are hit within the knowledge areas as well. What is changing are the pre-fixes. The courses are hitting essentially the same kind of outcomes. 187 requires writing. Science & Technology is heavier in math. QR covers math. CE also integrates writing. The General Education committee with Faculty Senate approval can change the program as you move forward to make improvements.

SOC 109 - Eric asked the committee to reconsider SOC 109. Department is changing the Ethics minor into a sociology minor. The originator put through the original proposal with ETS 101 syllabus which was very confusing. However, the department got everything in on time. In October it was split off to a second proposal, and it was discovered the original proposal caused the department to have too many courses in social justice and current perspectives. However, the syllabus attached to the revise proposal was still the ETS 109 syllabus. Eric worked with the originator to make the requested changes, but with winter break and the beginning of winter quarter, didn't get the changes in until after the committees last meeting for decisions. Eric asked the committee to reconsider some of these issues. The committee will think about this and look at approval prior to the Fall 2019, but SOC 109 will not be included with the current proposal.

Hearing on MGT 200 —

George Drake indicated he feels MGT 200 is a great course, but it is not an academic writing course. Academic Writing II is what is in English 102. Writing academic arguments and research papers. MGT 200 is not primarily a course about writing. While George appreciate the changes to the syllabus and activities in the course, he doesn't feel it has completely addressed the writing outcomes. Writing style, strong focus on analyzing and use of rhetoric in writing. He is not sure how much writing is involved and type of writing.

Bill Provaznik indicated that the department used the existing guidelines and objectives that were passed by the GERT in making changes to MGT 200. One of the reasons MGT 200 was developed originally was that students couldn't write, critically reason and do research for the upper level classes in Management. The department tried an experimental program that included mentoring and external course work. Due to the success of that experimental program, MGT 200 was made a requirement for upper division courses. Currently the course has 8 pages of writing. It is a mentoring class and it helps them to incorporate writing skills into their routine.

Committee Questions - How will course transfer to writing a paper in biology? Bill indicated that most of the students have been taught the skills but have lost some of those skills before they enter upper division major courses. Bill indicated that students learn how to research, find sources, and how to critique others. Students research a current event topic. The students don't know if they will be writing for or against the issue when they are doing the research, so they look at it from all sides. At each conjunction the writing is checked for grammar and clarity. Students do 4 pitches each are 2 pages. There is a 5th pitch that is 4-6 pages long. Students also write a resume, cover letter, do interviews, write thank you notes for approximately a total of 17 pages of writing. George indicated that English102 has two 4-5-page papers and a longer research paper 6-15 pages, with shorter writing assignments along the way. Bill said that the papers are individual projects, but the group presents the projects. Mentors are a ratio of 1-4.

Committee discussion – Thomas looked at the Philosophy courses that were approved for Academic Writing II and they appear to have less writing than MGT 200. George indicated that Philosophy agreed and History both have agreed to change the pre-req to Academic Writing I and increase the amount of writing.

Lori moved to accept the Hold on MGT 200 and remove the course from the General Education program proposal. Holly seconded, and motion failed (6 nay and 3 yes).

Thomas brought forward an issue that the committee could bring on criticism about rejecting a course that looks like it meets the outcomes and wanted to make sure the committee is comfortable that we are doing the right thing.

Jim called the Question and the committee approved to stop discussion and vote on the motion. Approved. 6 nays and 3 approved.

Jim moved to reject the Hold and maintain MGT 200 in the General Education proposal. Melissa seconded, and motion approved (6 yes, 3 nay). Holly called Question and motion was approved.

SOC 109 - Jim move reject SOC 109 right now and have them resubmit later. They don't identify the pathway criteria in the syllabus. Holly seconded, and motion was approved with 1 abstention.

The committee will need to decide the process and deadlines for future submissions for Fall 2019.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.